

dicial Sentence : But it is plain that in *Pauls* Epistles it signifieth more frequently the Sentence of the New Law.

2. Let the Reader here judge, whether Mr. *Crançons* reviling me as a deluding Papist, for distinguishing between Constitutive and Sentential Justification, as having no ground in Scripture, did more credit the Papists, or himself, and were any wiser and honest than the rest of his book ? 1. I might have distinguished between things of so known, palpable difference as *Justificatio Juris*, and *Justificatio Judicis*, though the Scripture had said nothing of it ; because it supposeth the matters of common Reason and natural verity. 2. But yet he may easily see both branches of the Distinction in many texts of Scripture, and particularly Constitutive Justification is in this, if making or Constituting righteous be Justifying, as the terms, and the foregoing 18. *verse* do shew that it is. Here is *ὅτι καὶ διὰ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τῶ ἐνδὲς ὅτι καὶ οἱ πολλοὶ ὁποῖοι* opposed to *διὰ τὴν παρανομίαν τῶ ἐνδὲς ἀνθρώπου ἀμαρτωλοὶ κατε- σάδηνσαν ὁποῖοι*. And he that hateth and curseth every man that saith to the wicked, Thou art righteous, and that Justifieth the wicked ; will undoubtedly make a man righteous before he sentence or declare him righteous.

And for the other branch of the distinction, if I must prove that there is such a thing as Justification by sentence in judgement (that is, that there is a Judgement and a Sentence ;) and it be not enough to prove that we shall be judged by Christ, who shall come to Iudge the quick and the dead ; to omit many more, I only now refer such a man to *Math. 12. 36, 37. But I say unto you, that every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of Judgement. For by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned ; viz. in that day of Judgement.*

Argument 15. From *Rom. 8. 1, 2.* The Justification which *Paul* treats of, freeth us from the Law of sin and death ; Justification in feeling or conscience, freeth us but from the Accusation of conscience, and inward disquiet of minde ; therefore.

It will prove a dangerous Doctrine, to teach that God doth make internal Declarations the Instrument of conveying right to his favours, or the foundation of our Right, and so lead men from

from that sure Word which is the Instrument and foundation. The obligation of the Law which is dissolved by Justification, is an Act of Law, whether we feel it or not; and not an act of conscience, nor alwayes there felt: therefore it must be an act of Law, that must dissolve that obligation (to punishment) and not an act of conscience, nor an act upon conscience, as such. But of this more anon.

Argument 16. From *Rom. 8. 30. Whom he called, them he also Justified, and whom he Justified, them he also Glorified.* The Justification that *Paul* speaks of, and is by Faith, belongeth to all the called: The Justification in feeling or in conscience, belongs not to all the called: therefore they are not one kinde of Justification. I shall say more to this also anon.

Argument 17. From *Rom. 8. 33, 34. Who shall lay any thing to the charge of Gods Elect? it is God that Justifieth; Who is he that condemneth?* The Justification that *Paul* speaks of, is opposed to mans Accusation, as that which it freeth us from, as to the effect of it: But so is not the Justification in feeling or conscience; therefore they are not all one.

It is not in our Consciences that men Accuse us: they have no Access thereto: they lay no charge there against us.

Argument 18. From the same place. The Justification that *Paul* treats of, is opposed to condemnation by any man whomsoever: But so is not Justification in conscience; therefore they are not the same.

Argument 19. From *Rom. 11. 30. The Gentiles which followed not after Righteousness, have attained to Righteousness, even the Righteousness which is of Faith.* The Justification which *Paul* treats of, is attaining to righteousness, even the righteousness which is of faith. Justification in *foro Conscientia* is not an attaining to Righteousness, but to the knowledge or apprehension that we are righteous: therefore they are not the same Justification.

Argument 20. From *Rom. 10. 4, 10. For Christ is the end of the Law, for righteousness, to every one that Believeth. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation.* The Justification that *Paul* speaks of, is a becoming righteous upon our believing, Christ being then
our

our Righteousness : Justification in conscience is not so, but a knowledge or sense of it : therefore they are not the same.

Argument 21. From *Gal.* 2. 16. and 21. compared. The Justification which *Paul* treats of, and is by Faith, is the coming of righteousness by Christ ; as opposite to the coming of righteousness by the Law, (to the person so justified) : But so is not Justification in conscience : therefore, &c.

Argument 22. From *Gal.* 3. 8, 9. All that have the blessing Promised to *Abraham*, and the faithful with him, are justified in *Pauls* sense, and by Faith. All that have that blessing are not Justified in *foro Conscientie* : therefore they are separable, and oft separated, and not the same. If all that are not Justified in conscience or feeling, are not blessed with *Abraham*, (that is, are not heirs of the promised Kingdom,) and his seed, then woe to thousands of poor distressed Christians, whom by their lives, we have taken hitherto for sincere.

