

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 strikte 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 strikte 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 quæ 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,*

est, nobis traditam. Sayr. Clav. Reg. li. 9. cap. 3. n. 1, 2.

Some Reasons that perswade me, that we are so far from being pardoned and absolved at Christs death, that we had not so much as Right to be pardoned and absolved for the future absolutely *in diem*, are these.

1. We were not existent, and so not subjects capable of actual Right : As our selves were only *in causa, potentia, & esse cognitio*, & *volito*, so only must our Right be. God might, as it were, oblige himself to give us Right when we were, and were capable of it ; and so it might be said to be just that he should give it. But we did not receive it till we were, and therefore it was not ours.

2. If God had before given us Absolutely right *ad rem*, then he would not have after made a Conditional Grant of the same thing to us. But he did after make a Conditional grant of the same thing to us : therefore.

The Major is plain, because it would be a retracting of his former Absolute Grant : For as a flat denial would have been a total retraction, so to reduce an Absolute Gift to a Conditional, is a partial retraction : This then would seem *non-justum*, yea *injustum*, or contrary to the former engagement. I would prove this more fully, but that it is not denied.

The thing that by the foresaid Learned man is denied, is the Conditional Grant : He affirmeth that it is Absolute *sub termino*, and saith it is false that (the Redeemed while Infidels) are but upon Condition under Christs Merit. even so far under, as that in respect of Good or Evil their Condition is alike with those under Demerit, in point of Right.

But whether Christ, *Peter, Paul*, hold not that as true which he saith is false, and make not Faith and Repentance (or one at least,) Conditions of Justification or Salvation, I appeal to the frequent express words of the text, and to the whole world of Divines.

3. If God made over to us at Christs death a *Jus ad rem*, a Right to future pardon Absolutely, then it was, either by some Promise, or signal Grant. or by meer Decree and Purpose. But by neither of these ; therefore not at all. There can no other way be imagined rationally that I conceive of, unless they say that *ipso facto*, by accepting Christs sacrifice, he gave us *Ius ad rem*, of which we shall speak anon ; and now only deny it. That Decree

gives not Right, is granted by moſt, and all that I know, (except this Learned man) that are worth the diſputing with in ſuch a point. The Immanent acts of God do *Nihil ponere in objecto*. That there is no ſignal Grant, either Vocal, or written, that gave us ſuch a Right, muſt be taken for granted, till the affirmers can produce ſome. If there be any in Scripture, it muſt be either the Promise to Chriſt, or the Abſolute Promise of the firſt Grace to the Elect, or the Law of Faith or Grace, giving Life to all, if they will believe. The laſt is Conditional, and after the Moral being of Chriſts death, and therefore cannot be it : The ſecond is alſo in order after the Moral being of Chriſts death, and therefore if it did give us Right *ipſo iure*, it follows not that we had it on Chriſts death *ipſo facto*. But indeed we have neither. For it is but a Declaration of Gods Decree towards ſome in general : the ſubjects are neither exiſtent, nor determinate, and therefore can receive no Right by it. If a man ſay, *There are ſome poor men in this City, whom I will give ſuch a Penſion or Alms to before I dye*. Neither deſcribing, nor naming any, nor determining the number in his words ; it is juſt that this man keep his word : but no man hath received Right to the Penſion hereby. Much leſs if he do but profeſs his purpoſe to leave a Legacy to ſome that ſhall live 100 years hence, and do not now exiſt.

But the firſt is the main ground of our Right alledged, of which (though I purpoſely avoid the contending with the foreſaid learned man, yet becauſe I know not any that hath ſaid ſo much as he, and therefore it will be to the advantage of truth) let us examine his proofs, which in his words lie thus, after this ſtating of the caſe, *The ſum then of what we have to prove is, that the Merit of the Death of the Lord Ieſus, hath according to the Conſtitution of the Father, ſo procured of him the good things aimed at, and intended thereby, that it is juſt, right, and equal, that they for whom they are ſo procured ſhould certainly and infallibly enjoy them at the appointed ſeaſon : and therefore unto them they have an Actual Right, even before Believing ; Faith it ſelf being of the number of thoſe things ſo procured. All which I prove as followeth. 1. The very terms before mentioned infer no leſs. If it be Juſtum before their believing, that thoſe for whom Chriſt dyed ſhould enjoy the fruits of his death, then have they even before believing Juſ, or a Right thereunto : for Juſ eſt, quod Juſtum eſt.*

Reply.

Reply
be Juſtum
ſubjects
receivers
miſe was n
us, and w
proof of
That it
niſeſt. For
his undert
11, 12.
required, J
Reply.
not the A
undertake
the pure
or after th
or from A
given out.
therefore
undertake
or ſome
give no R
If it w
then in be
could not
ken impre
venant w
2. This w
whom we
an Imma
fore not
led the C
and this
at all.)
time of
and the
of recei
11. See

Reply. I deny the Consequence. Its reason is invalid. It may be *Justum* that God do it ; and yet you and I, or others, be no subjects of the *Ius*, as receiving no Right thereby. If Right were received, it was only Christ that received it, to whom the Promise was made, and not we. He might receive a Right to Pardon us, and we receive no Right to Pardon. I desire also some clear proof of the Antecedent.

