

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. *Pemle*, 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

as it is his Legislative will *de Debito*, that must be here understood, so it is as much against his will, that such a person do it, as that it be done : He doth not use to constitute the Dueness of actions, without determining of the persons from whom they shall be due ; Actions are not the subjects of his Government, so properly as actors. He forbiddeth actions no otherwise, then by forbidding the persons to commit them. He saith not, There shall be no murder, adultery, &c. but, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not commit Adultery &c. Moreover, when the sin lyeth in the Act of Reasoning, Willing, Nilling ; the Elicite Acts of the Rational soul, it is somewhat nice distinguishing, to say, God is not pleased with the Actions, but he is fully pleased with the Actor : And they that assert such curious niceties, should do well to prove them plainly out of Scripture, if they can, and not expect that all men should be so credulous as themselves, nor too easily accept them on their bare obtruding, and naked affirmation. My plain opinion is, that though God be most eminently and principally pleased with us, in Christ, and for his Merits, and not at all for our own, yet that he will not be perfectly pleased with us in this life, but only in that life, when by Christ we shall be presented to him perfect, blameless, without wrinkle or spot. He that perfectly pleaseth God, is himself most perfect, as having attained his end, and therefore is glorified in heaven.

2. But all this that I have spoken, is not very needful : for it is not only unproved that it is only the actions, and not the persons that the Text speaketh of, but the contrary is most evident in the Text. For *v. 2.* It was the Elders themselves, and not only their Actions that obtained a good Report by Faith. In *v. 4.* it was *Abel* himself that obtained witness that he was righteous, and not only his action. In *v. 5.* it is said of *Henoch* himself, that he had this Testimony that he pleased God. So that it was *Henoch* himself, & not only his action. And then the words of the text in hand are immediately added as an Assumption, *But without Faith it is impossible to please God* : whereby it is past question that it speaketh of the same Pleasing as the foregoing words do, which is of the person.

And therefore *Beza* renders it, *Atqui fieri non potest, ut absque fide quisquam Deo sit Gratus*, applying it to the person.

And the next words which are given as the reason of these, do further evince this. *For he that cometh to God (and so will be Acce-*

pted of him) must believe that he Is, and that he is a Rewarder of them that diligently seek him : And it is the Person that he Rewardeth.

All the following Chapter running in the same strain, doth fully manifest, that it is the person that cannot possibly please God, without Faith, and not only his Actions, it being the Acceptation, Justification, or Salvation of Persons by Faith, that the whole Chapter treats of.

Argument 23. From 1 Cor. 6. 9, 10, 11. Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the Kingdom of God ? Be not deceived : Neither Fornicators, nor Idolaters, nor Adulterers, nor Effeminate, nor Abusers of themselves with mankind, nor Thieves, nor Covetous, nor Drunkards, nor Revilers, nor Extortioners shall Inherit the Kingdom of God : And such were some of you : but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are Justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God. Those men who lye under the Threatning of being shut out of heaven, even by the Law of Christ, and on whom that threatning shall be executed, if they be not washed, sanctified, and justified afterward, are not yet justified, pardoned or absolved from the guilt of death. But such are the Elect before conversion : therefore.

Argument 24. From Gal. 5. 18. 23. But if ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not under the Law. Against such there is no Law. They that are under the Law, and against whom the Law is, are not Absolved from the Laws Obligation to punishment, that is, not pardoned or justified. But such are all unconverted ones, even the Elect that have not the Spirit ; therefore.

Argument 25. From Gal. 5. 2, 3, 4. Behold I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testifie again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole Law. Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are Justified by the Law, ye are fallen from Grace. They that are Debtors to do the whole Law, and to whom Christ is become of none effect, and profiteth them nothing, as to the matter of righteousness, are not justified, pardoned, or absolved from the guilt of death : But such are some of the Elect, before effectual saving Faith : therefore.

The Major seems to me to need no proof. The Minor is plain from the Text. Paul supposeth some of the Galatians either really

ally in this Condition, or too neer it, and in possibility of it : And yet he supposeth them Recoverable, as appeareth by his exhortations, and many particular passages in the Epistle. 1. Seeing it is not the sin against the holy Ghost, no man can give a reason why the Elect, before true Conversion, though after convictions and common profession, may not fall into it as well as others. The sin is not incurable nor unpardonable : Nor hath God made any Promise that none of his Elect shall fall into it. 2. Nay the reason of the Apostle plainly sheweth that all the Jews that expected Justification by the Law, and not by Christ, (which was the case of the unconverted, at least of many), were in the same condition, even Debtors to do the whole Law, and Christ of none effect to them, and profited them nothing.

