

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. *Ans.* 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

Doctrine which supposeth 1. That God was so prodigal of his Sons blood and sufferings. 2. That there was no more need of the sufferings and Merits of Christ, then to manifest what was done from eternity. 3. That no Elect man was ever guilty, no not Adam himself upon his fall (unless he could be guilty, and not guilty at once.) 4. That we are no more beholden to Christ, then for doing a needless work, as to our Justification and safety: and accordingly are no more obliged by his favour to gratitude and obedience; with multitudes of the like pernicious Consequents, which I will not bestow the time distinctly to handle, or form into several Arguments *ab absurdo*; I say, this Doctrine which so subverteth Christianity it self, and makes it but a name and shadow, cannot be true. it were easie here to heap up fortie Arguments from so many Texts of Scripture to prove that there is no Justification or Remission, but by Christs Death and Merits: but I know the answer of the Adversary would be, that it is true of that sort of Remission and Justification which Christs death procureth, but not of that sort which is from eternity; To which I Reply, 1. No Scripture mentioneth the divers sorts of Justification which they feign (of which anon) 2. They have ill performed their parts in describing and distinguishing these two or three sorts of Justification or Pardon, which yet did lie so much upon them. 3. For ought I know, they do totally destroy the Merits of Christ: For 1. Mr. E. and the common sort of them acknowledge that it is not *actum volentis*, but *rem volitam*, which Christ procured or caused: so that Active Justification is hereby denied to be any effect of Christs death: and how a meritorious cause can work immediately on the effect, without working on the Agent, and whether the effect of meritorious causes be not directly on the Agent, that he may produce the further effect, I have already desired Mr. E. to satisfie me Though this scruple may be well solved, yet I think, not by men of their principles. And what is the *Res Volita*? If it be only Justification *in foro Conscientie*, it is unconceivable how Christs Merit can cause that, without causing the act of God. For the Declaration of our righteousness to our selves, they say is Gods act: and the sense of this, or the knowledge of it, Christs Merits do not immediately effect: Merit is not terminated on our consciences. If they say, It is Right to Justification in conscience, that Christs Merits do

cause,

cause, as the *Rem volitam*; I answer, no Right nor real benefit can come to the Creature, (who is wholly Gods own, and at his dispose) but by the Will of God, granting it as the efficient cause : If therefore Merit be no consideration, causing Gods Will to grant that Right, there will be a difficulty in shewing how it immediately causeth the Right it self, especially to *Us*. And perhaps it will anon appear, that they leave nothing to Christs death to do in this neither ; but that according to them, we had Right to all this, and much more, from eternity.

2. The words of the most sober and learned man that I know of, that writes this way, are these, *Here two things may be observed*; Mr. J. Owen.

1. *What we ascribe to the Merit of Christ : viz. The accomplishment of that Condition, which God required to make way, that the Obligation which he had freely put upon himself, might be in actual force. And so much (how rightly, I leave to himself to consider) doth Mr. Baxter assign to our Works : Thes. 26. p. 140.*

And all know, that a Condition as such, is no cause, but an Antecedent, or *Causa sine qua non*. And is not the death of Christ then fairly advanced, and his Merits well vindicated ? My constant affirmation is, and still was, that mans works are not in the least degree truly and properly meritorious, and that they are such meer Conditions of salvation (not of our first Justification) as that they are no causes of any right we have (no not to a bit of bread, much less) to Heaven. Do not these men well defend the honor of Christs Merits then, if they give no more to them, then I do to mans works ? *viz.* to be no meritorious causes, so much as of an hours temporal mercy ? that is, To be properly no Merits at all : It seems to me therefore that they do by their Doctrine of eternal Justification or pardon, not only destroy Justification by Faith, but also all the Merits of Christ, and leave nothing for them to do, for the causing of our pardon or Justification before God. Nay, whether this learned man can make Christs sufferings and obedience so much as a bare Condition, let them consider that read him, affirming that Conditions properly must be uncertain: and nothing is so to God : therefore there can be no Condition with God : therefore Christs death could be none.

S E C T. II.

BUT I will say no more distinctly to this immanent eternal Justification, but speak to it and the other supposed Justification before Faith, both together ; for dispatch. For all Arguments that conclude against Justification before Faith in general, will more evidently conclude against this supposed act from eternity, then that supposed act, at the undertaking or death of Christ.

And here it will first be requisite, that we may not make the quarrel or difference seem greater then it is, that we discern how much of our controversie is about the meer name of Remission or Justification, and how much about the Thing or Doctrine.

1. It is agreed on both sides, that God doth from eternity fore-know every sin that men will commit in time ; and that he Decreeeth to pardon (actually, and infallibly, and immutably) all the sins of his Elect.

