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Part I.

By Anthony Burgess, Preacher of God's Word.

The third Edition, with the Addition of the Contents of each Sermon, by a Friend of the Author.

HE many favours your Honour hath vouchsafed unto me, altogether undeserving, may justly command a public-like acknowledgement thereof to the whole world; But that which doth especially encourage me to seek for your Protection.
in the publishing of this Treatise, is your unfained love of, and steadfast continuance in the Truth: So that those two things which Pythagoras said made a man compleat, *eunynv"v ρελονολεν, to do good to others, and to embrace truth, may without flattery be affirmed to be in your Lordship. And as for the later, Paul speaks it as a great commendation, that the true faith did dwell in Lois, which denoteth a stable and firm permanency, as the Apostle elsewhere faith, *ἀνανεωθηκαίντιν. In some mens breasts, Truth is only a sojourner, and their assent to it passeth away (as the Psalmist speaks of our life) like a tale that is told. Now herein Christ speaks of a peculiar priviledge to the Elect, that it is not possible for them to be deceived by false Prophets (if it were possible to deceive the very Elect) which is to be understood of a total and final seduction: Thus also when the Apostle had mentioned the Apostacy of Hymenaeus and Philetus, he interposeth by way of comfort to the godly, *Nondum the Foundation of the Lord standeth sure, having this Seal, the Lord knoweth who are his; and no wonder if the Truths of Christ are worthy of all hearty acceptation, seeing they are wholly by supernaturall revelation, in which sense, some say, Christ is called "οὐκ ὤν Θεός, the Word, because he revealed the will of his Father to us; but in another respect are we to take heed how we decline from the Truths of God, because they are the inlet and first instrument of our Sanctification and Salvation, God would have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of
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Lect. I.

Rom. 3. 24, 25. Being Justified freely by his Grace, &c.

Introductory Propositions, setting forth the Excellency and Preciousness of the Doctrine of Justification; Of how much importance it is that it be kept pure; With the Signification of the word *justific.*

Lect. II.

Of the Reality of Justification by Christ; That the Scripture speaks of it as to us in a Passive sense, and as God's Action, not ours. And of other equivalent phrases to it in Scripture; With some necessary Cautions.
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Lect. III.

The Possibility of Pardon; How many ways sinne may be said to be forgiven; What things are con-
derable in sinne; The Difference between Original and Actual sinne; That when sinne is forgiven, it is
totally and perfectly forgiven: Also the Subject and Extent of Remission.

Lect. IV.

Of the Afflictions that come upon the Godly after the Pardon of their sins.

Lect. V.

Of Afflictions: Whether God chastiseth his Children for their sins.

Lect. VI.

Jer. 50. 20. In those daies, and at that time the iniquitie of Judah shall be sought for, and it shall not be
found, &c.

Of the Perfection of Justified Persons, and their free-
dom from sin: Whether God see sin in Believers:
Divers Scripture expressions about pardon of sinne.
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Lact. VII.
Arguments to prove, That God doth see sinne in the Justified as to be offended and displeased with it.

Lact. IX.
How greatly God is offended at the sins of those that are Godly.

Lact. X.
How Gods anger manifests itself upon his own Children sinning.

Lact. XI.
Heb. 4.13. Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in his sight; but all things are naked and opened unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do.

The Antinomians Distinction of Gods Knowing and Seeing sinne, examined.

Lact. XII.
Propositions shewing how farre Gods taking notice of sinne, so as to punish it, is subject to the meer Liberty of his Will.
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LECT. XIII.

Matt. 6:12. And forgive us our Debts, as we forgive our Debtors.

Sheweth, That Sinnes are Debts.

LECT. XIV.

That Justified persons are to pray for the Forgiveness of sinne in a proper sense, and not only for the sense of pardon: With the meaning of the Petition, Forgivem, &c.

LECT. XV.

Shews, What this Petition doth suppose and imply.

LECT. XVI.

Setteth forth the Nature of sinne in its several Names, Definition, Effects and Aggravations.

LECT. XVII.

An Enquiry into the Nature of Forgiveness of sinne. Divers Greek words that express this Mercy. And the Necessity of Faith and Repentance, in order to pardon.
LECT. XVIII.

The Necessity of Repentance in order to Forgiveness: And how it consists with God's Free-grace in remitting.

LECT. XIX.