The Text seems so plain, that it is not easie to discern what may be objected : But we may conjecture they will say : *Obj.* 1. It was *in foro Conscientia* only, or in their own feeling that Christ was of none effect to them, and not before God. *Ans.* The contrary is plain in the Text, 1. It is a greater matter then a misapprehension of Conscience, or an ignorance of the felicity which they had Right to, that the Apostle speaks of : as the whole Epistle shews. 2. He saith expressly, that they *are debtors to do the whole Law* ; So that it is matter of Debt, and not meer matter of knowledge, conceit or sense, that he speaks of. 3. He saith plainly, that Christ profiteth them nothing, and is become of none effect to them : But surely if they had then Right to salvation, and were pardoned, justified, absolved from all guilt of death, then Christ did profit them very much, though they wanted the knowledge of all this. *Obj.* But the Apostles words must be understood with some limitation : for if Christ profit them nothing, then they cannot have Repentance and Faith from him, and so cannot be recovered. *Ans.* 1. It is plainly to be understood, as to the subject in hand : that as to Justification, Remission of sin, and discharging from the Debt of the Law, he is yet of none effect to them, and profiteth them nothing. 2. Though he have satisfied Gods Justice for them, and intend in time their infallible conversion, by giving them Faith and Repentance, yet these are in himself and have made no change on them, and therefore Christ is yet of none effect to them, and profiteth them nothing ; either as to Sanctification, or Justification and Absolution.

Obj.

Obj. But the Text speaks only to them *that are Justified by the Law*, and that is no man. *Answ.* 1. But do you think the Apostle speaks to no man? 2. The text saith, *Every man that is circumcised*, and that was not no man. 3. If any had really been justified by the Law, they had not been so miserable as *Paul* describes these. 4. It is plain therefore that *Paul* speaks of those that expected to be justified by the Law, and so thought and professed, but were not so indeed.

Obj. *Paul* speaks only on supposition that they live and dye so, and then they are not Elect. *Answ.* That is to contradict the text, and not to expound it. *Paul* speaks in the present tense, *To every man that is circumcised*, *Christ is become of none effect*. And he speaks to them as miserable, and yet curable, and therefore endeavoureth the cure of some, and the preservation of the rest.

Argument 26. From 1 *Cor.* 11. 27. *Whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord.* He that is guilty of the body and blood of the Lord, is not absolved from that guilt. Some Elect men are guilty of the body and blood of the Lord: Too easily proved, in that they before Conversion may eat and drink unworthily; therefore.

Argument 27. From *Heb.* 8. 11, 12. *For all shall know me, from the least to the greatest. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and iniquities will I remember no more.* If God do put his Law into mens minds, and write them in their hearts, and give them to know him, at the same time when he pardoneth their sin, and putteth them out of his Remembrance, then Infidels or men unborn are not pardoned: But the Antecedent is plain in the text: therefore.

They cannot say, it is only pardon in conscience that is here spoken of, for it is Gods *Remembering their iniquity no more*; and *being merciful to them, being their God, &c.*

Argument 28. From *Heb.* 9. 15. *And for this cause he is the Mediator of the New Testament, that by means of death for the Redemption of the Transgressions that were under the first Testament, they which are called might receive the Promise of eternal Inheritance.* If *Christ* were the Mediator of the New Testament for this cause, that his death for Redemption of transgressions, might be a means, that they that are called might receive the

the promise of the Inheritance, then was it no effect of Christs death, to give that Promise to the uncalled, (and if not the Promise of eternal Inheritance, then not of Absolution, for it is confessed that they go together) : But the Antecedent is true : therefore so is the Consequent.

Argument 29. From *Jam. 5. 20.* *Let him know, that he which converteth the sinner from his error of his way, shall save a soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins.* So *Mark 4. 12.* *Left at any time they should be converted, and their sins should be forgiven them.* If upon Conversion mens sins be forgiven them, hidden, and their souls saved from death, then were they not forgiven, and Absolved from the guilt of death before. But the Antecedent is true : therefore so is the Consequent. It cannot here be said that it is in conscience only that all this is done : for that were not to save a soul from death, but to save a soul from the sorrowful apprehensions of death (which yet the wicked are seldom troubled with) : if that the man were saved and absolved from the guilt of death before. Nor were this to forgive them so properly, as to acquaint them that they were long before forgiven.

Argument 30. From *Act. 26. 18.* *To open their eyes, and turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive Remission of sin, and Inheritance among them that are sanctified, by Faith that is in me.* If it be Gods Order to give men illumination, and Faith that they may receive Remission of sins, then their sins were not before Remitted : But this is Gods Order : therefore, They receive not what they had before.

Argument 31. From *Rom. 8. 30.* *Whom he called, them also he justified, &c.* Justification is placed according to Gods Order between Calling and Glorifying : therefore it is not before we believed or were born. The more are these two last cited Texts to be regarded, because they do the most clearly, and as of purpose express the order of the causes of salvation, or of God in conveying to us the saving fruits of Christs death, of any that I know of in Scripture.

Argument 32. From *Psal. 32. 1, 2, 3.* with *Rom. 4. 6, 7, 8, 9.* *Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord imputeth not iniquity, and in whose Spirit there is no guile.* And *Paul sheweth, that all this is*

when Faith is Imputed for Righteousness. If mens transgression be then in order forgiven, their sins covered, and not imputed to them, when their Spirits are without guile, and when they believe, and not before; then Infidels, or men that are no men, are not forgiven, Justified or Absolved. But the Antecedent is true: therefore.