Argument 23. From *Gal.* 3. 11. *But that no man is Justified by the Law in the sight of God, it is evident ; for the just shall live by Faith.* Justification by Faith, and in *Pauls* sense, is the life of the just, and is in the sight of God : Justification in *foro Conscientie*, is not such, but followeth it ; therefore they are not the same.

Argument 24. From *Gal.* 3. 21, 22. *Is the Law then against the Promises of God? God forbid? For if there had been a Law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the Law. But the Scripture bath concluded all under sin, that the Promise by Faith of Iesus Christ might be given to them that believe.* From these words I may raise divers Arguments, One is from the Instrument, and foundation of the Relation, the Law; the Promise. Justification in *Pauls* sense, and by Faith, is such as the Promise doth give, and the Law would have given, if it could have given Life. Justification in *foro Conscientie* is not this, but a consequent of it : therefore.

For the Major, that the Text speaks of Justification, is evident in those words, *Righteousness should have been by the Law.* For the Minor, it is confessed by the most learned of mine Antagonists, whose main plea is, that Justification is only the Sentence of the Judge, and not of the Law or Promise. And in the thing it self it

it is evident, in that to assure the conscience, is a separable effect, that alway follows not the Law or Promise: but to convey Legal right to the benefit conferred, is an inseparable effect, as soon as the Promise acteth and is effectual. This shews also that *Justificatio Juris*, is true justification.

Argument 25. From the same words I argue thus. Justification in *Pauls* sense, and by Faith, is either the giving of life, or an act of the same nature: Justification in conscience is not so, but is the giving of Assurance, knowledge or sense that life is before given us: therefore they be not all one.

Argument 26. From the same words I argue thus. Justification in *Pauls* sense, and by Faith, is opposite to the concluding men under sin: Justification in conscience is not so, but is opposite to the knowledge or sense of our being concluded under sin, or to the concluding our selves under sin; and not to Gods concluding them under it by Law: therefore they are not all one.

Argument 27. From *Gal. 3. 24, 26. To bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by Faith: For ye are all the children of God, by Faith in Christ Jesus:* Justification by faith, and in *Pauls* sense is the same, or of the same sort as to the act, as is the making us the children of God. But so is not Justification in conscience, but is as the sense or assurance that we are already the children of God: therefore, &c.

Argument 28. *Titus 3. 7. Gal. 3. 24. and 4. 5, 7.* Justification in *Pauls* sense is of the same kind of action, as the making us heirs according to promise, or goes before it. Justification in conscience, is not so, but follows it, being the Declaring to our selves that we are already heirs according to Promise: therefore they are not the same.

Argument 29. From *Gal. 4. 6. and Rom. 8. 16. Because ye are Sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying Abba Father. The Spirit it self beareth witness with our Spirits, that we are the children of God; Gods witness in our hearts that we are justified and are his children, (which is the thing which they call justifying us in foro Conscientie)* is given to us, because we are first his children; and therefore after we are his children, and therefore after we are Justified; and therefore is not the same with Justification, in *Pauls* sense, and by faith,

(for it is by faith that we are made the children of God ; Gal. 3. 26.)

Argument 30. Gal. 5. 4. *Christ is of no effect to you ; whoever of you are justified by the Law, ye are fallen from Grace.* The continuance in Justification in Pauls sense, and by faith, is opposite to *Christ being of none effect to us ; and falling from Grace ;* that is, Gods favour : The continuance in Justification in foro *Conscientia* is not so, but is opposite to *Christ not affording us the knowledge of his efficacy to us ; and to falling from the sense or knowledge of Grace :* therefore they are divers.

Argument 31. From Ephes. 1. 6, 7. *To the praise of the glory of his Grace, wherein he hath accepted us, in the beloved, in whom we have Redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, &c.* Justification in Pauls sense, is the same with Acceptance in the beloved, and Remission of sins. Justification in conscience, is not so, but is the Declaration of that Acceptance and Remission ; therefore they are divers.

Argument 32. From Phil. 3. 9. *And be found in him, not having my own righteousness, which is of the Law, but that which is through the Faith of Christ ; the righteousness which is of God by Faith.* Doubtless this is a description of a state of Justification. The Justification that Paul treats of, and is by Faith, is that which followeth, being found in Christ, and consisteth in not having a righteousness of the Law of our own, but having the righteousness, which is of Christ by Faith. The Justification in conscience is not such ; but is our knowledge that we are in Christ, and have his righteousness, which is by Faith : therefore.