That it is right and equal that they should enjoy those fruits, is manifest. For 1. It was the engagement of the Father, to the Son, upon his undertaking to die for them, that they should so do. Isa. 53. 10, 11, 12. 2. In that undertaking he accomplished all that was of him required, Joh. 17. 4.

Reply. Though it be the Consequence that I deny, yet I see not the Antecedent well proved : For to the first I say, 1. The *undertaking of Christ to dye for them*, means either some action of the pure God-head, before the Incarnation, or some Action at or after the Incarnation. If the first, either it was from eternity, or from *Adams* fall, or at the time when that Prophecie *Isa. 53.* was given out. If the first, then it was 1. before that Prophecie, and therefore that Prophecie did not give Christ his Right upon his undertaking, at least not first. 2. It was nothing but Gods Decree, or some Eternal Immanent act, which is confessed by others to give no Right.

If it were at *Adams* fall, 1. The Prophecie *Isa. 53.* was not then in being neither. 2. Christ was not then Incarnate, and God could not make temporal Covenants with himself. 1. It is but spoken improperly, after the manner of men, that God makes a Covenant with God, the Father with the second person in Trinity. 2. This which is so called a Covenant, must on the ground of them whom we oppose, be acknowledged to be from Eternity, as being an Immanent Act in God, which cannot *oriri de novo*. It is therefore nothing but Gods Decree or such Immanent acts that is called the Covenant between the Father and the Son, then in being ; and this is confest not to give new Right, (and to us it gives none at all.) 3. The same holdeth, if they take it to begin at the time of that Prophecie, *Isa. 53.* Christ being then meerly God, and the God-head being incapable of formal Covenanting, and of receiving any Right thereby. 2. And the words in *Isa. 53. 10,* 11. Seem rather a Prophecie, and a renewing of the Promise of a

Saviour to the world, then any Promise to Christ giving him a new Right. And as they concern mankind, they can give no actual Right to pardon, to particular persons; though they may give mankind in general a Right to a successful Saviour. The reason is before mentioned.

But I suppose it will be said, that this Promise was not made to Christ as merely God, but as foreknown to be Incarnate, God-man. To which I say: 1. The foreknowledge of the Incarnation makes not Christ to be man, and God esteems not himself man till he is so: therefore it makes not the second Person the subject of this new Right by this Promise or Covenant, till he be Incarnate indeed. 2. If upon all this it should hold good that Christ himself did not before the Incarnation, by any formal or proper Covenant or Promise receive himself any new Right, it would be much more evident, that no man before the Incarnation received any such Right, by his Reception, and by that same Covenant. Though for my part I think that a new Right did accrue to the pure God-head; but rather on mans fall with Gods Promise to Redeem him by the Son, then from the meer eternal Decree, called a Covenant between the Father and the Son. But this requires a stricter enquiry.

2. To the second proof I say, 1. We use to distinguish between the undertaking and accomplishment. Divines use to say, that upon mans fall, Christ undertook satisfaction, but it was in the fulness of time that he accomplished it. How therefore he accomplished it in the Undertaking, I do not well see. 2. But that he did perfectly accomplish what he undertook, I easily grant, as the ground of my hope: but that proves not a Right thence redounding to the humane nature before it did exist.

Lastly, I desire that none of this may be so understood, as if I denyed that which we commonly call the Covenant between the Father and the Son, or the Right redounding to Christ thereby: Nay I think this Covenant or Law with the Mediator, to deserve a peculiar place in the body of Divinity, as of great moment, as I have elsewhere said: But the main thing I insist on is, that when Christ is a capable subject in his humanity of such Covenant-right, yet we are not thereby made the subject of it.

2. That which is merited and procured for any one, thereunto he for whom it is procured, certainly hath a Right. That which is obtain-

ed for me, is mine in actual Right, though not perhaps in actual Possession. The thing that is obtained, is granted by him of whom it is obtained, and that * unto them for whom it is obtained.

Reply. All this is as easily and confidently denied as affirmed. A thing is procured For a man, either only finaliter, so as that mans good is the end of the procurement ; or subjectively, so as it is procured into that mans hands or possession, as the subject of the Right or thing. In the latter sense, I deny that ever Christ procured pardon for us now living ; so as that we should be the subjects of it, or right to it, when he dyed : In the former sense, I yield that Christ did procure it finally for our good, and require some proof, that this makes us the subjects of that right. If a man contract with you, to give your horse so much Provender every day, I do not think that your horse hath any actual Right by it to his Provender : And if a King agree with you to be General of an Army for the reducing of a Country of Rebels, and give you power to grant a general pardon to all that will come in, and secretly agree with you to use such means with certain men named, that they shall infallibly come in and be pardoned ; I will not believe without proof, that any one of these men hath a Right to pardon, upon this Contract between you and the King, * no nor upon the general act of pardon, which is much more.

* If you could make the Lavers all believe this strange Doctrine, you would make a great change in England.

In some sense or other, that is a mans, which is procured for him : In saying it is procured for him, we say no less. If this then be not in respect of Possession, it must be in respect of Right.

* No, though you were certain of success.

Reply. 1. I confess this is as probable a way to make good your assertion, as you could devise. In some sense or other, is so large a word, that you may say what you will with that Caution. In some sense or other man is God ; and that is yours, which indeed is none of yours.