Argument 33. From *Act. 8. 21, 22, 23.* *Thou hast neither part nor Lot in this matter, for thy heart is not Right in the sight of God: Repent therefore of this thy wickedness, and pray God, if perhaps the thought of thy heart may be forgiven thee. For I perceive that thou art in the gall of bitterness, and in the bond of Iniquity:* whether by this matter *ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ*, be meant in Christ, and the Grace of Christ, or else in the Word of Promise which we preach; the matter comes all to one. He that hath yet no part or lot in Christ or the Promise of the Gospel, and is not forgiven, but is in the Gall of bitterness, and obligation of Iniquity, is not Absolved from the guilt of death, or obligation to Punishment. But such may an Elect person be, before conversion: therefore. The Minor is proved from the text thus, 1. There is no sin here charged on *Simon*, but what an Elect man unconverted may commit. 2. *Peter* supposeth this, when he sets him on praying for forgiveness. 3. His reason, *for thy heart is not Right with God*, makes this the case, in some degree at least, of all whose hearts are not right with God: and that is the Elect as well as other, before Conversion.

Argument 34. *Act. 13. 38, 39.* *Through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins: and by him all that believe are justified from all things from which ye could not be justified by the Law of Moses.* If that Justification which is opposed to the (supposed) Justification by the Law of *Moses*, come with or after believing, then no Infidels are absolved from the Laws Obligation to death. But the Antecedent is plain in the text: therefore.

Argument 35. From *1. Job. 1. 9.* *If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.* And *vers. 7.* *But if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin.* If those that will not confess sin, nor walk in the light be not forgiven, nor cleansed from all sin, then no

Infidels.

Infidels or Impenitent ones, though Elect, are forgiven, or so cleansed. But the Antecedent is plain in the text. therefore.

It may be objected, 1. That he saith not, that no other are forgiven. *Ans.* It is most plainly implied: or else the Apostle could not make Confession a Condition, no nor so much as a sign, to distinguish the pardoned from the unpardoned. 2. It may be objected, that this is spoken of true Believers, and yet they are forgiven. *Ans.* 1. Prove that it is spoken of them. 1. They walk in the light. 2. And confess sin. 2. If it were, yet would it hold *a fortiori*: If true Believers, whose former sins are pardoned, shall not yet have their future sins pardoned but upon Confession, &c. then much less shall they that yet have no sin pardoned, receive pardon while Infidels.

Argument 36. From *Prov. 24.24. He that saith to the Wicked, Thou art righteous, him shall the People curse, nations shall abhor him.* If God have forbidden it men as a hainous sin, to say, the wicked is righteous, then he will not do it himself. But the Antecedent is true: therefore.

Though the Consequent hold not in all cases, yet in this it will, where the reason of the prohibition is because the thing spoken is false: for God cannot lie. *Obj.* But this is spoken only of Inherent righteousness, and not of that which consisteth in a Right to Impunity. *Ans.* I deny it. God forbiddeth also Justifying the wicked, as an abomination to him. He that saith to the wicked, either, *Thou art not wicked*, or *Thou art not condemnable, guilty of death, or obliged to punishment*; doth justify him, and say, *Thou art Righteous.* *Obj.* God himself justifieth the ungodly or unrighteous. *Ans.* That is not by saying they are righteous when they are not, but by making them righteous in Law sense, of unrighteous, and then judging them to be as they are. And he justifieth them sententially by the Gospel that are not Justifiable by the Law: But he Justifieth them no further then they are truly Justifiable.

Obj. But we are never righteous in our selves, but in Christ. *Ans.* God makes us our selves Righteous, by giving us right to Impunity and the Kingdom for the sacrifice and Merits of Christ. *Obj.* But we are not righteous inherently with such a righteousness of our own Works, as will suffice to Justifie us against the Accusations of the Law. *Ans.* Nor doth God ever

esteem us so, nor say we are so, nor justify us on those terms.

Argument 37. From 2 *Pet.* 2. 14. *Mal.* 1. 14. *Jer.* 17. 5. *Pro.* 3. 33. If many of the Elect before Conversion are cursed of God, and his curse be in their house, then are they not Absolved from all guilt of death, and obligation to punishment. But the Antecedent is plain in the text; therefore.

Argument 38. From *Psal.* 10. 3. *Zach.* 11. 8. *Psal.* 5. 6. *Pro.* 11. 20. and 17. 15. and 28. 9. and 15. 8, 9. and 16. 5. If the Elect before Conversion are abhorred of God, and are an abomination to him, and their sacrifices, and prayers an abomination to him, then are they not Justified, pardoned, actually reconciled, or absolved from guilt of death. But the Antecedent is plain in the text: therefore.

At least me thinks they whom we oppose, should see the ground of their Assertion subverted by all this: For if the perfection of Christs satisfaction were a sufficient ground to conclude that God must needs immediately pardon and absolve us, or did so, or that he were unjust if he should lay any penalty on us, when Christ hath born our punishment, then the same reason would prove it unjust in God, to Curse us, Abhor us, Abominate us, and actually inflict castigatory punishments on us, when Christ hath born our punishment.