Repentance no cause of pardon, and yet its Usefulness and Necessity as to Repentance. Why Repentance is not sufficient to remove the Guilt of Sin; And why it bears not the proportion in Satisfaction that Sin doth in the offence.

LECT. XX.

Whether pardon of Sinne be an immanent or transient Act of God: And whether it be Antecedent to our Faith and Repentance. The contrary proved, viz. That God doth not justifie or pardon us before we Believe and Repent.

LECT. XXI.

The Antinomian Arguments for Justification before Faith, answered.

LECT. XXII.

More Arguments to prove Justification before Faith, answered.
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L e c t. XXIII.

Whether we pray here for pardon, or for assurance of pardon only. Why God sometimes pardons a sinner, and doth not acquaint him with it; with Directions to doubting, tempted people concerning their finnes.

L e c t. XXIV.

Whether in Repentance the difference between great Sinnes and lesse is to be respected.

L e c t. XXV.

Psal. 32.1. Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sinne is covered.

Ver. 2. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord imputeth not iniquity.

Of the pardon of Sin under the notion of covering it.

L e c t. XXVI.

Psal. 51.9. Hide thy face from my sins, and blot out all mine iniquities.

Sheweth, That God takes notice of, and is Angry at the sins of Believers. The Aggravations of Davids, and so of all Believers finnes. What finnes Believers may possibly fall into, and yet wherein they differ
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differ from the sinnes of other men.

Lect. XXVII.
How farre grosse Sinnes make a breach upon Justification.

Lect. XXVIII.
Whether God in pardoning do forgive all Sins togethther, as well future as past.

Lect. XXIX.
Acts 3.29. Repent, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out.

That full Absolution is not untill the Day of Judgement: Wherein pardon then consists: And whether the Sins of Gods people shall be manifested at that Day.

Lect. XXX.
Luke 7.47. Wherefore, I say unto thee, Her sinnes which are many are forgiven, for she loved much.

Tenderness of Spirit, and true Humiliation (not carnal Presumption) the Effect of the Sense of pardon.
The Epistle Dedicatory.

The truth: Sanctifie them by thy truth, thy Word is truth, and our regeneration is described partly by the renewing of our minde, for as corrupt distillations from the head are apt to putrifie the vitals, so Errors and false Doctrines do quickly corrupt our practice. One thing more I make bold to recommend to your Lordship, that besides the bare receiving of the truth, there is (as the perfection of knowledge) the acknowledgement of truth after godliness, and the learning of truth as it is in Jesus Christ; which is, when the truths we believe have a favoury and powerfull effect upon us, and nothing causeth our abode in the Truth so much as the experimentall efficacy of it upon our hearts. It is good (faith the Apostle) to have the heart established with grace and not with meats. One would have thought the Apostle should have said it is good to have the heart established with sound Doctrine, because he exhorteth them not to be carried aside with every winde of Doctrine; but he faith Grace rather then Knowledge, because this is the choicest Antidote against falshoods; Tantum scimus, quantum operamur, we know no more (viz. favourily, clearly, and stedfastly) then we have powerfull practice of: Now of all supernaturall truths the Doctrine of Justification hath no mean excellency, this is the Article which Luther said reigned in his heart; In this is a Christians treasury of hope and consolation: and because the Antinomians, whose opinions may be styled as those of Epicurus were, ἄγωνες νόμος (inticing Syrens of a mans fleshly minde)
minde) have put their dead flies in this precious Box of ointment, I have endeavoured to select this precious Gold from their dross. Though the matter I handle be in part Controversial, yet it is also in a great measure Practicall. The greatest mercy I can wish to your Lordship, is this glorious priviledge of Justification, in which only, and not in riches, honours, or any earthly dignity, consisteth true and perfect blessedness, as David a King, doth heartily, and with much affection acknowledge, Psal. 32.1. and Paul by vertue of this Justification, Rom. 8. triumphs over all adversity and trouble whatsoever. Of which glorious happiness that your Lordship may be made partaker, is the Prayer of

Your Lordships most humble

Servant in the Lord,

Anthony Burgess.
TO THE

Christian Reader.