2. But in the sense as custom hath taught men to use these words, I say, that If a thing be merely For you finaliter, it is never the more yours subjectively. You may have neither Dominion of, nor right to that good which may be for you. It might easily have been foreseen that somebody in the world would require better proof of this then bare affirmation.

Now all the fruits of Christs death are obtained and procured by his Merit, for them, for whom he dyed. He obtains for them eternal

Redemption. Heb. 9. 12. Purchasing them with his own blood. Acts 20. 28. Heb. 2. 14. 1 Pet. 1. 18. Gal. 1. 4. Rev. 14. 3, 4.

Reply. 1. All fruits of his death, are not procured for every man for whom he dyed. He procured not the same measure of Grace, Illumination, Sanctification, for me, as for some others : Nor the same freedom from temptations, sickness, malicious enemies, &c. Nor did he procure Faith infallibly to be given to all for whom he dyed, as he did for his Elect. 2. As is said before, he procured it for us as the *finis cui*, (though God be the ultimate end) but not for us, as the subjects of present Right, till he should in due time and order convey a Right unto us.

*The very nature of Merit described by the Apostle, Rom. 4. 4. infers no less. Where Merit intercedes, the effect is reckoned as of debt. That which is my due debt, I have a Right unto. * The fruits of the death of Christ, are the issues of Merit (bottomed on Gods gracious Acceptation) and reckoned as of debt.*

Reply. I confess, he that merited, hath a Right unto the thing merited as of Debt. But we that go on lower Principles then you, dare not say to God, Lord, *I have merited salvation in Christ, therefore it is mine of debt.* I do not think you are Christ : nor that you were in Christ when he Merited : nor that you merited in him. What then though Christ hath of Debt a Right to Pardon and save you ? Will it follow that you have of debt (and that before you believe, and before you are born) a Right to Pardon and Salvation ? I shall think not, till I see better proof.

He for whom a ransom is paid, hath a Right unto his liberty by virtue of that payment.

Reply. All unproved, and by me unbelieved. If you pay a summe to the Turk for a 1000 slaves, thereby buying them absolutely into your own power ; I do not believe that they have any more Right to freedom then they had before : though you have Right to free them, if you please. They are now your own, you may do with them as you will. Or if you resolve to free them, that gives them no Right. If a Prince pay a ransom for some Traytors to the King his Father thereby purchasing to himself a Dominion (or Propriety) over them, so that they are absolutely his, though both Father and Son agree that all or some of these shall be so dealt with, as that their deliverance may be certain, yet I think it gives them no more Right to it then they had before.

* You should have assumed The fruits of Christs death are my due Debt ; viz. While uncal- led, yea un- born. But that is false.

before. *Negatio juris est injuria*. I do not think that any Elect person could say, God did him wrong, if he did not pardon him before he was born, or while he was an Infidel.

3. 2. Pet. 1. 1. *The Saints are said to obtain pretious Faith, through the righteousness of God. It is a righteous thing with God, to give Faith to them for whom Christ dyed; because thereby they have a Right unto it: Faith being amongst the most pretious fruits of the death of Christ, by vertue thereof becometh their due for whom he dyed.*

Reply. 1. May it not be righteous with God, that we obtain it, unless we our selves have Right to it before we obtain it? That should have been proved: Yours, *because they have a Right to it*, is an addition of your own, having no word that you shew us in Scripture to sustain it, nor any thing in reason that I have yet heard of.

2. Though the Text understood in your sense, be nothing that I see, for your Cause, yet I see no proof nor reason that it should be so understood. I find in Expositors these several Expositions of it besides yours.

1. As Faith is called *Pretious*, from the excellency of its object, Christ and Glory. So it is said to be by the righteousness of God in the same respect, *viz.* as precious, and in respecting the object; because God hath Promised Christ and Glory to all Believers, and he is true of his Promise.

2. Others say, It is by the righteousness of God in that same promise, as that promise being the object, causeth our Faith: we knowing God to be true of his promise, do believe him.

3. Our new Annotations, and many others, mention a third, making *the Righteousness of God* to be put for the bounty of God, as oft in Scripture.

4. The words *ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ*, Many take as not respecting the efficient cause, but the Object: God hath given us a precious Faith in his righteousness: or a Belief in Christs righteousness for salvation. *Diodates* words only I will repeate, *viz.* *Whose foundation and object is Christs Righteousness; which comprehends all that he hath done and suffered for his: Others expound the word Righteousness for Mercy, and Goodness, or for Loyalty in keeping Promises.*

4. The Condition of persons under Merit and Demerit, in respect of,

* But they must
then be alike
under Merit
and Demerit.

of Good and Evil, is alike. * The proportion of things requires it. Now men under Demerit, are under an Obligation to Punishment : and it is a Righteous thing with God to recompence tribulation to them. 2 Theſ. 1. 6. It being the Judgement of God, that they who do ſuch things are worthy of Death Rom. 1:32. They then who are under Merit, have alſo a Right unto that whereof it is the Merit.