Argument 33. From 1am. 2. Justification in James his sense, was such as salvation depended on, vers. 14. and as consisted in Gods Imputation, vers. 23. Justification in conscience, is not so, but is only the Declaration of this to our selves ; therefore they are not the same.

Argument 34. From John 1. 11, 12. *As many as received him, to them gave he power to become the Sons of God, even to them that believe in his name.* Adoption, which is an act of the same nature with Justification, and concomitant, if not part of it, doth not consist in a Declaration to our consciences that we are sons ; but in giving power, or Authority to become sons : (which is by the Promise or Law of Grace, and not by sentence internal or eternal :)

nal:) therefore Justification in Christs sense here, and which is by Faith, consisteth not in a Declaration to our consciences, that we are righteous, but in giving us power, Priviledge, or Authority to become righteous. The Reason is the same.

Argument 35. From *Ioh. 3. 18.* The Justification by Faith is described as consisting in *Not being condemned, opposite to being condemned already, because he believeth not, &c.* which must needs be a condemnation in Law, and not in conscience, for every such a one is not then so condemned already, nor is every Believer not-Condemned by his own Conscience.

*I had written
hither, before I
heard of Mr.
Crandons
death.*

Argument 36. A most effectual Argument may be drawn from *1 Cor. 4. 3, 4, 5.* Where *Paul* saith, he is not Justified, because he is conscious of nothing to himself, and slighteth mans Judgement, and opposeth both to Gods, which will not be perfected till the time of his Judgement Come. I had rather desire the Reader to study the Text well, then say any more from it.

A multitude more of Scripture Arguments might be produced, but I have been numerous enough already. I shall add some from the nature of the thing, and the Analogue of Faith.

SECT. III.

A *Argument 1.* If there be a Justification by Faith in point of Law or Right, that ever goes before Justification *in foro Conscientia*, then it is not justification *in foro Conscientia* that is the Justification by Faith which the Scripture treats of. But the Antecedent is true, therefore so is the Consequent.

S. 3.

The Consequence of the Major is proved thus: The Justification by Faith, which Scripture treats of, (at least commonly, if not ever, as I suppose, when it excludeth all works) is the first Justification by Faith, or of the same sort, and not any following sort, overpassing the first: therefore the Consequence is good. I know but one man, if any, that denyeth this; or that affirmeth it is only a second Justification of a different sort from the first,

that Scripture meaneth by *Justification by Faith* : nor is there any probability that our first Justification by Faith should be silenced and passed over, and a second (of a far lower nature) only, or usually mentioned, without it ! When I know any to dispute against, I shall easily prove what in this I assert.

And for the Antecedent (that there is a Justification by Faith in point of Law or Right, before that of conscience) I prove it thus : No man is by God, or a well informed conscience, declared to be personally, actually just, before he be personally actually just indeed : But no man is personally actually just indeed but by Faith : therefore.

The Major is plain, in that God and a well informed conscience declare nothing but the truth : But if they should declare him to be personally actually just, that is not so, they should declare an untruth : therefore.

I say *personally and actually* just, because it is not righteousness as it is in Christ only, not made ours, nor our persons thereby yet righteous, that can justify us, that have it not in Right : 2. Because it is not a righteousness merely potential, or *in Causa*, that can justify us actually.

And for the Minor, that none is so just but by Faith, almost all the Scriptures forecited prove, with many more : *Without Faith it is impossible to please God. Heb. 11. 6. The just shall live by Faith. It is the righteousness which is by faith ; and faith that is imputed for righteousness*, &c. Here the common subterfuge, is by bringing in the case of Infants, which have not Faith. To which I still say, 1. That our discourse is supposed, and to be of the aged, and the case of infants obscure : and so is the Scripture it self to be understood, unless you will say, all dying in Infancy are damned, 2. Infants are righteous by Christ upon their Parents Believing.

The ordinary opposers have nothing that I know of against all this that I have said ; but two learned men that have more wit than the rest, have each of them an objection. The first saith, that the first Justification by Faith is indeed by the moral Act of the Law of Grace or Promise, but it is nevertheless terminated in conscience ; for it is conscience which the Promise

speaks.

speaks to and assures. To which I say, as I did before : The act of the Promise, Law or Grant, constituting Right, Giving Title, Remitting the Obligation to Punishment, in it self is totally distinct from the act of declaring this to our selves which is said to be terminated in conscience , and is before it , and may be without it. A man may by the Princes Grant, be made free, or noble, before he know it ; and so may a Traytor be actually pardoned before he know it, seeing the Princes pardon doth remit the Guilt , and Constitute a Right to Impunity , before it notifie this to the offender , at least in order of nature , if not of time.

The other objecteth , that its undenyable that men are Constituted Iust , or pardoned by the Covenant or Promise, before they are Iustificed in conscience : but it is not the former, but the latter, that is called in Scripture , Iustification, seeing Justification is ever *sententia Iudicis*, and not *Legis*. To which I Reply.