Christian Reader,

Ere I not already engaged (I know not how) in this publike way of Controversies, I should wholly decline such service; partly because of that ill fate, (if I may say so) which doth accompany Books through the various Palates of those that read them, whereby they are unwilling agnosere quod Dei est, or ignoscere quod hominis est; partly because of expectation, (which is an heavy prejudice) all men judging it reasonable, that now in these later times there being the advantage of all the abilities of those who went before us, a man should not so much libros, as the sauros scribere, write not Books, but rich Treasuries, as the Heathen said; partly because this Controversial way doth...
To the Reader.

So possess the intellectual part, that the affectionate part is much dulled, and made remiss thereby. Even a Papist, Granada (in his way of Devotion) said, A Learned man that was busied in such kind of employments, should reckon himself in the number of those wretched Captives that are ad metalla damnati. Though all the day long they dig up Gold, yet they are not any whit enriched by it, but others for whom they work. And Rodericus (as I remember) related of Suarez, that he was wont to say, He esteemed that little pittance of time, which constantly every day he set apart for the private examination of his own conscience, more than all the other part of the day, which he spent in his voluminous Controversies. The Apostle speaks of doting about questions, but the Greek word signifies to be sick and languishing, which doth declare the nature of needless disputations, that they fret away, and make to consume the true power of Godliness.

De perfec.

1 Tim. 6.4. God once only spake out of a thorny bush, and as the Israelites were to go out of the military Camp to gather manna, so must a man shun tedious Disputes, who would enjoy the fat and marrow of Christian Religion. But notwithstanding these discouragements, yet the Apostle with a vehement obestation calls upon Timothy, and in him all faithful Ministers to preserve that good thing committed to their Charge, that it is the duty of Ministers not only by Preaching, but otherwise as occasion serveth, to see that the golden treasure deposited in the Church, be not debased with drossy errors, or the childrens necessary food mingled with destructive poison. Truth is a Depositum. Aristotle doth rationally conclude, That it is a greater in-justice to deny a little thing deposited, then a great summe that
To the Reader.

that we are indebted for, because he that depositeth any thing in our custody, trusteth in us as a faithful friend; the other expecteth only justice from us. Now of all points of Divinity, there is none that with more profit and comfort we may labour in, then in that of Justification, which is stiled by some, articulus stantis & cadentis ecclesiæ. The Church stands or falls, as the truth of this is asserted, and a modest, sober vindication of this point; from contrary errors, will not hinder, but much advantage the affectionate part of a man, even as the Bee is helped by her sting to make honey. God's way of Justification is for the truth of it above natural reason, and therefore there is required a supernatural Revelation to manifest it: In so much that the Divine Authority of the Scripture is in nothing more irradiant, than in the discovery of this glorious way of our Justification. But it hath been a stumbling block, and a rock of offence to many mens hearts, who look for a Philosophical Justification, or righteousness of works, either wholly issuing from our free will (as they suppose) or partly from it, and partly from the grace of God, and on this hand, have erred the Pelagians, Papiists, Arminians and Socinians: But while the Orthodox have been diligent to keep this fountain pure from the filth those Philistims daily throw in, there arose up another error on the right hand, which the Apostle Paul in his Epistles doth many times Antidote against, viz. such a setting up of Free-Grace in Justification, that should make the Law as to all purposes useless, and while it extolleth privileges debases duties; That as the Arminians on the one side, think it most absurd that the same thing should be officium requisitum & donum promissum, a duty required on our
part, and yet a gift promised on God’s part; so on the other side the Antinomian cannot at the same time see the fulness of Grace, only in blotting out our sins, and yet at the same time, a necessity of repentance, without which this Justification could not be obtained. Hence it is they fix their Meditations and Discourses upon the promissory part of the Scripture, not at the same time attending to the preceptive part. But whether it be their weakness or their wilfulness, they seem to be upon those passages of Scripture, which speak of God’s grace and Christ’s satisfaction, as David in Saul’s arms, which were an hinderance not an advantage to him. Men destitute of sound knowledge and Learning, should be afraid lest they do *πρέπειν, 2 Pet. 3.16. wrest the Scripture, and that εἰς ὑποπλεύρα, to their own destruction. It is no less a sin (faith Oecumenius) to torture the Scripture by perverse interpretation, than it was to torment and crucifie the very bodies of the Apostles; but to how many ignorant men attempting beyond their strength in Controversies of Divinity, hath that fall out, which did to one Lucian speaks of, who finding Orpheus his harp consecrated to Apollo in a certain Temple, bribed the Priest of the Temple, thinking to make the same melody which Orpheus used to do, which he attempting, through his ignorance made such an horrid sound, that it enraged all the dogs neer him, which presently fell on him, and tore him in pieces.