2. It is agreed on both sides, that Christ gave himself a sacrifice and Ransom for the Elect ; taking upon him those sufferings which he underwent, that we who had deserved everlasting suffering might escape.

3. I yield more then they desire or agree to, that Christs sacrifice was a sufficient satisfaction for the sins of the whole world, and not for the Elect only ; and that it was not only the sins of the Elect, which were the cause of Christs suffering, but of fallen mankind in general.

4. It is agreed on both sides, that Christ dyed not for all alike, or with an equal intent of pardoning and saving them : But that he had a special intent infallibly to pardon and save all his Elect ; and them alone : And that the Father had the same intent in giving his Son to death ; and therefore gave him the Elect to be infallibly saved.

5. It is agreed on both sides, that Christ did perfectly pay the Ransom which he undertook, and left not any part unperformed : and that he overcame Death and Satan, and was Discharged by

Gods

Gods publick Declaration, and that in him God was well pleased.
This much we agree in.

The first thing now to be handled, wherein we differ, is, *de nomine*, Whether all, or any part of this be to be called the *Justification* of any particular person, not yet believing or born.

Conclu. 1. I affirm, that *It is not fit to say that we are justified by all or any of this, before we are born, or believe.*

Argument 1. If the Scripture never call this our *Justification*, (or say we are Justified before we are born, or believe) then we may not fitly so call it. But the Scripture never calls it so, (nor so affirmeth) : therefore we may not, &c.

For the Major, I take the Consequence as granted to be good, on this explication : That I do not say that in no case it is fit to take up any Name which the Scripture hath not used : but in this case it is not fit. For 1. We should not depart from the language of Scripture, in sacred things, without necessity : But here is no necessity : therefore, &c. 2. Specially if it be a point of supernatural Revelation, and not naturally known. But this is such : therefore. 3. And specially if it be a controverted point, where new made terms, or altering of terms in the application to the thing, may foment differences, and cloud the Truth : But this is such ; therefore. 4. And also specially, if it be in a case of great moment, where mistakes are more dangerous. But this is such ; therefore, &c. 5. And especially if it be a Name or Word, which is very frequently used in Scripture in another sense, and never in this sense : For then it is worse to use that word to a sense different from that of Scripture, then to devise words that are not in Scripture at all : For it tends to lead men to a Misunderstanding of all those Scriptures that otherwise use it. But that is undeniably the present case : therefore, &c. So that I think I may safely conclude that it is not fit nor safe to depart from the Scripture-sense in the use of the word *Justification* here.

And for the Minor, that Scripture never so useth this word. To avoid the tediousness of reciting every Text where the word is used, and examining them as to this point, it may suffice 1. If you will turn by your Concordance to the Texts, and peruse them impartially, you may satisfie your selves. 2. If we only speak to those Texts that are pretended to speak in this sense, it is enough. We have often urged the Antinomians to cite one Text of Scri-

pture that faith, *We are Justified before we were born, or do believe*; and we could never yet see one produced that had any strong appearance, of speaking in that sense. Nor do I remember any more then two, that ever I heard produced, with any shew of Reason.

The first is that *Rom. 4. 5. To him that worketh not, but believeth on him that Justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted to him for Righteousness.* The forementioned learned man saith, *Perhaps also this may be the Justification of the ungodly, mentioned Rom. 4. God Absolving a sinner in heaven, by accounting Christ unto him, &c.* To this I have said enough against *End. Colvinus*, to which I refer the Reader.

Mr. J. O.

See Anton.
Fayus on the
Text, Syrus
Interpres leg-
git, Justifi-
cante peccato-
res.

1. The Text by *ungodly*, plainly means (in my judgement) *unjust*: God makes those just, by giving them part in Christ, who are unjust by their own sins.

2. The common answer also, is far liker to truth then their Exposition: *viz.* that it is *in sensu diviso*, he that was ungodly, (and that in the same moment of time wherein he was justified) and not he that was so in order of nature after Justification as well as before, yea and in time too.

3. Ungodliness is by most Divines supposed to be opposed to sanctification, and not to our first Faith: and they judge commonly (till Mr. *Pemle*) that Faith goes before Justification and Sanctification. And therefore it might be said that the person Justified is ungodly, as being unsanctified; but not an unbeliever. If they say, Can a Believer be unsanctified? I answer, There is no moment of time, wherein a Believer is unsanctified: but because in order of nature a man is first called, and then a Believer, and then justified and sanctified, therefore Justification going before Sanctification, and after Faith, the object must be accordingly denominated, *quoad momenta rationis, non temporis*; and we must say, God justifieth an unholy man, (because he is not holy in order of nature till after Justification;) but not that he justifieth an unbeliever, because he is in order of nature a Believer first. Though I speak not this as giving you any opinion of my own in this point, yet it being the common Doctrine of the Protestant Churches, should not by Protestants be slighted.