1. I have fully proved the contrary before.

2. Gods Laws are such, that in some of them may be said *Iudicis partes agere* in some measure, as well as *Legislatoris* : much execution being done without any other intervening sentence then that in the Law ; and God having so exactly fitted his Law to mens cases, and described the case in the Law , that Judgement is less necessary in those cases, especially where himself is the unerring Executioner , he may slay them if he take them in the fact.

3. *Sententia Legis*, is a common phrase, and though not so proper as *Sententia Iudicis*, yet here it is not unfit.

4. What means the Scripture to talk so much of Iustification by the Law , and to yield that the Law would Iustifie us , could it have given life, or were it not weak through the Flesh ? And Iustification by Christ and the Promise, is opposed to Iustification by the Law : It is plain therefore, that its primarily of Iustification in Law sense or Right that *Paul* treateth, and secondarily or consequentially of Iustification, by sentence at Judgement, (which is also oft mentioned directly ;) but never that I can find doth he once call that Iustification, which is but the Declaration of our righteousness, to or by our consciences.

5. At the utmost, all is granted us by this objection, save the name. For it is confessed that we are by Faith made righteous, (by Christs satisfaction, and Merit, as the deserving Cause, and by Remission of sin as the thing) before we are justified in conscience: And to say we are made righteous, but not justified, is to be more or less accurate than Scripture, or then *Grammarians* are: Though we confess that there is a sentential Justification, after making righteous. I would not therefore make any more debate about the name *Justification*, when the thing is granted, were it not that by this advantage, the Erroneous will interpret all the texts that use the word Justification, of Justification in conscience only, to the no small wrong of the Scripture, themselves and others. I must be shorter in the next.

Argument 2. In the Justification in conscience, man justifieth himself, or is the true efficient cause of that his justification. In the Justification by Faith, which *Paul* treats of, man doth not justify himself, nor is any true efficient cause of it: therefore they are not the same kind of Justification.

The Major is undeniable, at least, if it be not an Enthusiasm, which they speak of, such as the Prophets Revelations were: such an act as knowledge is, such is conscience. *Omne Conscire, est scire.* If it were proved that *Intelligere est tantum pati & non agere*, and so that the Intellect were a meer patient in receiving its part, yet Intellection is but an Introductive act or passion: that is more fully said to be done to or on the man, which reacheth the heart: and in that the Intellect must be Active, or else the order of the natural operation of mans soul must be subverted: If the Will or Affections be moved by supernatural Truths or Matters, and not by the action and meditation of the intellect, it will not be *actus humanus*, not a rational act. But Justification by Faith is not such, I think.

Argument 3. Justification in conscience, or in any Declaration to the soul, is of divers Degrees, at first: (for ought I know as different as there be persons;) one justified more, and another less: Justification by Faith in *Pauls* sense, is in all men at their first believing, in the same measure: therefore they are not the same Justification.

The Major is undoubted; 1. From Christian experience: 2. From the nature of the thing, and quality of our faculties, which

which God makes use of in that sort of Iustification. So that it is as needless to prove it further, as to prove that one man knows more then another, or that one man lives more comfortably then another, or hath more assurance.

The Minor is commonly granted by Protestants. Our justification at our first believing, is in the Remission of sins past: and all mens sins are equally remitted; all men have equal right to impunity, and equal right to glory. The conclusion therefore must needs follow.

Argument 4. Iustification in conscience may rise and fall in degrees every day in the same persons: Justification by faith in Scripture sense, doth not so; therefore they are not the same.

The Major needs no proof, but consulting the common experience of our selves and others. What man hath the same knowledge and feeling of Gods Love, or the pardon of sin, one time as at another: yea or long together? To whose soul doth God declare Remission of sins, every day, and at all times alike?

The Minor is commonly acknowledged by those that I dispute against: Only some may question whether I hold it my self; which I have spoke enough to before. Iustification by Faith in Scripture sense may be said to be increased as to the addition of new sins remitted, which were not remitted before; or as to the degree of Castigatory punishment remitted: but not as to the nature of the act of Remission, nor as to the right to eternal life (though Iustification by sentence be yet of a higher kind:) But Iustification in conscience, is increased in the very nature of the thing: And as it may rise, so may it fall again, many times a day. But Iustification by faith, is not changed according to every change in our apprehensions.

Argument 5. A man is not actually justified in conscience, when he is a sleep, or wholly taken up with other thoughts (and then I doubt most of us, live unjustified the far greater part of our lives:) But a man is justified by faith, when he is a sleep, and wholly taken up with other thoughts: therefore these are not one sort of Iustification.