To be under Merit, is a ſtretching word : but if there muſt be any force in the Compariſon to be under Merit, muſt ſignifie to be Really, or Reputatively the Meritors of that good ; or that we be the ſubjects of that Merit, as we are of the Merit of evil here compared to it. But how eaſie had it been to fore-ſee that we would deny, either *non entia*, or Infidels to be ſo under Merit; yea or any man living, though a Believer ! And who can find here a word of proof of any of this ? For my part I would neither believe it for a world, nor practice according to ſuch principles. I durſt not go to the holy God with ſuch a ſacrifice, and ſay, *Lord, the proportion of things requires it, that my Condition, while I was a wicked unbeliever, ſhould be alike to Good, as is the Condition of Reprobates to Evil, as to Merit : I deſerved ſalvation while I was an Infidel, as well as they deſerve Damnation.* Then God ſhould have done as much injury in damning us, as he had ſhewed mercy in ſaving them. Then it ſeems you would not ſay to God, *Thou mighteſt have juſtly cut me off in my unbelief, and caſt me into hell :* but contrarily, *Thou couldſt not juſtly have done it.* And whether under ſuch perfect Merit you think God doth not wrong you, if he inflict on you the leaſt Caſtigatory penalty I know not ! And may you not as fairly ſay, *Lord, I have merited as well, not to continue a ſinner, under any of thine anger, any penal ſuffering, to dye, to lye in the duſt till the Reſurrection, (in my body) &c. as the Reprobates deſerve to be damned.* The Lord ſave me, and all his Church from ſuch principles. I cannot ſwallow and digeſt them, any eaſier then I can ceaſe to be a Chriſtian. I cannot choſe but ſay clean contrary, *Lord, I deſerve thy wrath, and am by nature a child of wrath, and thou mighteſt juſtly have caſt me into Hell from the womb.* 2 Nay to this day, ſhould I think that I were under no obligation to puniſhment, I muſt needs think I am incapable of pardon, and ſo muſt forbear to beg pardon, or to take my ſelf beholden to God for any renewed pardon : nor that I ought to uſe the means for any. Men united to Chriſt by Faith, have a better

ter claim to Christs Merits, then Infidels, though Elect : And yet I thank God I do not use to hear Ministers in prayer (nor any Christians) talk to God in this language, and say , We have by Merit as good right to heaven, as the Reprobate to hell. Nay more, I doubt not to prove, that Christ never communicates his Merit in its formal nature, to any man ; but only the effects of it : He gives us his Merit, as a man gives a prisoner 1000. li. which indeed he never shewed him in it self, or gave him, but only gave it the King for his ransom. It was not that Merited but Christ, and I am no further under it, then to partake of the fruits of it, and that is by Degrees, in what time and measure he seeth meet to give them out to me : which is not all at once, nor all perfectly, till another world.

It is not of any force to say, that they are not under that Merit, but only upon Condition. For this is 1. False. 2. With God this is all one, as if there were no Condition, at the season and term appointed, for the making out the fruit of that Merit, as hath been declared.

I confess it is of small force, till they know what you will mean by *under Merit* ; 1. If you will mean, that we are esteemed the Meritors, I confess it is false. For this is never true, or made out either Conditionally or Absolutely : no more then that you shall be Christ. Yet this seems plainly your meaning ; but the proof we want.

2. If you mean it of the effects of Christs Merits, they are of several sorts, and he that shall say, they are all given to us Conditionally, I would say as well as you, it is false;

3. But if it be the special fruit that we have in question, *viz.* Absolution from guilt, or actual right to it, I say that is given on Condition, or else *If* is not a Conditional term. If thou confests with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and believe in thy heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. *Rom. 10.* And to say this is false, weighs as much with me, as your former reasonings to prove it false, which I may not now examine.

And where you say, *With God this is all one at the season, &c.* I Reply. 1. And do you confests it is not all one with him before the season or term ? 2. The question is rather what it is with us, then with God : when we enquire whether we be the subjects of that Merit and Right. 3. It is not true nor proved, that it is all one with God. God seeth things as they are, and therefore seeth not

divers things as one : nor a Conditional Grant as an Absolute.

4. It is true that the Elect shall be as certainly Justified by the Conditional Grant, as if it had been Absolute : but this is so far from making them all one, that it more sets forth the Omniscience and Wisdom of God, that can bring man to his appointed ends, by means most fit to his nature, and as infallibly attain his ends by Contingent means, as by naturally necessary.

Neither yet to Object that it is not their Own Merit, but of another which respects them, that other being their Surety, doing that whereby he Merited on their behalf : Yea in their stead, they dying with him : though the same in them could not have been meritorious, they being at best meer men, and at worst very sinful men.

Reply. Here is the heart of the whole Controversie, and (if I may have leave to speak as confidently as your self,) the Root of many dangerous errors, I think very plainly subverting the Christian Religion. I confess with comfort, that Christ was our Surety, and merited on our behalf, and in our stead in some sense, especially that he satisfied in our stead : But that *we dyed with him* when he dyed, I deny : I suppose you would by this intimate that he did not only Merit in our stead, but Reputatively so in our person, as that *ipso facto* his Merit was theirs, for whose sake it was performed, and they reputed to have merited in, by, and with him. This opinion destroyeth the substance of all Religion, as I hope to manifest upon fitter occasion. Though Christ did Merit for us, and suffer in our stead, yet it was not as our Delegate, nor did we do it in him in a Civil and Law-sense, anymore truly then in a natural. Nor is the sinner reputed to have done all that his voluntary Sponsor doth for him, nor is the benefit of it *ipso facto* his, but on what terms the Sponsor and the Creditor or Rector shall please to convey it.