Argument 39. For brevity, shall be from all those texts that affirm Remission of sin, and Justification to be given to men, if they will Repent and Believe, or to be by Faith, or to follow faith: *Act.* 10. 43. *To him give all the Prophets witness, that through his name, whosoever believeth in him shall receive Remission of sins.* *Act.* 2. 38. *Repent and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Iesus Christ for the Remission of sins.* *Luk.* 24. 47. *And that Repentance and Remission of sin should be preached in his name among all Nations.* *Act.* 5. 30, 31. *Whom ye slew and hanged on a tree, him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give Repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins.* So those that speak of the forgiveness of the particular sins of the Godly, after the Commission, and where they are taught to pray for it. And 1 *Ioh.* 1. 9. *Luk.* 6. 37. and 11. 4. *Mar.* 11. 25, 26. *Dan.* 9. 9, 19. *Ier.* 31. 34. and 36. 3. *Psal.* 86. 5. and 25. 18. 2 *Chron.* 6. 21, 25, 27, 30, 39. and 7. 14. *Psal.* 130. 4. and 51. 1. 9. So of Justification by Faith. *Isa.* 53. 11. *By his knowledge shall my righteous*

(servant

servant in
21, 25, 26,
justified in
the Law is
is by Faith
For all have
sinned freely
by whom God
blood, to de
through the
righteousne
lieth in the
Law: Of
conclude th
Law. Seeing
and the unc
Law through
Faith, we ha
Whom also w
Gal. 2. 16.
Law, but
Iesus Christ
not by the w
shall be just
live by the
fore, that th
ham. And
Heathen th
ham: In the
Faith, are b
works of the
justified by the
live by Faith
hath conclu
Christ, mig
was our Sch
sified by Fa
Christ Iesus
like purpos

servant Iustifie many, for he shall bear their iniquities. Rom. 3. 20,
 21, 25, 26, 28, 30. Therefore by the deeds of the Law shall no flesh be
 justified in his sight, &c. But now the righteousness of God, without
 the Law is manifested &c. Even the righteousness of God, which
 is by Faith of Iesus Christ, unto all, and upon all them that believe, &c.
 For all have sinned and come short of the glory of God, being justi-
 fied freely by his Grace through the Redemption that is in Iesus Christ:
 Whom God hath set forth to be a Propitiation through Faith in his
 blood, to declare his righteousness for Remission of sins that are past
 through the forbearance of God: To declare I say at this time his
 righteousness, that he might be just, and the Justifier of him that be-
 lieveth in Iesus. Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what
 Law? Of works? Nay, but by the Law of Faith: therefore we
 conclude that a man is justified by Faith, without the deeds of the
 Law. Seeing it is one God that shall justify the Circumcision by faith,
 and the uncircumcision through faith. Do we then make void the
 Law through Faith, &c. Rom. 5. 1, 2. Therefore being justified by
 Faith, we have Peace with God, through our Lord Iesus Christ. By
 Whom also we have access by Faith into this Grace wherein we stand.
 Gal. 2. 16. Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the
 Law, but by the Faith of Iesus Christ, even we have believed in
 Iesus Christ, that we might be Iustified by the Faith of Christ, and
 not by the Works of the Law: for by the Works of the Law shall no
 flesh be justified. Vers. 20. The Life which I now live in the flesh, I
 live by the Faith of the Son of God, &c. Gal. 3. 7, 8. Know ye there-
 fore, that they which are of Faith, the same are the children of Abra-
 ham. And the Scripture foreseeing that God would justify the
 Heathen through Faith, preached before the Gospel unto Abra-
 ham; In thee shall all Nations be blessed. So then they which be of
 Faith, are blessed with faithful Abraham. For as many as are of the
 works of the Law, are under the Curse, &c. But that no man is Ius-
 tified by the Law in the sight of God, it is evident: for the just shall
 live by Faith: and the Law is not of Faith. 22. But the Scripture
 hath concluded all under sin, that the Promise by Faith of Iesus
 Christ, might be given to them that believe. 24. Wherefore the Law
 was our School-master to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justi-
 fied by Faith. 26. For ye are all the children of God by Faith in
 Christ Iesus. So I am. 2. 13, 14. to the end. Many more to the
 like purpose might be added, in which it appears that Gods time

and order of giving us pardon and justification, is upon our Believing, and not while we are Infidels : and that this is a Justification in Law sense, and not merely in conscience, as was before proved : It was not only by Christ and the Absolute Promise made to the Elect, but it was by the Law of Faith that boasting was excluded. I will not stand to answer the vain objections here brought in by some, knowing that the light of the express text to the impartial may suffice.

Argument 40. Shall be from all those texts, which say Faith is imputed to us for righteousness : which upon these two Considerations do clearly evince the point. 1. That it is not only a judicial Sentence, much less a sense or Reception in conscience, which both imply that the person is before constituted or made righteous in Law ; But it is the very giving and imputing of righteousness it self that is here mentioned. 2. When the interest of Faith is such that it is said to be imputed for righteousness, it is undeniable that it is not while we are Infidels that we are righteous.