Argument 6. Iustification in conscience is frequently lost and repaired again. Iustification by faith, in Scripture sense, is not frequently

frequently (nor at all) lost and repaired again : therefore they are not the same sort of Justification. The Major is proved by the common experience of Christians ; who sometime (at least many) do quite lose all Apprehensions of the pardon of their own sin : and of Gods special love to them : The Minor is commonly maintained by our Divines against the Arminians, Lutherans and Papists (save only that *Davenant*, and some others, and it seems the Sinod of *Dort*, excepted infant Justification from being not-loseable) But we speak of that of actual Believers.

Argument 7. Justification in conscience is not enjoyed by every true Believer. Justification by Faith is enjoyed by every true Believer : Therefore they are not the same. For the Major, I appeal to experience : The Minor is past question.

Only I must answer one great objection against the Major, which may be made. *Obj.* Whoever believeth, taketh Christ for his Saviour, and Believeth the Promise of Pardon and salvation : and therefore he must needs believe that Christ is his Saviour, and consequently his Justifier : and that there is a Promise of his pardon and salvation. *Ans.* Whoever believeth to Justification, believeth that Christ is the Saviour, having made himself a sacrifice for sin, and received power to pardon : also that God offereth Christ to him as well as others : and also that there is a Promise of salvation made through Christ to all that will believe sincerely, and therefore to him, if he so believe : He also consenteth unfeignedly that Christ should be his Lord and Saviour on the terms that he is offered on. And he that goes thus far, believeth to Justification. But this same man that doth thus believe, may be ignorant that he doth believe sincerely : Either not knowing the nature of saving Faith, as distinct from common Faith, but thinking a common Faith may go further then it can : Or else not knowing his own heart, or misjudging of what he doth through fear and temptations : and so he may conclude he is an hypocrite, or unbeliever, as having but a temporary faith, and not a saving faith : and thence he may conclude, that though Christ be offered, yet he doth not sincerely accept him, and though there be a Promise of pardon and life to true Believers, it is not effectual to him who is none. I conclude therefore, that every true Believer is not Justified in conscience : Some may be condemned by a misinformed conscience :

What

What more common then the sad experience of such Cases ?

Argument 8. Justification in Conscience, is a thing that a true Believer may not only live without, but die without : Justification by faith is no such thing : therefore they are not the same :
1. Experience tells us of Godly people that have dyed without the former (*immo qui nece violenta seipsos perdiderunt*) : 2. God hath no where promised that a Believer shall not dye till he attain Justification in Conscience : or if he lose it, that he shall not dye till he have recovered it. At least I may thus argue.

Argument 9. Justification in conscience doth not evermore immediately and inseparably accompany Justifying, or true saving faith : Justification by faith doth evermore immediatly and inseparably accompany such a faith : therefore they are not the same.

Argument 10. No Infants are Justified in conscience ; All the Infants of Believers that are in a state of salvation, have that Justification which is by faith ; therefore they are not the same.

To prove the Major, there needs no more then to prove that they have not the use of reason ; for if they do not *scire*, they do not *conscire*.

The Minor is proved thus ; 1. It is the same Promise that is made to Believers, and to their seed, as the seed of Believers ; and the faith of the Parent, is the Condition of that Promise ; therefore the Infant is so Justified by Promise, upon the Parents believing, as well as the Parent himself is. I refer you for this, to what I have said in my Book of Baptism.

2. Infants stand accused and condemned by a Law ; therefore they must be discharged and justified by a Law, or Promise as well as others.

3. If Infants have no Promise of pardon, then what differ they from the Infants of Heathens.

4. And if there be no Promise of their pardon, who can tell that any of them ever are pardoned.

5. Or who can Baptize them for Remission of sin. All this I say, as to them that say, Infants and all the Elect are justified in Christ when he satisfied ; and this may save them that are not

I would not argue from the case of Infants in any of the obscurer points, nor scarce in this more plain one, but with men that will so do themselves.

capable of Believing. But to what is said, I further answer.

6. No man hath an actual right in Christ, or actual Remission or Justification, upon the meer payment and acceptance of the ransom, without a further means of conveyance; No word of God gives any such Right. Let them prove it, that affirm it.

7. Infants have no other kinde of Right to Christ, then the aged have, upon the meer payment of the price, before a further conveyance. But the aged are not in a state of Justification or salvation by it before further conveyance: therefore Infants are not.