5. *A Compact or Covenant being made of giving life and salvation upon the Condition of Obedience, to certain persons, that Condition being compleatly fulfilled, as it was in the death of Christ, claim being made of the Promise according to the tenor of the Compact, and the persons presented for the enjoyment of it, surely those persons have an actual Right unto it.*

Reply. If the Covenant had been made with us, and we had performed the Conditions, or another for us, (so be it the Promise had been made to us, upon such performance of another,) then

then all this
that he sh
Authority
shall event
which is pro
though For
presenting
1. Did Chri
all the year
Or what w
only when
ment, then
we believe
Abolive us
for enjoym
time but of
to agree me
gives us
That all
10, 11, 12.
Reply.
countenan
when he h
be successf
fits before
such as are
eyes the
solved fro
sed are the
the Tree
Argu
from Ete
death, be
creed on
Christs M
say any
God
Aron
such fro

then all this had been true that you say. But a Promise to Christ that he shall have all things delivered into his hands, and have Authority to forgive sin, together with an Agreement whom he shall eventually call and pardon, this gives no man Right. That which is promised to another for our good, is not promised *To us*, though *For us* ; nor giveth us any Right. For what you say of *presenting the persons for the enjoyment of it*, I understand not. 1. Did Christ present us to enjoy it before we had a being ? 2. Or all the years of our Infidelity ? why then did we not enjoy it ? Or what was that which you call *presenting us* ? 3. But if it were only when we received Faith that he so presented us for enjoyment, then it seems we are Absolved but in the same moment as we believe. And then our *dying with Christ* when he dyed, did not Absolve us, nor give us Right. If the person must be so presented for enjoyment first, stay but a moment longer (and that not of time but of nature) and let him believe first, and we are nearer to agreement. Yet do I know of no presentment before Faith that gives us Right, but much to the contrary.

That all this is so, see Isa. 49. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, &c. Psal. 2. 2, 4, 5. Isa. 53. 10, 11, 12. Joh. 17. 3. and 2. 21. Heb. 2.

Reply. Whether any word in any of these texts give the least countenance to your assertion, I am content the Reader judge when he hath perused them. They prove that Christs death shall be successful; but for any word that we have a Right to the benefits before we believe, I mean, to the benefits following Faith, such as are Absolution and Pardon, he must have better or worse eyes than I, that can find it. Much less, that we are actually Absolved from guilt of death, and Obligation to Punishment. *Blessed are they that do his Commandments, that they may have Right to the Tree of Life, &c. Rev. 22. 14.* So much for that Argument.

Argument 5. If we are pardoned or Absolved from guilt from Eternity, because it was Decreed, or at the time of Christs death, because it was then Merited, then all other Relations Decreed or Merited should be from Eternity, or from the time of Christs Merits : But the Consequent is so false, that I need not say any more to manifest it : therefore

God Decreed from Eternity that *David* should be King, and *Aron* Priest, and both Types of Christ : Yet were they not such from Eternity : Nor yet from the time of Christs undertake-

ing to Merit it, If a man that was Decreed to have two or three wives successively, were husband to them all at once; *Quere*, Whether the Law will reach him for his life? Yet so it must be, if all his Relations are from eternity, because Decreed from eternity, or from Christs dying, because then Merited. Was *Edward* the 6th King of *England*, or *Elizabeth* Queen from the time of Christs death? Was Mr. O. Mr. E. Mr. C. or any now living, a Pastor of a Church when Christ dyed? I hope none will say that God Decreed not these, or that Christ Merited them not.

The Consequence is plain from the parity of Reason. If it be *eo nomine*, because Decreed or Merited that one is eternal or from Christs death, then other Relations that are Decreed and Merited must be so too.

I put both together, because I deal with men that somewhat differ: Some do not so openly or plainly own the Eternity of Absolution as others do. The forementioned learned man saith; *For the foundation of this Right, seeing that before the Consideration of the death of Christ, it is not, from thence it must needs be*: But whether this Consideration of Christs death be not from eternity, and so our Merit and Right from eternity, in his judgement, I am uncertain: By some passages I should hope better: but these words make me doubtful; *That the Decree of God gives to no man a Right, to the thing concerning which the Decree is, is so far from being a sufficient proof of the Major, that it is in it self very questionable, if not unquestionably false. That the Decree gives not being and existence to the things concerning which it is, is an old Rule. That no Right should from it arise unto that thing by vertue thereof, is not so clear. Right is but Jus; Jus est, quod Justum est: If it be Just or Right that any one should have such a thing, he is said to have a Right thereunto. Now supposing the Decree of God, that a man shall by such means have such a thing, is it not just, equitable and condecant unto righteousness that he should have it?*

Reply. 1. It seems then we had our *Jus ad rem* from eternity: And then Christ did not Purchase or Merit it: for he is not the cause as Mediator of eternal effects (*à parte ante*.) And if we had Right from Eternity to Justification and Salvation, and that Absolutely *sub Termino*, as you speak, to be ours, then when the term comes, we shall have it, as having Right to it before. And what doth Christs death cause by interposing? If you say, that it is
not

not Decreed
dition of C
ditional De
2. If our
3. If Christ
condition of
a Right from
to Life from
ritus, and th
dition of;
condition m
there can be
or Merits be
Right to us.
prest? 2.
a meritorio
past my reac
Right to Li
the Right in
had it Absol
for, to proc
Upon Christ
and then on
the thing it
creed the me
cree, yet he
means to
pose, is bu
effect i Co
God. Cause
time to its p
can cause m
Meriteth.
take up wit
It affecteth
curing effica
well recon
But you g
and exten

not Decreed to us, or by Decree given us Absolutely, but on condition of Christs Merits ; I *Ans* w. 1. Take heed of making conditional Decrees, so as that any thing be a condition of Decreeing.