4. At least they that bring this Text to prove the Justification of the Elect before believing, must confess that there is no such words

words in the text. And therefore they that will affirm that *ungodly* is as much as *unbelieving*, their bare word is no proof : and therefore we must expect some better, or take the point unproved.

5. Nay, what need we more words with them, when the Text twice over tells you what *ungodly* ones are Justified, even *Believers* : It must be, *He that believeth on him that Justifieth the ungodly, and it is his Faith (that) is imputed to him for righteousness : And this man is not an unbeliever.*

The second text cited to prove *Justification* to be a word applicable to the eternal act, or to some before Faith or existence of that person, is *Rom. 8. 33. Who shall lay any thing to the charge of Gods Elect ? It is God that Justifieth, who is he that condemneth ? it is Christ that dyed, yea rather that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us.* *Ans.* The whole scope of the Chapter shews that it is the sanctified Elect that are here spoken of, and not any other. *It is they that are in Christ Jesus, that walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit, to whom there is no condemnation. v. 1. to 14. It is they that are led by the Spirit of God, and so are the Sons of God. v. 14. That have received the Spirit of Adoption. v. 15. Having the Spirit bearing them witness that they are the children of God. v. 16. That are heirs, and joynt heirs with Christ. v. 17. That have Hope and Love to God. v. 24. 28. and are Saints. v. 27. And God doth exactly tell us his order of gifts. v. 30. where calling goeth before Justification.* In the very text it is plain; 1. It is such Elect ones as are chargeable and condemnable, if God did not justify them. But so are not any unborn. 2. It is such as the world is apt to accuse and slander, and condemn, and this is spoken to encourage them against such sufferings from the world : But the world doth not so persecute the Elect while they are unconverted, and run with them to all excess of riot, and are foolish, disobedient, serving divers lusts and pleasures : but when they break from their captivity, and escape the pollutions of the world. 3. It is such as Christ is interceding for, as for strength and perseverance. 4. It is such as *Paul* was confident should persevere, and nothing separate them from the Love of God.

2. And, though I do believe that there is an Absolute Election of Individual persons to Faith and Salvation, yet it is certain,

tain, that the words *Elect*, and *Election*, do often signifie that which is in time, if not far more often then that which is from eternity : When God by his Spirits effectual Grace doth choose one, and pass by another, this is (executive) Election, and these so actually chosen or taken out of the world to Christ, are Elect : and this is the most usual sense of the word in Scripture, as I think.

3. The Text speaks of such as God himself doth not condemn : but God by his Law doth condemn all Unbelievers, the Elect as well as others; though not with a Peremptory, Remediless Condemnation. For he that believeth not is condemned already : And God hath concluded all under sin. God chargeth with sin, conscience chargeth them, and others may charge them. I conclude therefore that this Text cannot be understood of Infidels.

Argument 2. If the name *Justification* be not fitted to the nature of the thing, viz. of the Decree of God to pardon us, or the present immediate effects of Christs satisfaction, as to us, before we did exist : then it is not fit to be ordinarily applyed thereto : But the Antecedent is true : therefore so is the Consequent. Here we should examine the nature of the thing it self, and the sense of the word, but the former will be our work anon, when we come to speak of the Real or Doctrinal difference between us in this point ; and the latter is oft enough done by others. I proceed to the next verbal difference.

Conclu. 2. The name of Pardon or Reconciliation is not fit to be given to Gods eternal Decree of Pardoning, or to any eternal act, or any act not procured by the Mediation of Jesus Christ. The proof is the same with the former. There is no word of God (that ever I observed, or heard produced by any of them to that end) that doth so use the word Pardon or Reconciliation. He that saith there is any, let him prove it if he can. I admire that they neither do something in it, or give up that cause, being so much provoked to it as they have been.

Conclu. 3. Though the names of Reconciliation, and Taking or Purging away sin, (and perhaps Pardon) may be applyed to that which Christ hath done for us with God, by his Merits, before we believe or were born, yet should it be very sparingly, and never but with sufficient caution to discover, that we mean not an Absolute,

Actual

Actual Reconciliation of any man, nor such a pardoning, purging, or taking away his sin.