8. Else according to this Doctrine, why may we not say that Heathen Indians are saved by Christ, as well as Christians Infants? For they are not called to believe in Christ any more then Infants: And either Infants of Believers have some Promise of pardon, more then the Heathens that never heard the Gospel, or they have not: If they have no more Promise, then we must say alike of them, that either both may be Elect, and so Justified in Christ without Faith or Promise; or that neither are Elect, justified or saved. If there be a Promise to our Infants of pardon, more then to those Pagans; then I have what I seek: viz. That Infants have a Justification in Law or by Promise, distinct from that in conscience, and from the benefit which flows from Christs death, meerly as a price paid and accepted, without a further Conveyance of a special Right, which all have not.

Argument. 11. Justification in conscience, is but a Declaration or knowledge that we were actually justified (or made righteous) before. Justification by Faith in Scripture-sense is not so, but the making us first actually righteous: therefore they are divers.

Argument. 12. Justification in conscience freeth us but from the Accusation, Condemnation, and Consequent terrors of conscience, and not from the effect of Satans, and the Laws Accusations before God, nor from Gods Condemnation. Justification by Faith, in the Scripture sense, freeth us from these latter, and not alwaies from the former: therefore they are not the same. Our salvation depends on our Justification by Faith in Law, or before God (as many Scriptures shew): but our salvation doth not depend on the knowledge of this, and of Justification in conscience.

science. It is only our comfort that dependeth on that. Our peace with God is the attendant of one, and our peace of conscience of the other. Justification in conscience (commonly, and more fitly called Assurance, or some degree of the knowledge of pardon) is a great mercy, and highly to be valued. But compared to our Justification by Faith in Right and before God, it is small and inconsiderable: differing from it as much as a mans present comfort differs from his safety and eternal salvation. He that liveth sadly here, may dye well and live happily hereafter.

Or take the Argument thus. Justification in conscience dissolveth not the Laws obligation to punishment: Justification, or pardon of sin in Law-sense by Faith, doth dissolve the Laws obligation to punishment: therefore they are not the same.

Argument 13. Justification by conscience is by a fallible and unauthorised Judge (as to any certain decision): Justification by Faith is, by God the supream, rightful, infallible Judge; therefore they are divers. I know nothing by my self saith *Paul*, yet am not thereby justified: there is one that judgeth, even the Lord: Hereby he expresseth that conscience hath not authority of Decision for life and death, but of Discretion for comfort or discomfort.

Argument 14. Men may be justified in conscience by other Graces as well as by Faith, and in the same kind and rank, Coordinate with it, if not without any consideration of it. (for he that can find Love, Hope, true Humility, &c. may receive the knowledge of Gods Love by them by way of evidence, as well as by Faith) But Justification by Faith is in a special and principal manner by Faith; therefore, &c.

If any say, I equal them my self. I *Ans.* 1. I have shewed before that I do not. 2. If I did, yet the Argument is good *ad hominem*, in that I plead upon their principles with whom I deal. *Obj.* But it is not objectively by way of evidence only that Faith justifieth in conscience, but it is effectively *ex natura actus*, because Justifying Faith is a Believing that I am just in Christ. *Ans.* Then either you were so before, or not. If not, you believe a falsehood. If you were, either by Faith, or without. Not without! For without Faith it is impossible to please God: and it is by Faith that we are justified: being till then all concluded under sin: If by Faith, then you were justified by Faith, before that

Justification by Faith which you plead for. Furthermore, your belief that you are justified in Christ, is either such an act as all ought to perform, or not: If it be, then either most must believe an untruth, or else it is only some common Justification that you mean, which all are partakers of: but that is not it in question now. If not, then either you have some ground more then others in Gods Word, for to bottom your Faith of particular Justification in Christ upon, or not: If you have, either that Scripture nameth you (which it doth not) or it describeth you as a qualified person distinct from others by some qualification by which you may know your self. But this it doth not: and to assert such qualifications before Faith, to which Justification is annexed, is Pelagianism, or worse. If you have no grounds in Gods Word to bottom your particular belief on, which all have not, then

1. Your particular belief is confessed not to be grounded on the Word, and then I had rather it were yours, then mine: at least, I durst not trust to it.
2. Then it must have the very nature of an Immediate Euthusiasm or Revelation from Heaven: and if you say, you have such, I will not deny it; but if you say; All the justified by Faith have such, I shall not believe you in the least, without better proof.

Argument 15. If Justification by Faith, be Justification in conscience, then Justification is a part of Sanctification (which is the work of the Spirit making a Real change on the soul.) But Justification by Faith is not a part of Sanctification. Therefore it is not Justification in conscience.

The Minor is undenied. The consequence of the Major is proved from the description of them both: Sanctification is the Real mutation on the Intellect and Will; on the Intellect, it is Illumination, acquainting us with Divine verities; On the Will, it is the entertainment of these as good, &c. Justification in conscience, is Gods illuminating our understandings to see the Truth of our Condition, that we are righteous; and the affecting the heart to Rejoyce herein; both are a real change, and an illumination, whereas Protestants have taken Justification hitherto to be a Relative change, and distinguished it from Sanctification, and that in this respect. (Though executive Remission be a Real change.)