2. If our *Jus ad Rem* be but conditional, then actually it is none.

3. If Christs death be no condition of the Decree, it can be no condition of the conjunct effect, which is eternal too, if we have a Right from eternity. 4. Or if you judge that we have a Right to Life from Eternity, without any procurement of Christs Merits, and that it is the *Jus in re* only that his Merits are the condition of ; yet remember these things. 1. That you suppose a condition must *tendere ad incertum*, and therefore that with God there can be no proper Conditions : How then can Christs death or Merits be a condition ? how can God make a grant of such Right to us, on this condition of Obedience, as you before express ? 2. We hope Christs death was not a meer condition, but a meritorious cause : And how it can be so on your grounds, is past my reach to know. 3. And what need it, or can it cause ? The Right to Life we are conceited to have before (by many at least :) the Right in life needs no more but *ut veniat dies* to cause it, if we had it Absolutely *sub termino*. And was this it that Christ dyed for, to procure us a Right to that which we had Right to before ? Upon Christs dying it is still but *Jus ad Rem* till the term come : and then our first Right would turn to a *Jus in re*, when we have the thing it self. If you say that God who Decreed the end, Decreed the means, and though he gave us the Right to Life by Decree, yet he Decreed that Christs death should interpose as the means to the *Jus in re* ; I *Ans* w. What means is it ? To interpose, is but to come in such an order ; but what doth it to the effect ? Condition it can be none, if there be no condition with God. Cause it can be none, of that which wants no cause but time to its production. Nor do I see, according to you, how it can cause meritoriously, if it cause not with God from whom it Meriteth. You did therefore more cautelously then satisfactorily take up with a word that will bear many interpretations, saying, *It affecteth Gods Justitiam Regiminis*, and there you place its procuring efficacy ; which words I like well, if they were cleared, and well reconciled with the rest.

But you grant it as an old Rule, *That the Decree gives not being and existence to the things concerning which it is*. I demand then ;

Did God Decree to give us Right to Life ; or not ? If not, then we have it not as Decreed. If he did, then the Decree caused not the being of it : and then it had no being, for it had no other cause from Eternity.

I speak all this more to the Defence and Confirmation of my Argument, then your confutation : For in doing that I should take another course, and deny the Definition of *Jus*, is the case in hand ; and prove both, that if God should not perform his Decree, it would not be injustice in him, or injury, (which is contrary to *Jus*, as in our case) but only mutability, (as *Durandus* imagined also, in case he should not perform his word, which is much more ;) and that neither the Purposes of God or man, do convey any Right to another, of the benefit purposed : no nor a bare discovery of that purpose neither, nor that which some call a Pollicitation, as distinct from a Promise ; but only such a Promise, Grant, or Law, whose nature and use is to transfer or convey Right.

1. If man hath a Right to all that God hath Decreed to him, then he hath Right to punishment, even to Hell from Eternity, before ever he sinned in himself or in *Adam* : yea before he was : and this punishment is his due : but that is not true.

2. I know most of those that are against me, will maintain that God Decreed from Eternity, that men should commit all the sins that ever are committed, *ipso permittente, & voluntatem ad actum, promotione immediata efficari prædeterminante* : and so sin was due to all sinners from Eternity, when they were no men : or they had then Right to it : but that is not true.

3. No Right is conveyed to another, but by some Transient act, (for it doth make a change on the object, *ponendo novam relationem* :) But Gods eternal purpose is not such an act ; therefore, &c.

4. The Transient act which makes such a Relative change, (in giving Right,) must do it by laying a real foundation, whence that Relation must result : but the eternal purpose layes none such : (But the Promise or Grant of the Law of Grace, is that foundation, *Conditione præstita, ubi conditionalis est promissio*.) That which giveth not Title, gives not Right : but, &c. Much more might easily be said to the great dishonor of this new unheard of opinion (till now so far as I know) that men have Right to that

which

which is D
purposes an
of all Law
ment. Divin
maybe bou
but if hereb
the world is

Argument
Guilt, either
Christs dea
effects of D
be from Ete
false: there
ved, becau
same Reas
because th
and reason

Argument
undertakin
were made
Pardoned.
that the A
Heb. 11. 7

seen, as yet
house, by th
Righteousn
his Grace,
Life. Gal

in Christ I
and heirs ac
an heir of
shall not be

children of
Father of
Righteous
Circumci
walk in th
the Prom
ham or lo

which is Decreed them. In a word, It confounds the nature of purposes and promises, destroyes the main use, if not the Essence of all Laws, Promises and Contracts, and so subverts all Government, Divine and humane ; and civil commerce among men. I may be bound to God to perform my purposes (yet not alway) but if hereby I give Right to men to all that I purposed them, all the world is ignorant as well as I.