The reason is, because 1. Scripture useth these words thus, but very seldom. You hear not any act at Christs death called by any of these names, once, for many times that you hear of pardon to Believers, and Reconciling them to God, &c. 2. You never read these words so used in Scripture, but with sufficient cautionary light (there, or neer at hand) to acquaint us, that it is not personal, actual, absolute pardon or Reconciliation that is meant : and usually this is done two waies ; 1. In that the Reconciliation or pardon mentioned from Christs death, before the sinner was born, is never mentioned (that I know of) with appropriation to the Elect, or any sort of men more then others, nor with exclusion of any sinner, but as a common Reconciliation or Pardon : Now it is certain that all men attain not to an absolute, actual pardon and Reconciliation. 2. In that when the Scripture doth mention Reconciliation or purging away sin, &c. as done before we believe, it either prescribes us some Condition or Means by which it may be made Ours in particular, or else some other way makes it manifest that it is not yet ours, any more then the rest of lost mankind. Let us peruse the particular places.

The most remarked text, and most urged by them that we oppose is, 2 Cor. 5. 19. *That God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses to them, and hath committed to us the word of Reconciliation : Now then we are Ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us ; We pray you in Christs stead, be ye Reconciled to God.* To this I have spoken against L. Colvinus.

Note here, 1. That the Text saith not, God was *Reconciled* to the world, but *God was Reconciling the world* : He did much, and as much as concerned the sufficiency of a Sacrifice, Ransom and Satisfaction towards an actual Reconciliation, which through their own wilful rejection, many do miss of.

2. Note that the Text only saith, *God was Reconciling, &c. not Imputing* their sin. Not that he did not at all impute sin to them : but he was then, not dealing with them according to the desert of their sin, but in mercy : So far was he in that work from imputing sin to them, or then charging it on them, that he was providing

viding a sufficient Remedy for the pardon of it, if they would accept it freely given.

3. Note that it is not any special sort of persons, that are here spoken of, but *the world*; whether simply considered, as the whole race of mankind, or whether the Gentiles as well as the Jews: it is to *avoid* an exclusion of any, and not to *exclude* any: and therefore it is not meant of the Elect only.

4. The next words most plainly shew that they were not yet actually reconciled, when the Office of Embassadors is appointed, to beseech men in Christs stead, and as if God did it by us, to be reconciled to God. If they were Reconciled already, what need Ministers beseech them to be Reconciled? I remember *Don* and other Antinomians say, that God was reconciled to them, but not they to him: but this vain objection I have answered in two former writings already.

The 2. Text that is urged, is *Joh. 1. 29. Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world.* Here note 1. The text saith not that, He hath taken away, but he *taketh away*, as *Erasmus* and *Beza*, signifying his continued act in taking away sin: So that it saith nothing of taking it away before we believe. *Beza* thinks *John* pointed to Christ in reference to his Baptism, to shew them that it was by vertue of Christs blood, that the sins of the baptized were taken away. 2. The word here used, may signifie the taking away of sin it self in its power, as well as Guilt: And though we may not expound it as *Grotius* doth, of taking away sin it self only, yet we may well do as other Expositors do, extend it to both. *Beza* blames them that restrain it to the taking away of Punishment only, and himself expounds it of both, Punishment and Power of sin. Now it is certain that Christ took not away the Power of sin, or sin it self before we were born, or did believe. 3. Note that, if it were granted that it is meant of taking away sin, at the time of Christs death, yet it would prove but a common taking away, and therefore not an Absolute and Actual pardon: For if it be so understood, the world will never be proved, to be meant of the Elect only.

Another text that is stronger in appearance then this, for the phrase in question, is *Heb. 1. 3. When he had by himself purged our sins, (sat down on the right hand of the Majestie on high.* To which I say, 1. The text saith not he pardoned or Justified us, but

but *he made a purgation*, as the words are expressly. 2. They whom we in this oppose, deny not but that it is the sin it self, or power of it, as well as the guilt, that is purged away through the blood of Christ: yet none will say that sin it self, or the strength of it is purged away, before we are born or believe, but only that Christ made a Purgation, which should in time, being applyed, effectually, and actually purge us from sin. 3. The text having reference to the Jewish sacrifices, doth plainly speak of Christs blood as a price or sacrifice; and only intendeth that he did make a sufficient Purgation of our sins, *quoad pretium, vel sacrificii perfectionem*: as far as concerned him as sacrificer of himself. He did all that was his part on the Cross to do; though there remained more to do in the application and conveyance of Right to particular persons, by his Word and Spirit: If the High Priest had offered a sacrifice for the sins of an obstinate impenitent sinner, he had not thereby made a legal effectual Purgation of his sin, supposing the sinner, at least, to declare his Dissent and Impenitency. Yet it is so much that Christ hath done before we believe, that we may see Reason why it may bear the name of *Purgation or Reconciling*; because it is a Pardon sufficiently purchased by him, and granted freely by God to all that Refuse it not, when it is offered them. If a Kings Son pay a Ransom for 100. Traytors, and his Father grant and seal them a pardon, is it not fit or tolerable language to say, the King hath pardoned these men, or the Prince hath bought their pardon? Yet it is no actual pardon, till they consent, if we suppose it to be granted on Condition of their Consent or Acceptance. And so reasonable, so naturally necessary is that Condition, that it is not used to be expressed in Pardons or the like Grants, but implied; But whether expressed or not, it is in the nature of the thing most commonly supposed: And if it did run in an Absolute form, yet is Acceptance still implied as an unquestionable Condition, and as to it, the Pardon is not intended to be Absolute. Yet if such a Pardon were brought to a Traytor at the Gallows, and he refuse it, and be hanged; men would say, that *The King or State did Pardon such a man, but he wilfully refused it.*