I go not about now to determine how far, and in what sense it is that Faith is imputed: but in what sense soever it is it shews that Faith there must be, or else how can it be imputed for righteousness at all. As for them that say that by Faith, is not meant Faith, but Christ, I hope I shall not believe them, as long as I believe that God would be understood : and that the Word is a Lamp and a Light, and not a darkness. And for some of the Reformed Divines themselves, that say that it is *Christ believed in*, that is meant by Faith, though I doubt not but Faith Essentially includeth Christ its object, and therefore accordingly connotes it, and therefore whenever it is said that Faith is imputed for righteousness, or that we are justified by Faith: it is connoted that we are in a more excellent kind of causality justified by Christ, then by Faith (Faith indeed being no proper cause) ; Yet I believe not that by Faith, is not meant Faith it self, but only Christ : and the contrary to him that will read the text impartially is as evident, as any sense can be in words : But yet if it be *Christ believed in*, that is meant by Faith, then Faith there must be : It is not Christ despised, or not believed in that justifieth, or pardoneth, or absolveth any. I will recite some of the words: *Rom. 4. 3 &c. For what saith the Scripture ? Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness.*

HAVE
ptu
thing; by
Argum
Christ, as
to satisfie
being a fac

righteousness. 5. To him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his Faith is counted for righteousness. 6. Even as David describeth the blessedness of the man, unto whom God imputeth righteousness without Works. 9. Faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness. 10. How was it then reckoned, &c. 11. And he received the sign of Circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the Faith, which he had yet being uncircumcised: that he might be the father of all them that believe, that righteousness might be imputed to them also. 13. For the Promise that he should be heir of the world, was not to Abraham or to his seed, through the Law, but through the righteousness of Faith. 16. Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by Grace, to the end the Promise might be sure to all the seed. 18. Who against hope, believed in hope, that he might become the Father of many Nations, &c. 19. And being not weak in Faith, he considered not his own body now dead, &c. 20. He staggered not at the Promise of God through unbelief; but was strong in faith, giving glory to God. 21. And being fully persuaded, that what he had promised, he was able also to perform. 22. And therefore it was imputed to him for righteousness. 23. Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him. 24. But for us also, to whom It shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead. Gal. 3. 6. Even as Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness. Jam. 2. 23. Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness, and he was called, the friend of God.

SECT. IV.

HAVING produced these Arguments from the words of Scripture, I shall next add some more from the nature of the thing; by which the point in hand shall be evinced.

Argument 1. To Pardon, Absolve and Justifie, are acts of Jesus Christ, as King, and as Judge: By being a sacrifice and Ransom to satisfy Justice, he did not act as King or Judge: therefore by being a sacrifice and Ransom to satisfy Justice, he did not actually Pardon,

Pardon, Absolve, or Justifie, (but only Merit Pardon, Absolution and Justification , to be given by him a King and Judge.) Two things are in the Major to be proved : The first is that pardon and Justification are Acts of Jesus Christ : And the proof shall answer them, that say, It is enough that it be an Act of God the Father for the sake of Jesus Christ. To which I say : It would clear much of these matters to mens understandings, if they would consider this great Truth, that, As it was not man that sinned, that did by himself (naturally or legally) satisfy Justice, so it was not thought meet that man himself should receive the immediate fruit of that satisfaction ; but as it was a Mediator that suffered for us , so was the world delivered over to the Mediator as Redeemer of them, as being his own, being bought with a price : and so the pardon that was immediately granted by the offended Majesty was into Christs hands, and not the sinners own : that is, A Right of granting out pardon to them as a King-Redeemer, on terms most agreeable to his ends and interest : (with resolution not to do it equally to all, nor with equal success.) So that God as the offended Legislator of the first Law, upon satisfaction made, was reconciled, as far as the Intention of the Satisfier and satisfied did require ; that is, so far as to Remit all into the Redeemers hands, and give him Power, Right and Commission to grant Pardon by a new Law, which should not be as the old, which was fitted to man in perfection, but a Law of Grace, fitted to man in sin and misery, giving him a Saviour and salvation on condition of meer Acceptance. (Purposing to cause his chosen infallibly to accept him.) So that though the Father as Rector according to the old Law, being satisfied, did give to the Redeemer a Right of pardoning us, and delivered all things into his hand, yet the actual pardoning of us must be an act of the Redeemer himself (and the Father in and by him, as God-Redeemer) by a Promise, Covenant or Law of Grace, made as King, after the Moral being of his satisfaction. Now that Christ hath made no Act to pardon man, but the Law of Grace, promising Remission and Justification if we Repent and believe, I shall shew further in due place. The second thing to be proved in the Major, is, that as Remission and Justification are acts (or an act) of Christ, so it is of Christ as King and Judge. I will first prove the former, that Christ himself hath Received a Right of pardoning. *Math. 28.*

18, 19, 20. *All Power is given to me in heaven and in earth; Go ye therefore and teach all Nations, baptizing them, &c. Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you. Where Mark 16. 16. it is, He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned.* Where we see first the fulness of his power, and that the Law, or Act of Grace and Pardon granted by that Power. *Luk. 5. 24. That ye may know that the Son of man hath power upon earth to forgive sins, &c. Luk. 10. 22. All things are delivered unto me of my Father. Joh. 13. 3. Jesus knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands. Joh. 3. 35, 36. The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hands. He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life, and he that believeth not the Son, shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him. Joh. 5. 22. to 30. For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all Judgement unto the Son: that all men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father. Verily, Verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my Word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life. Verily, Verily, I say unto you, the hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live. For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself. And hath given him Authority to execute Judgement also, because he is the Son of man. Marvel not at this, for the hour is coming in which all that are in the Graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, to the Resurrection of life, and they that have done evil, to the Resurrection of Damnation. Rom. 14. 9. For to this end Christ both Dyed, Rose and Revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living Phil. 2. 8, 9, 10. But what should I stand on this for, among Christians that confesse Christ as Mediator, to be the King: All those texts that mention his Kingdom, and Kingly Power, prove it. See *Psal. 2.* All that call him Christ the Anointed, prove it. And yet what stiff perverse arguings have I heard from Learned prejudiced men, (for fear of yielding to any kinde of general Redemption, if they yielded that Christ as Mediator, hath a Kingly Power over all) maintaining that this Power he hath as God, and not as Mediator; that is, Christ is not Christ, the King. God would have his Crucifiers affix to his Cross the Title of King. By these Texts mentioned, it is evident that Christ*