Argument 6. If we are Pardoned, Justified or Absolved from Guilt, either from Eternity, because it was then Decreed, or from Christs death, because it was then Merited ; then would all real effects of Decree, and of Christs death, (as well as the Relative) be from Eternity, or from Christs death : But the Consequent is false : therefore so is the Antecedent. If we are therefore absolved, because our Absolution is Decreed or Merited, then on the same Reason we are Sanctified, raised from the dead, glorified, because these are Decreed and Merited, there being the same cause and reason of both.

Argument 7. If neither from Eternity, nor the time of Christs undertaking, nor any time before we were born, or believed, we were made Heirs of the Promise and Kingdom, then were we not Pardoned, Justified, or Absolved from the guilt of death. But that the Antecedent is true, I prove by these Scriptures following. *Heb. 11. 7.* By Faith Noah being warned of God of things not seen, as yet moved with fear, prepared an Ark to the saving of his house, by the which he condemned the world, and became heir of the Righteousness which is by Faith. *Tit. 3. 7.* That being Justified by his Grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal Life. *Gal. 3. 26, 29.* For ye are all the children of God by Faith in Christ Iesus. And if ye be Christs, then are ye Abrahams seed, and heirs according to the Promise. *Gal. 1. 7.* And if a Son, then an heir of God through Christ. *v. 30.* The son of the bond-woman shall not be heir, &c. *28.* Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of Promise. *Rom. 4. 11, 12, 13, 14.* That he might be the Father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised, that Righteousness might be imputed unto them also. And the Father of Circumcision to them who are not of the Circumcision only, but also walk in the steps of that Faith of our Father Abraham, &c. For the Promise that he should be Heir of the world, was not to Abraham or his seed through the Law, but through the Righteousness of Faith.

Faith. For if they which are of the Law be heirs, Faith is made void, and the Promise made of none effect. Rom. 8. 16, 17. And if children, then heirs, heirs of God, and joynt heirs with Christ. Ephes. 3. 6. That the Gentiles should be fellow heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his Promise in Christ by the Gospel. Jam. 2. 5. Hath not God chosen the poor of this world, rich in Faith, Heirs of the Kingdom, which God hath Promised to them that love him?

The Consequence is of apparent verity, seeing the word *Heirs* expresseth their Right. He therefore that is not Heir of the Promise, or according to the Promise, or heir of the Kingdom, cannot have Right in Remission, Absolution from guilt, or Justification: and therefore cannot be Pardoned, Absolved, Justified.

Argument 8. If the Elect were all Justified or Absolved in Christ as the publike person, or having themselves satisfied or merited in, and by him (which is the common foundation of the adverse opinion) then they are Justified or Absolved without any Pardon of sin, merited by Christ for them: But the Consequent is false, and destructive to the Christian Religion: therefore the Antecedent is not true.

The Consequence (which only needs proof) is thus manifest to be found.

1. Christ was Justified, or Absolved without pardon: therefore if the Elect were Justified or Absolved in Christ as the publike person, as having themselves satisfied or merited in him, then they are Absolved or Justified without pardon: For the same Absolution cannot *toto cælo* differ in nature from it self: Christ was declared Just and Absolved without pardoning him one sin, as to the undertaken Punishment.

2. They that have either perfectly obeyed, or satisfied, must be Justified or Absolved without pardon (being capable of none, as not needing it) and that in the most rigid Justice. If therefore we have either perfectly obeyed or satisfied in Christ, we must be Absolved or Justified, without pardon, in strictest Justice.

The strictest Justice can require no more then all that is due. Nor can deny an Acquittance or Justification, to him that hath paid or performed all that was due.

Obj.

Calvin in
Math. 6. 11.
Neq; enim Remittere dicitur
Creditor, qui
accepta solutione nihil amplius exigit; sed
qui ultro &
liberaliter Jure suo cedens absolvit debitorem.

Obj. Had neede
pardon
Ans^r
relants, ye
that we pai
a person in
Debt which
himself. It
though not
of Laws
must be a
Christ had
by his, tha
Idem, and
the same
then no Ju
without fu
us was not
But inde
that was c
and not o
satisfie Le
in paymen
Law admitt
the same,
doth, him
the Law c
alloweth
or in the r
vin. simul
And th
in our ca
tute of
yet not as
tisfie or n
his Sacrifi
on, on w
agrecabl

Obj. Had we paid or performed it in our own persons, then we had needed no pardon, but seeing Christ paid it for us, it must be pardoned to us, though not to him.

Ans. This is very true; and the ordinary Doctrine of Protestants, yea of Scripture. But then observe, that this affirmeth, that we paid it not in our own persons. And this must be true, of a person in a civil sense, or Law sense, as well as a natural: That Debt which a man paies by his servant or other Delegate, he paies himself. It was done by his person in Moral, Civil, or Law-sense; though not by his natural person. It being therefore the Action of Laws (or according to Laws) that we have to speak of, it must be a Legal person that we must speak of. If therefore Christ had so Merited, or satisfied in your person, and you in and by his, that Reputatively the Law, or Lawgiver, did judge it the *Idem*, and not only the *Aequivalens*, and did esteem the person the same, and judge you to have merited or satisfied in Christ, then no Justice could deny you present Justification or Absolution without further pardon: though the natural person of Christ and us was not the same.