I know no other texts that have neer so strong appearance of favouring their cause, as these cited, especially the last, and therefore I shall not need to mention any more; but come to the Doctrinal difference.

And here it is hard to say wherein we disagree, because they agree not among themselves, some saying one thing, and some another. Most of them say, that we are actually pardoned and justified in Christ at his undertaking to dye for us ; and that it is but the knowledge, and comfortable feeling of this that is wanting to us : Mr. Crandons words are these in his *Epist. Dedic. Justification as an Immanent act in God* : *As actually compleated in the Redemption which is by Christ, and in Christ ; both these before we believe.* So that it is Actual and Compleated Justification, which they suppose to be before Faith. Many of them use to express themselves, that Christ being the Publick person, he represented all the Elect, and they dyed in him, and satisfied in him, and were justified in him.

Mr. Owen.

The forementioned Learned man, makes the ground of the Elects Absolution to be, *they dying with him*, as he speaks : and saith that *Christ is Reckoned to us, and Gods Reckoning Christ in our present sense, is the imputing of Christ to ungodly unbelieving sinners for whom he dyed, so far as to account him Theirs, to bestow Faith and Grace on them for his sake.* And *If then this be done for Christs sake, then is Christ made ours before we believe* : And I cannot conceive how any thing should be made out to me for Christ, and Christ himself not be given to me. And the Question he offers is this : *Whether Absolution from the guilt of sin, and Obligation unto Death, though not as terminated in the Conscience for Compleat Justification, do not precede our Actual believing?* So that this learned man seems to judge that the name of Compleat Justification is proper to that in Conscience, and not to be given to any before. He seems also to judge that Justification hath Degrees and Parts at many 100 or 1000 years distance one from another : Or else Absolution at least hath, which we have hitherto taken for the same thing with Justification. For as he calls this in conscience, *Compleat Justification* ; So he saith *Absolution in Heaven, and Justification, differ as Part and Whole.* By this much it may be gathered where our difference lyeth in sense, as well as terms. We will except then Justification as *Terminated in Conscience*, and speak to that which is terminated, or (*passive sumpta*) consisteth in our meer Relation, of being *Iust* : Of all the forementioned

oned sorts of Justification that will fitly bear that name (I mean of Actual Justification of such persons,) the first in Order is *Constitutive Justification*, or *Making us Just* : and therefore if I prove that this is not before Faith, it must needs follow that the rest are not. I confess the grounds of their mistake do call lowdest for a Confutation. 1. That *We dyed with Christ*, or satisfied in him, or fulfilled the Law in him. 2. That Christ is given to us in special manner more then to others, (the non-Elect) before we believe. Against both these I would oppose these two Conclusions.

1. We did neither Really, nor in Gods Account, Dye with Christ when he dyed, nor in him satisfie Gods Justice, nor fulfil the Law. *Con.* 2. Though Christ were given for the Elect, more then others, yet is he no more given to them then others, before they are born, or before they have Faith. The first of these is of so great moment, and is the heart and root of so many Errors, yea of the whole body of Antinomianism, that I had rather write as great a volum as this against it, then leave it with so brief a touch as here I must do, if I should particularly fall upon it. Let it therefore now suffice, to tell the Affirmers, that it is their part to prove it, which I think, they will never be able to do, while Scripture is taken for Gods Word.

SECT. III.

S. 3.

I Will come therefore to the point in question, and prove this Conclusion contrary to theirs.

Conclu. No man now living was Justified, Pardoned, or Absolved actually from the guilt of sin, and Obligation to Death, at the time of Christs death, or undertaking, or from eternity, or at any time before he was born, or before he did believe; (or being an Infant, had a Believing Parent.)

Though I think it reasonable that the Case of Infants and Heathens that hear not the Word, should be * laid by in this dispute, least the case be carried into the dark, and men argue *a minus notis*.

* I mean not whether they are at all justified, but of the manner.