hath Authority and Right as Mediator to grant Pardon of sin , and that he hath made a Conditional General Act of Pardon hereupon. So that both the parts of the Major are proved together. And the nature of the thing proves it to all men that know what Pardon and Justification is. It is the Pardon of the breach of publike Laws that we are speaking of, and not of private trespasses or damages.

To whomsoever it belongs to make Laws , to him it belongs to Remit offences against those Laws : But to the Supream Power, or Legislator it belongs to make Laws : therefore.

To whomsoever it belongs to Judge men for breach of Laws , to him it belongeth sententially to Justifie him that is Justifiable. But to Christ as Judge it belongeth to Judge men : therefore, &c.

I will recite one text more that containeth all that I have said.

Act. 5. 30, 31. The God of our Fathers raised up Jesus , Whom ye slew and hanged on a Tree. Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give Repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins, and we are his witnesses of these things, and so is the holy Ghost, whom God hath given to them that obey him. Here we have first his sacrifice, then his Resurrection, then his Exaltation and Kingdom, he is become a Prince and a Saviour, or a King-Saviour, or Lord-Redeemer : Where note, that all his work of saving us was not on the Cross : that prepared for the rest which was to follow. He was exalted to be a Saviour and Prince. And then we have the end or effect of his being exalted to be a Prince and Saviour, which is to give Repentance and Forgiveness of sin. As a Prince he doth this, because it is necessarily a work of Sovereign Power, or of a Ruler or King. As a Saviour he doth it, because the thing wrought in this work is our salvation, to the perfection of which it also tendeth.

Having proved the Major Proposition, I need not say much to the Minor , it being granted, for ought I can understand, by all that I have to do with; that Christ doth not pardon and justifie by satisfying or meriting, directly : For as to satisfying it is past question : And Merit, is a remote cause, moving (to speak after the manner of men, as we must do) the Principal Agent : and so upon Christs Merits , God as Sovereign did deliver up all to his Son, as Saviour and Sovereign, and gave him Power to forgive sins.

Observe

Observe also, that if all this were denied (that Pardon and Justification are Acts of Christ as King) and if we granted that they are Acts of God the Father, and not of the Mediator , yet we shall confute eternal Justification as an Immanent act, thus Justification, Absolution, Pardon, are acts of God as Rector : God was not Rector from eternity ; therefore, Justification and Pardon are not acts that were in God from Eternity. The Major is past question. The Minor is proved thus : A Ruler and Subjects to be ruled, are Relatives, and exist together ; one cannot be before or without the other. But God had not subjects from eternity to be Ruled, certainly not man , (unless all creatures co-exist with God, not only in Eternity, but from eternity) therefore, &c.

Argument 2. Where there is no actual guilt, there can be no actual Remission or Justification. But from eternity, or the time of Christ, there was no actual guilt on any that did not then exist (or were not then conceived) therefore from eternity, or from the time of Christs death, there could be no actual Justification or pardon of such.

The Major is proved by the definition of Remission or Justification, which ever contains guilt as the thing destroyed thereby. All Remission or Justification is a Remission of some guilt , or a Justification against or from some guilt, real (in Constitutive Justification) or charged (in sentential Justification) therefore actual Remission must be of actual guilt. Remission is a dissolving the Obligation to punishment. Guilt is the Obligation to punishment : therefore.

For the Minor , that there could be no actual guilt on us from Eternity, is past doubt. Nor yet at Christs death, when we were not in being. We were no subjects or Entities, and therefore had no Accidents or Modes.

To this two things are answered ; 1. That from eternity our guilt had an *Esse cognitum*. I Reply, 1. That is not to *Be guilt* : 2. That *esse*, if any where, was in God, for there was no other subject of it. But it was not guilt, but knowledge that was in God. 3. There was no *esse ab aeterno*, but God himself. But God himself was not guilt. 4. To be *Cognitum*, makes a new *esse* in man, (viz. *Rationis*) where the Object causeth. But it makes no new *esse* in God, with whom Objects have no Causation : therefore guilt had no true *esse nt Cognitum* from eternity properly so called;

but a formality at most. 5. Gods knowing, was a foreknowing, (Scripture so calls it); not a knowing that a man then was, or was guilty, but that he would be, or that it was *futurum*. Therefore man was not guilty : *futurum* is *terminus diminuens*, as to *existens*, and so is *pre cognitum*. I conclude therefore, that man was not guilty from eternity, and therefore not capable of pardon.