But indeed it could not be, that Christ paid the *Idem*, the same that was due in Law: For that was *supplicium ipsius Deliquentis*, and not of another: Nor could it be that you should merit or satisfy Legally in Christ, he doing it in your person. For though in payment of debts to a Creditor (which is not our case) the Law admitteth payment by a Delegate, and taketh the person as the same, looking only at the Debt (for what a mans Instrument doth, himself doth) yet in case of Obedience and Punishment, the Law determineth of the person, as well as the thing due, and alloweth not a Delegation, or doing or suffering by an Instrument, or in the natural person of another: and therefore *dum alius solvit, simul aliud solvitur*.

And though God as Rector, *supra Legem*, as above Law, doth in our case, allow and Accept of a Sponsor, and kind of substitute of punishment, viz. that Christ should suffer in our stead; yet not as in our person, so as we do Morally or Reputatively satisfy or merit in or by him: but in the person of a Mediator; that his Sacrifice, Satisfaction, Merit, may be a valuable Consideration, on which God may pardon our sins, in his time, and on terms agreeable to his honor and ends of Government. I take this to

Sohinus in
Exeges. Con-
fess. Aug. Art.
4. p. 921. On-
nis enim Omi-
natio tollitur
solutione ejus
quod debetur
sive is solvat
qui debet, sive
alius pro eo.

be the truth, about the nature of our Redemption by Christ, between the two Extrems of the Socinians (who deny satisfaction by Christ) and the Antinomians, (who say, that we satisfied, or obeyed and merited, or both in and by Christ;) Two Errors of so great moment, subverting the very foundation, and whole frame of Christian Religion, that I confess my soul abhorreth them, though in all tollerable differences I can go far in bearing with dissenters. And I wonder that some Divines do look on this so lightly, as if it were but a verbal or inconsiderable difference.

Obj. But yet, though it be true that God was bound in Justice presently to Absolve and Justifie us, without further pardon, when we had paid all the debt (either of Obedience or Penalty) in and by Christ; it followeth not, that we are not pardoned: For God did pardon us by translating the Punishment from us to another: To put another into our person, was Gods pardoning act: He might have inflicted it on our selves, and he laid it on Christ: therefore we are not Justified without pardon of sin.

Ans. This is the answer I confess, of some men, whose parts and worth one would think should promise much better. They yield to, and maintain what I said before; that we did satisfy and merit in and by Christ, and that God could not in Justice deny us present Absolution or Justification without any further pardon, (except in the after Manifestation of this to our consciences.) But then they think this act of Deputation, or change of the person is a sufficient pardon. To which I say.

1. I did not mention the exclusion of all pardon, in my Consequence; but only of *all pardon merited by Christs death*, or satisfaction, or by any act of obedience, which he is supposed to do in our persons, and we in him. And according to this desperate Doctrine which I gain-say, there can be no pardon merited for us by Christ. For this change of the person, which is mentioned, was both naturally and morally (according to their supposition) antecedent to Christs satisfaction and merits: we are supposed first to be made or reputed one person with Christ, and then to have satisfied and merited in him: That is, to be first pardoned, and then to have satisfied and merited.

2. But I deny that this deputation or change of the person, (if it were true) were any actual pardon of sin. The definition is

not

not the same : therefore the thing is not the same. Indeed it might presuppose a pardon (according to their grounds) but is not a pardon it self : For it is not a dissolving the obligation to Punishment, nor a Giving us Right to Impunity.

3. Doth not this make Gods punishing of us in Christ to be unjust ? For if we were pardoned before, how can it be just that we should pay all the debt after ? or suffer what was pardoned ? For if it be we in Moral or Law-sense that satisfie, then it is the same person that was pardoned that satisfieth.

4. And if we did satisfie in Christ, then nothing was pardoned to us ; if the person were Legally the same.

5. But suppose these two last answers may be put by, (by saying that is a pardon to our natural person, though not our legal ; or some such frivolous reply) yet can Christian Religion bear it, or Christian ears endure to hear it that we have no pardon of sin, which was purchased or merited by Christs death and satisfaction, but was freely given before, by the change of persons ? some more I shall say of this in the next.

Argument 9. If we did merit or satisfie (as aforesaid) in Christ, then must our Absolution and Deliverance be *ipso facto* from that moment so compleated, that no Justice can continue us under the least punishment, or inflict the least upon us : But the Consequent is false, and desperately subverteth Religion, and blasphemeth Gods providence : therefore.

It is easie to argue *à facto ad finem*, in all Gods Works he doth it : therefore it is Just ; is an unquestionable consequence. But that God doth inflict castigatory Punishments on Believers ; and then doubtless no less on Infidels and wicked men, though Elect, is a truth so plain, that while Scripture is believed, or providence acknowledged, all the Antinomians on earth shall not prevail against it.

Is it no penalty for God to hate all the Workers of Iniquity ? to abominate their Prayers ? to deny them all sanctifying Grace ? to continue them children of wrath, without hope, without God in the world ? Under the power of Satan ? yea to be the children of the Devil ? 1 *Joh.* 3. 10. *Act.* 26. 18 and to be led Captive by him at his will, as his bond-slaves ? 2 *Tim.* 2. 26.

He that can make men believe that these men are under no punishment, may next make them believe that there is no God, or Providence,