Argument 16. If the Faith whereby we are justified in Scripture

pture-sense, be not the same act of Faith, with that whereby we are supposed to be justified in conscience, then the Justifications are not the same : But the Antecedent is true ; therefore so is the Consequent.

The Antecedent (which only requireth proof) is proved by the description of each of them. The Faith whereby they feign that we are Justified in conscience, is, say they, a particular belief that my own sins are pardoned ; or that I am justified, or righteous in Christs righteousness, or that I am Elect : Or a perswasion of this ; or an Assurance of it. The Faith whereby we are Justified in Scripture-sense, is a believing the Gospel, and that Christ is the *Messiah*, and an accepting of him as he is offered in the Gospel : It is a receiving of Christ Jesus the Lord : *As many as received him, to them he gives this power ; Joh. 1. 12.* Or it is a believing in or on Christ for Justification and pardon, and not a believing that we are pardoned already. The conclusion therefore cannot be avoided.

Argument 17. If Justification by Faith, be that in conscience, and such as the most learned maintainers of it affirm (that is, an immediate supernatural Declaration of God to the soul, that it is absolved, without our own discourse to collect it by way of Conclusion from other Premises) then the duty of Examination, to try whether we be in the Faith, and whether Christ be in us, seems vain : But the Consequent is unsound : therefore so is the Antecedent. The reason of the Consequence is here, where God immediately by supernatural Revelation declareth to a man that he is justified, there is no use for his own reasonings and collection thereto : No more then of a Candle at noon : for Gods immediate Declaration is the fullest testimony : especially if it be so convincing and deciding as the maintainers do affirm it. But all that are Justified by Faith, according to them, have these Demonstrations, or Declarations from heaven : therefore to all believers do they make examination useless : which yet the Scripture doth command.

Argument 18. If God justifie all Believers by such an immediate Revelation or Declaration to conscience (or any the like) then Justification may be felt, and discerned *in se*, as sanctification may, and not only in and by its signs, causes, effects, concomitants. But the contrary hath hitherto been the Doctrine of Protestants,

testants, who have taught that election and Justification cannot be discerned in themselves but only by the signs, as sanctification, &c.

Argument 19. That Doctrine is not true, which contradicteth the experience of the Generality of the Godly, in a case wherein their experience is fit for decision. But this Doctrine (of the most learned of that way) that Justification by Faith, is such an immediate Declaration to the conscience or soul, without the use of mans reasoning to collect it, is contradictory to the experience of the generality (the most) of the Godly, (of my acquaintance, so far as I can learn) : therefore, &c. Sure I am, I know not my self of any witness or Declaration of God to my soul, which was not in the natural way of discourse, (though supernaturally excited, assisted and succeeded) ; the Intellect receiving the objective *Species*, and seeing a Reason for the Conclusion in the Premises : and not that ever I knew any Conclusion, which is revealed neither in nature, Scripture, nor by humane testimony, without knowing the Premises, and how it riseth from them. Yet I confess I have experience of strange unusual incomes of Light, and very suddenly, when I least expected it : but it is only in a Revelation of Conclusions from Premises, shewing me suddenly the reason of things which I observed not, or sought after before in vain. But never found I an immediate Revelation, Euthusiasm, or Vision.

Argument 20. That Doctrine is not to be embraced which tends directly to the deluding of fanatick, proud and melancholly persons, and to drive all sober Christians, or most, to unavoidable despair ; But such is this Doctrine, that all that are Justified, have such immediate supernatural Revelations, that they are justified or pardoned, without the use of discourse to collect it : therefore

1. How directly doth this encourage every one that hath a strong melancholly, opinionated, or diabollically deluded fancy to conclude that they are Justified by Revelation.
2. How necessarily doth it leave the generality of sober Christians to despair, who never felt such Revelations, when it is concluded that all the justified, that is the saved, must feel them.
3. What means is there to discern delusions, from such Revelations.
4. All Christians then must live by feeling, if this hold.

CHAP. IX.

The reasons why I judge that the Elect are not justified from Eternity, nor at Christs death, nor while they are Infidels or impenitent. And that we did not Merit or satisfie justice in Christ; but he did it in the person of a Mediator.

SECT. I.

HAVING (I think) proved that the Justification by Faith, that Scripture speaks of, is not the same thing which they call Justification *in foro Conscientie*, or Gods Declaration to the soul, or sentence in the soul that we are just or pardoned, I am next to prove that we are not justified from eternity, or from the death of Christ. The former as distinct from the latter, I will speak of but briefly, and then speak to both conjunctly.