2. It is objected, that at Christs death we were guilty, because we were all guilty in *Adam*. I Reply ; When we exist, we are said first to be in *Adam*, and so to be guilty in *Adam*, as we are the progeny of him. But properly, before we exist we were not guilty : He that was not in *Adam*, was not guilty in *Adam* : They that now live on earth, were not in *Adam* at Christs death : therefore they were not guilty in *Adam*. The Minor is plain ; for, He that *was not*, was not in *Adam* : But he that now lives on earth, *was not* at Christs death : therefore he was not in *Adam*. To be in *Adam*, supposeth to be. *Obj.* In Gods account we were in him. *Ans.* Not so : Gods account is according to truth : therefore he accounts not those in *Adam* that are not. *Obj.* All mankind sinned in *Adam* : therefore they were in *Adam*. *Ans.* Mankind is taken either for the humane nature, or for each Individual person. And *sinning in Adam*, signifieth either that they personally sinned in *Adam*, at the time when he sinned, or else that he then committed a sin which shall begin to be theirs, when they shall exist. And so I say, that the humane nature did sin in *Adam*, and my person as soon as existent is guilty of *Adams* sin, and so far may be said to have sinned in him ; but my person did not as a person really or reputatively sin in him before it did exist, or was a person. *Obj.* If our guilt or sin were not then Reputatively in Being, how could it be laid on Christ, or Christ bear it. *Ans.* It was not sin it self, or guilt in it self, the same with our Individual guilt that Christ bore. But he contracted, as it were, a guilt by his own voluntary sponson, which he did, not because we then were guilty, but because he foreknew we would be guilty, and by that guilt liable to punishment : and therefore to prevent our punishment (not our guilt) he offered that sacrifice of himself on the Cross, on consideration whereof, our guilt, when it did exist, should be done away : Not that it did then exist, or was then done away.

2. And it must be known that all that then did exist, were actually guilty.

3. And

3. And that Christs sacrifice was for mankind in general, the humane nature being then guilty; though God did know and determine the particular personal application, and intended the pardoning of each individual Elect person by it. But there is more required to the full explication of this, then I may now stand to perform: and I remember I have spoke to it against *Lud. Colvinus*.

Argument 3. He that is capable of pardon, is capable of punishment. They that are now living here, were not from eternity, or from Christs death capable of punishment (actual and personal) therefore they were not capable of pardon (actual and personal.) The Major is plain, in that guilt is an obligation to punishment: and he that is obliged to it, is capable of it. If it be due, men are capable of it. The Minor is evident, in that a *non ens*, is not capable of punishment. Punishment hath a subject: a *non ens* is no subject for it: therefore.

Argument 4. Remission of sin gives Right to Impunity. From Eternity, or at Christs death, we had no Right given us (who are now here living) to Impunity. Therefore from Eternity or Christs death, we had no Remission.

The Major is past doubt. The Minor I prove thus. *Non-entia*, *non est modus vel Accidens*. Non-Entities have neither Mode nor Accident. Right to Impunity is a *modus vel Accidens*, and we were then *non-entia*: therefore.

Obj. We were *Entia* in Law, or in Gods account.

Ans. Not so, for their Judgement is according to truth.

Obj. The children unborn may have such a Reputative Being in Law, and in the estimation of Donors, or Contractors, that they may by Deeds and Conveyances be made the subjects of right or Title.

Ans. Not so, it is no actual Right till they are actually subjects of it. And they cannot be made actual subjects by a mans conceits or suppositions. Nature is supposed in Morality. There is only an Instrument made in such Donations, or Contracts, which shall give Right when the subject is capable; Or a sign by which the will of the Donor is sufficiently signified, that on such a supposition, at such a time, such shall have Right. As in natural motions, a man that shoots an Arrow, may have irrevocably delivered

vered it out of his own hand, when yet there is a certain space of time before it shall come to the Butt or Mark : So in these civil actions or motions, a Donor that gives a thing *in diem*, or a Contractor that doth Promise it *in diem*, may (if the Donation be Absolute) irrevocably *quantum in se*, part with his right, or emit the Right, or perform such an act which shall give Right *quando venit dies* : but *donec venit dies*, till the set time, the Right is not received by the Legatory, Donatory, &c. it comes not to him ; and so is not his. And if it be thus in an Absolute Donation, which is *in diem*, much more in a Conditional, where the Reception is suspended on a Condition, Contingent in it self, and uncertain to the party that is to perform it. And especially where the subject to receive it is not yet in being. Mens Covenants in such cases, do but contain that signification of their will which shall then prove *fundamentum Juris*, or give Right to the child when it is born, and be intrusted in the mean time in the hands of others for them, if they shall exist.

Obj: But we have before we are in being, a *Jus ad Rem*, though not a *Jus in re*, because God promised it to Christ for us, or to us in him ; and it is just that God make good his Promises, and therefore we have Right to it.

Ans. I shall the rather speak to this Objection, because the late mentioned * learned man builds so great a Fabrick on it. 1. The things to which we are said to have Right, is, *The good things purchased*. Absolution from guilt, and so pardon of sin, is one of the good things purchased. If this be so, all is granted that we desire, as to the point in hand. For he that hath but right to a pardon or Absolution (though it were absolutely granted *in diem*) is not yet pardoned or absolved : There must be the *Jus in re*, before he can truly and properly be said to be pardoned and absolved. While he hath but a right to be absolved for the future, it is certain that he is not Absolved at the present. Even as he is not sanctified or glorified, that hath not the thing it self, and so a *Jus in re*, but only a *Jus ad rem*, a right to be Sanctified and Glorified. Therefore for all this (pretended) Right *ad rem*, none are Absolved or Pardoned from the time of Christs death, much less from Eternity.