I put the Conclusion in their own terms : To me and other men, all these (or 3 at least) are one and the same thing , viz. To be actually justified , and pardoned, and Absolved from the guilt of death, and Absolved from the Obligation to Death or Punishment. Guilt is an Obligation to Punishment ; at least , Guilt of death distinct from the meer *Reatus Culpe*. The dissolving of the Obligation to Punishment, is Pardon (that is the true Nature of pardon.) Pardon is taken by some to be the whole of Justification, and the same thing ; though notionally differing : by others to be part of it, and Imputation of righteousness the other part : or Accepting us as Righteous, as others. If therefore we are Absolved from the Guilt of Death, and from the obligation to Punishment, then we are certainly pardoned and justified. And this must be in Law-sense, as to Right and Title, and Constitutively, at least. For it is the Law that obligeth us to Punishment, and concludeth us under guilt : therefore if the Laws Obligation to Punishment be dissolved, then in Law we are pardoned and Constituted Righteous This is it therefore that I deny , and shall now confute ; and in this sense I shall disprove the pretended pardon and Justification of the Elect, at the undertaking, or death of Christ.

Argument 1. From *Ioh. 3. 18.* *He that Believeth on him, is not condemned : but he that believeth not, is condemned already.* He that is condemned, is not pardoned, absolved or Justified : He that believeth not, though Elect, is condemned ; therefore.

I know nothing that can be said against the Major, but that he may be condemned in one kind, and yet absolved in another. But that is nothing to the Argument, as long as Condemnation and Absolution are here taken in the same kind. Absolution, as you heard, is taken for Dissolving guilt of Death, or Obligation to Punishment, or Absolving from these : And Condemnation here must needs be taken as opposite to that kind of Absolution : for to that in conscience it is not opposed, as I have already proved ; And to that at Judgement, whether by Witness, Advocate, or Sentence, it cannot be here opposed : For many that are now condemned as unbelievers, shall Believe, and then be Absolved.

The common answer is against the Minor, that the Text speaks only of such Unbelievers, as shall so live and dye, and are not Elect : But when that is proved, they say something. In the mean

mean time, if Christ say without limitation, that *He that Believeth not is condemned already* ; We shall take it for a Contradiction and not an Exposition, to say, the meaning is, Not all that believe not are condemned, but they that shall so live and dye : Else I know not what Scripture may not be thus perverted. So *Origen*, or any of that mind might have said, that the Text which saith, *Their worm dyeth not, and their fire is not quenched* ; is not meant of all the damned, but of those that continue there Impenitent and Unbelievers.

Argument 2. They that are dead in Trespases and Sins, and by nature the children of wrath, even as others, were not justified, absolved or pardoned, as aforesaid, in Christ, before they believed or were born. But many of the Elect were (after Christs death) dead in trespases and sins, and by nature the children of wrath, even as others. therefore.

I think the Major needs no proof. The Minor is expressed, *Ephes. 2. 1. 3.* All the answer that is commonly given is, that They were justified in Christ, and yet children of wrath in themselves : But what is the meaning of *in Christ*, and *in themselves* ? One man hath but one person, and that cannot be at once justified and condemned, in the same kind. Its like they mean, as Mr. *Hye* expresseth himself ; that it is not we that are the subject of that Righteousness, but Christ. That is plain dealing : but then it is undenyable that it is not we that are justified by it, but Christ : For no Accident is ours, or can denominate us, whereof we are not the subject.

Argument 3. From *Ephes. 2. 12.* *At that time ye were without Christ, being Aliens from the Common-wealth of Israel, and strangers from the Covenants of Promise, having no hope, and without God in the world.* They that are thus without Christ, Covenants of Promise, Hope, God, are not in Law Absolved from the guilt of death, and obligation to punishment : But such are many of the Elect, if not all before they believe : therefore.

Argument 4. From *Tit. 3. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7.* *For we our selves were sometimes foolish, disobedient, &c. But after that the kindness and Love of God our Saviour, toward man appeared: not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his Mercy he saved us, by the washing of Regeneration, and renewing of the Holy-Ghost, which he shed on us abundantly, through Jesus Christ*
our.

our Saviour ; that being justified by his Grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life. If we are not justified nor made Heirs before the washing of Regeneration, then we are not Justified or Absolved from the guilt of death, before we believe or were born : But the Antecedent is true (and plain in the Text :) therefore so is the Consequent.

Argument 5. They that are under the Curse of the Law, (that is, obliged to death eternal by it) are not justified, or absolved from the guilt of death. But the Elect before Faith are, at least many of them, if not all, under the Curse of the Law : therefore.

The Major I suppose will be granted ; for the Law to curse men to death, when the Obligation to that death is Dissolved, and they absolved from it, is to contradict it self or God.