1. The Elect are not justified from Eternity : I prove it thus.

Argument 1. To be justified, is either to be made just, or witnessed to be just, or maintained by Apologie to be just, or esteemed just, or sentenced just. But the Elect are in none of all these senses justified from eternity : therefore not at all.

Yet I deny not but a man may, if he will speak unfitly, put the name of Justification upon some act that is eternal, and then if he so say, we are justified from eternity, the thing that he meaneth is true ; though the words in the proper sense are false ? For the Major, if they have any other fit sense of the word Justification, when we know it, we shall know what to say to it. For Dr. Twisses *Non punire, & Nolle punire*, I have said enough in another writing to it. To which I will now add but this: Should we grant that

S. r.

that Remission of sin may be expressed by those terms; it must be on supposition of the existence of a Capable object: that is, that it be about a guilty person. For as it is Essential to *Punishment*, that it be *propter peccatum*, for a fault (real, or mistakingly judged so, at least), and if it be otherwise, it is but Affliction and no Punishment: So is it essential to any. *Non punire*, or *Nolle punire*, which may be called Remission, that the party be guilty who is the object. Yea and that it be an act of God as Rector, of mankind: (or Angels in their case.) Otherwise God might be said to justify or pardon a stone or a tree from eternity, because he doth *Non punire*, not punish them, and *Nolle punire*, resolve not to punish them. Now God was not Rector of the Rational Creature, before the creature did exist; that is past doubt: And as certain is it that man was not guilty from Eternity. If it be said that it sufficeth that his guilt had an *esse cognitum* in God; I answer, when that is proved, I will believe it.

1. As the guilt hath but an *esse cognitum*, so the Remission can have no higher a nature, and therefore not have an *esse Reale*: Nay it implyeth a denial of Real existence in both: For as the *esse cognitum* of the guilt, is but Gods foreknowledge that it will be, or his knowledge that it is future, so his Will not to punish, is but a Decree to Remit that guilt, when it is guilt indeed; and is no Remission of it from eternity.

2. A purpose to punish, is no obligation to punishment, nor makes it due: therefore a purpose not to punish, is no Remission of any such dueness or obligation.

3. Foreknowledge is an immanent act, that puts nothing in the object: therefore it makes it not guilty, nor removeth guilt.

4. It is manifest injustice among men, to suppose a man guilty and capable of pardon or punishment meerly because it is foreknown that he will offend, if any could foreknow it.

5. Foreknowledge makes no man immediately capable of punishment: therefore it makes him not capable of pardon.

For the Minor, 1. That we are not constituted just from eternity needs no proof. 2. That we are not witnessed, maintained by Plea, or sentenced just, need no proof neither. I know none that will affirm them. The only doubt is, whether God esteem us not just, or accept us as just from eternity? But this is answered sufficiently already, and especially in my Reply to Mr. Kendal.

1. The

1. The most learned deny that Gods secret estimation is any Justification or pardon, nor so to be called. 2. If it were, it must be the estimation of God as Rector of mankind : but he is not Rector from eternity. 3. God esteemeth not that to be true which is false, nor men to be what they are not : therefore he esteemeth not men to be guilty before they are guilty, nor just before they are just : *Ob.* God esteemeth us just in time : therefore he so esteemed us from eternity, because esteeming is an immanent act in God. *Answ.* According to the commonly approved Doctrine in these high points, we must say, that as it is but *Denominazione ex trinfeca, or Relatione Rationis*, at most: That Gods Acts of Approving and Disapproving, esteeming just, and esteeming unjust, are diversified and distinguished; so in the same respects they may and must be said to begin and end according to their objects, without any change in God. And therefore we must say that God esteemeth men just, when they are just, and not before; For the same Act or Essence of God, which before was only denominated, A foreknowing that we would be just, was not to be denominated, An esteeming us to be just, till we are so indeed. So much for that Argument.

Argument 2. If we are justified from eternity, then we are justified without Christs satisfaction as the cause of it. But we are not justified without Christs satisfaction as the cause : therefore.

The Major is evident, in that Christs satisfaction was not from eternity, and therefore could not cause from eternity. Nor was there any effect from eternity to be caused by it; Gods immanent acts are commonly said to be God himself; and Christs Merits did not cause God himself. They whom I oppose, say, that Christs death causeth only the *Rem Volitam, at non Actum volentis*. They cannot say, therefore, as in the foregoing case, that it causeth *in esse Cognito*: or if they did, the same answer will seem fitting to this case, besides what is now said. But I need not contend where I have no adversary.

The Minor I should think most Christians should confess. Without Blood there is no Remission : It is Christ that is the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world. What need his blood be shed for the Remission of sins, that were remitted from eternity? to do that which was done before. That