2. But I maintain that we had no actual right *ad rem*, to future Remission

* Mr. Owen.

Remission and Absolution from the time of Christs death, either *ipso facto* upon his dying, or *ipso Iure*, upon the Promise of the Father to the Son; yea or (which is more) *ipso Iure* upon the Covenant made by the Father and Son to mankind : But then we must first determine what *Ius*, Right is. It reacheth not our case to say that *Ius est, quod iustum est*. It may be Just *in naturae rei*, that such a man do such a thing, when yet no man may be said to have right to the action or its effect. At least it is *Ius* as *existent*, in some subject, to whom it is communicated, and in whom it doth as it were inhere, that we are to speak of. And we take not *iustum* in so large a sense, as to comprehend *non-inustum*, as it is just for a man to pardon him that hath wronged him (according to the Law of man ;) because it is not unjust, there is nothing against it : But we take it in a stricter sense.

It is one thing to be the Object of that Act which is right and just, and another thing to be the subject of Right. It is one thing to *Be* Right and Just; and another thing to *Have* Right. To be Right, as every thing is that is Just, is a Relation of a lower nature then that which we treat of; being scarce more then *nomine tenus*, a Relation. When you say, *Ius est, quod iustum est*; You denominate a *Thing* just: but when we say, *A man hath Right to this or that*, we speak of the *Person*, as the subject (of Adhesion or Inhesion) of that Right. It is only a Person, and not an Inanimate, or a bruit, or a meer Action or Quality, &c. that is the subject of the Right that we are to speak of: *Ius est effectum Tituli, vel Relatio à Titulo resultans*: *Titulus est fundamentum Iuris*: He that hath a good Title hath Right. But *omne quod iustum est*, is not *Relatio resultans à Titulo*. The meer Object of a Just act, or the act it self which is just, is not said to *Have Right* to it self or another thing; as we say, man hath right to things, *si ius est, quod iustum est*; then to set true Landmarks is *Ius*: But who is it, or what, that is the subject *hujus Iuris*? The Land hath no Right (civil Right) to the act: The act hath not Right to it self. The Agent is the subject of that quality of Justice which causeth him to do Right: but is not said to have *Right* to his own Act. It is therefore some second person that *hath Right* to that just act of the Agent: In which words it is plain that the justness or right of the Act is one thing, (a respect by which that act is denominated just) and the Right which the second person hath to that act

and

and its effect, is another thing (A Right commonly called Civil or Legal, adherent to the person, and founded in his Title.) For an Act or Thing to be Right or Just ; and for a person to Have Right by Title, are in my sense no more the same thing, then for a person himself to be righteous, and to have right to a thing. So that in the sense in question, it is not true that *Omne quod justum est, est Ius*. I take *Ius*, Right in the person, in our case, to be that which answers *Debitum* in the thing : For me to have Right to the Thing, and for the Thing to be due to me, is all one. I hope I may in this case have your free leave to mention the Judgement of *Grotius* (and to prize it with the highest) He distinguishing between these two senses of *Ius* (*de Iure Belli*, li. 1. §. 3, 4, 5.) saith, *Ius hic nihil aliud quam quod Iustum est significat; idque negante magis sensu quam agente; ut Ius sit quod injustum non est* — *Ab hac Iuris significatione diversa est altera, sed ab hac ipsa veniens, que ad Personam refertur: quo sensu, Ius est, Qualitas Moralis persone, competens ad aliquid juste habendum vel agendum. Persone competit hoc Ius, etiamsi Rem interdum sequatur, ut servitutes prædiorum, que Iura realia dicuntur comparatione facta ad alia mere personalia: non quia non ipsa quoque persone competant. Sed quia non alii competunt quam qui rem certam habeat. Qualitas autem Moralis perfecta, Facultas nobis dicitur, minus perfecta, Aptitudo: quibus respondent in naturalibus, illi quidem actus, huic Potentia. Facultatem Iurisconsulti nomine sui appellant: Nos post hac Jus proprie aut stricte dictum appellabimus. Sub quo continentur Potestas tum in se, qua libertas dicitur, tum in alios, ut patria, dominica: Dominium, plenum sive minus pleno, ut usus fructus, jus pignoris: Et Creditum, cui ex adverso respondet Debitum.*

The like distinction do other Lawyers ordinarily give, and some such Description of the personal right in question, which *Grotius* calls *Jus proprie vel stricte dictum*.

Sayrus defines it, *Ius est facultas aliquid faciendi, sive obtruendi, aut in eo instituendi, vel aliquo alio modo se habendi, cui sine causa Justa, absque injuria contraveniri nequit. Jus ad Rem dicitur illud, quod habetur ex aliquo vinculo obligationis circa rem nobis Debitam, nondum tamen factam nostram. Ius in re dicitur quod habetur de re qua est nostra & existens: unde ad comperandum Dominium atque adeo jus in re, non satis est rem cujus Dominium sumus comparaturi, existere, sed ulterius requiritur eandem rem esse nostram, id est,*