The Minor I prove thus. They that are of the Works of the Law, are under the Curse. Many, at least, of the Elect before Faith, are of the Works of the Law : therefore they are under the Curse.

The Major is the Word of God, *Gal. 3. 10.* For as many as are of the Works of the Law, are under the curse. The Minor is plain, unless no such Jew or Legalist be convertible.

Argument 6. If all are concluded by Gods Laws under sin, that the Promise by Faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that Believe, then the Elect are not Absolved from the guilt of sin or death, before they believe : But the Antecedent is Gods Word ; *Gal. 3. 22.* therefore.

Argument 7. From *Rom. 3. 23. 9. 10. 19.* We have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin. For all have sinned and come short of the Glory of God. There is none righteous, no not one. That all the world may become guilty before God. They that are not righteous, but have sinned and come short of the Glory of God, and are under sin, and guilty before God, are not Absolved from the guilt of sin and death, nor Justified : But such are the Elect before they believe : therefore.

Argument 8. From *Rom. 5. 12, 13, 14.* Death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned : For until the Law sin was in the world : but sin is not imputed where there is no Law ; Nevertheless death required from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adams transgression, &c. But not

as the offence, so is the free Gift, &c. Those ; over whom death reigned, (according to the sense of this text) through the Imputation of sin, both original and actual, were not Justified or Absolved from the Guilt of death, before they were born, or were Believers : But such were those to whom the free Gift came for Justification by Faith in Christ : therefore. I take it for granted that those whom I dispute against, do take the efficacy of Christs death to be immediately after the fall, or that Adam was sentenced, and the Promise made, and not only since the time of his actual dying.

Argument 9. From Rom. 5. 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21. Those men are not yet absolved from guilt, and Justified or Pardoned, over whom sin reigneth unto death, on whom judgement is come to condemnation, that are so made sinners, as not yet to be made righteous, justified, or have received the free gift : But such are the Elect before they believe : therefore.

Argument 10. From Rom. 7. 1. Know ye not, that the Law hath Dominion over a man as long as he liveth ? They, over whom the Law hath Dominion, are not Absolved from its Obligation to Punishment : But such are the Elect before believing (all or some) *vers.* 4. therefore.

Argument 11. They that are the Servants of sin, free from righteousness, doing that whose end and wages is death, in whom sin did work, to bring forth fruit unto death, that are not under Grace, but under the Law, &c. are not Absolved from the Laws Obligation to punishment, nor pardoned. But such were the Elect (all or some) before believing. Rom. 6. 14, 15. 13. 16, 20, 21, 23. and 7. 5. therefore, &c.

Argument 12. From Rom. 8. 1. There is therefore now no Condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, that walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. This plainly implyes, that till men are in Christ Jesus, there is still Condemnation to them. Those that are not yet freed from Condemnation are not Justified, absolved, pardoned : But such are the Elect, till they are in Christ Jesus : therefore.

Argument 13. From Rom. 8. 1, 6, 7, 8, 13. They that have that carnal mind which is death, and enmity against God, and cannot please God, and shall die, if they hold on, these are not yet Justified, Pardoned, or Absolved from the Laws Obligation

to death. But such are the Elect (all or some) before they believe: therefore.

Argument 14. From *Rom.* 8. 2. He that is not made free from the Law of sin, and death, is not absolved from the Laws obligation to punishment. But *Paul* an Elect man, before he believed, was once not freed from the Law of sin and of death: therefore.

Argument 15. From *Rom.* 8. 9. *If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his.* He that is none of Christs, is not Absolved from the guilt of death. The Elect that have not the Spirit of Christ, are none of his: therefore. Though they are chosen by him, they have no Legal Right to him.

Argument 16. From *Ioh.* 8. 24, 32, 33, 34, 36. They that are yet in their sins, and not made free by the Son, are not Absolved from the guilt of death: But such are all Unbelievers, though Elect: therefore, &c.

Argument 17. He that lies under the Threatning, that he shall not live; he that hath no life in him, (neither of Justification nor Sanctification) such are not Justified or Absolved. But they that eat not the flesh of Christ; and drink his blood, have no life in them, and (except they do it) shall not see Life. *Ioh.* 6. 53, 54, 57, 58, 59. Read the Text, and note that it is not upon the meer shedding of Christs blood, but on the eating of his flesh, and drinking of his blood by Faith, that we receive eternal life, in the beginnings and right to it.

Argument 18. From *Psal.* 5. 5. *Thou hatest all workers of Iniquity.* Those whom God hateth, he hath not yet Justified or Absolved from the guilt of death. But the Elect before Conversion God hateth: therefore. The Minor is proved: God hateth all workers of Iniquity, the Elect before Conversion are workers of iniquity: therefore.

I know this is a hatred consistent with the Love of Election and Redemption: but not with the Love of actual Reconciliation, Remission, Justification or Absolution from the guilt of death. For this Hatred is, when God stands related to them as any enemy, according to the terms of his Laws, which is, while the effects of Hatred, that is, Destruction remains their Due according to Law. And this cannot be when they are absolved from that obligation and pardoned.

Argument 19. From *I* *Ioh.* 3. 8. 10. 7. *Let no man deceive you:*

be

he that doth Righteousness, is Righteous, even as he is Righteous. He that committeth sin, is of the Devil, &c. In this the children of God are manifested, and the children of the Devil : whosoever doth not righteousness, is not of God, neither he that loveth not his Brother. They that are not of God, nor Righteous, nor are the children of God, but are the children of the Devil, are not yet Justified, Pardoned, Reconciled and Absolved from the guilt of death. But such are the Elect before conversion : therefore. The Minor is too evident. They that do not Righteousness, nor Love their brother, are the children of the Devil. The Elect before Conversion do not righteousness, nor love their brother (at least some of them) : therefore.

Argument 20. From 1 Joh. 3. 14, 15. *We know that we have passed from death to life, because we love the brethren : He that loveth not his brother, abideth in Death, &c.* He that abideth in death, and is not passed from death to life, is not Justified, Pardoned, or Absolved from the guilt of death. But the Elect before Conversion abide in death, and are not passed from death to life : therefore. The text proves the Minor. He that loveth not the brethren abideth in death, and is not passed from death to Life. The Elect before conversion, love not the Brethren : therefore. Death here is not only the power of sin, but the guilt of death : and life is not only holyness, but Relative life also, and Right to life eternal.

Argument 21. From 1 Joh. 5. 10, 11, 12. *He that believeth not, hath made God a Liar, &c. He that hath the Son, hath life, and he that hath not the Son, hath not life.* He that hath not the Son, nor that life which God hath given in him, is not yet Absolved from the guilt of death, nor Pardoned, nor Justified. The Elect that yet believe not, have not the Son, nor that life which God hath given in him : therefore, &c.

Argument 22. Heb. 11. 6. *Without Faith it is impossible to please God.* If it be impossible for the Elect to please God without faith, then they are not actually reconciled to him, nor pardoned, nor absolved from the guilt of death without Faith. But the Antecedent is true, therefore so is the Consequent.

The common Answers, (and all that I know of) that are made to this, are these two. 1. That the person is not in himself, but in Christ only Pleasing or Acceptable to God, without Faith :

and then in himself acceptable when he believeth. To which I Reply; If by *in himself*, they mean *Objectivè*, that Christ, and not he himself is the Object of Gods Acceptation, or that God is well pleased with them, *habetur propositum*, they grant what I desire: It is not the Unbeliever, but Christ that is righteous too: therefore let Christ be the subject denominated only, if he be the only Object of Acceptation: say not then that men are Absolved, Pardoned, &c. If by *in himself*, they mean *causaliter*, by way of Merit, I hope they will not stand to it, that the Regenerate do meritoriously please God in themselves, (no more then the unregenerate) but only in Christ. 3. Or if another way be found of pleasing God, yet it is here a general denyal of our pleasing God; and if you will limit it to any one kind, it must be to that pleasing which is proper to the Regenerate, which is to be Adopted, Reconciled, Absolved, &c. 4. To say that we please God in Christ before we believe, is but to contradict the text, which saith we please him not: and supposeth that we are in him before we believe, which is against the Scripture.

The second Answer I remember in Mr. *Pemble*, and its the most common, *viz.* that They cannot please God with their Actions, or their Actions are not such as please God, but their persons do: therefore this text speaks not of their persons, but their actions. To which I Reply, 1. That this is a contradiction: for the person to please God, and all his future sins be pardoned before hand, and especially in the Antinomian sense, so as for God to see no iniquity in them, and yet to be displeased with his Actions. As nothing but imputed sin can make God displeased, so the Act and the Actor are so neerly related, that if the act displease God, the Actor must needs, in some measure, or so far, displease him. If displeasure be taken for dislike, or disapproving, then God doth so far dislike or disapprove of the persons, even of Believers, as he disapproveth their actions: that is, He disliketh them as evil actors, or as sinners, at the same time when he is pleased with them, and loveth them as Redeemed, Reconciled, Pardoned sinners in Christ. But if displeasure be taken for anger, or Castigatory punishing displeasure, then this cannot be ultimately terminated on the sin, but the sinner: It is not actions that are punished, but men for actions. God was displeased with *David* himself, and not with his actions only. If *displeasure* signifie, that It is against Gods will, that such actions are, then I say,

as