It is therefore good for men in all humility and modesty not to think of themselves above what they ought, or to affect to be Doctors, before indeed they have been Disciples.

But to my matter in hand, I shall briefly give an account of...
To the Reader.

of my method in this Treatise. Whereas in Justification many things are considerable, the efficient and impulsive Cause, God's grace, the meritorious Cause, Christ's satisfaction, the instrumental Cause, Faith; and every one of these hath many Debates upon it by Learned men. Yet I have insisted upon that wherein the nature of it doth consist, and because that is made by some two-fold, partly in remission of sins, partly in imputation of Christ's righteousness, this Discourse is wholly upon the former, in endeavouring to clear all the Doctrinal and Practical doubts that are of greatest consequence in this matter. And if God should bless this part with any good success, to establish the minds of those that waver, I shall (with God's assistance) proceed to the other point, viz. The Imputation of Christ's righteousness, the mistaking of which point is no mean cause of Antinomianism. I am not ignorant, how subject to blindness and several imperfections the best of men are, whereby through after-thoughts, they see such an argument might have been more strongly managed, and such expressions better ordered, insomuch that most men may say, as Luther said of his Books, He could (like Saturn) eat up his own children: It is also to be considered how difficult it is, with pure ends and godly intentions, aiming only at the glory of God, and edification of others, to undertake such a business as this is; therefore in all these exercises, it is good to go out of our selves, depending upon the strength of God only, and not to boast as if we had not received. Tutius vivitur, quando totum Deo damus, Et in nihilo gloriam dum est, quia nihil nostrum est.

One thing more I am to inform thee of, which is, that
To the Reader.

in the former part of this Treatise, I have more remisly spoken of Justification in the generall (because that will more pertinently be handled in the other point of imputed Righteousness) and have indeavoured more vigorously to prosecute the other part which is wholly spent about Pardon of Sin. These things premised, I leave thee to the Lord, who teacheth his children to profit.

Thine in Christ Jesus

Anthony Burgess.
OF JUSTIFICATION.

LECT. I.

Introductory Propositions, setting forth the Excellency and Preciousness of the Doctrine of Justification; Of how much importance it is that it be kept pure; With the signification of the word Justifié.

Rom. 3. 24, 25.

Being Justified freely by his Grace, &c.

The Apostle in the words precedent laid down two Propositions, to debase man and all his works, that so he might make way for the exaltation of that grace of Justification here spoken of.

The first Proposition is, That By the deeds of the Law no flesh shall be justified in his sight: Where two things are observable.

B 2. That
We are justified freely through Christ.

1. That he calls every man by the word *Fleb*, which is emphaticall to beat down that pride and tumor which was in the Jews.

2. He addeth, *in his sight*, which supposeth that though our righteousness among men may be very glorious, yet before God it is unworthy. The other Proposition is, That *All come short of the glory of God*: Some do make it a Metaphor from those in a race, who fall short of the prize. Whether by the glory of God, be meant the Image of God, and that righteousness first put into us, or eternal life, or (which is most probable) matter of glorying and boasting before God, which the Apostle speaks of afterwards, is not much material. Now the Apostle having described our condition to be thus miserable, he commends the Grace of God in justifying of us, which is decyphered most exactly in a few words: So that you have in the Text a most compendious delineation of Justification. First, There is the benefit set down, *Being justified*. Secondly, The efficient cause, *God's grace*; and here we have a two-fold impulsive cause, one inward, denoted in the word *Freely*; the other outward, in the meritorious cause, *Christ's death*; which is further illustrated by the appointment of God for this end, *ςτηθέν*: Some understand this of God's manifestation, as if it were spoken to oppose the propitiatory in the Ark, which was left hidden; some to the whole Polity in the old Testament, which in the Legall shadows, and the Prophets predictions did declare Christ; Others (upon better ground) referre it to the Decree of God. This death of Christ is called *ἀπεκτάνωσιν*, which denoteth both the action it self, as also the effect and benefit which cometh by it. Chrysostom observeth, that it's called *redemption*, and not a simple *emption*, because we were the Lords once, but by our sinnes became slaves to Satan, and now God doth make us his again. In the third place, you have the instrumentall cause, *Faith in his blood*: This is that Hysope that doth sprinkle the blood, though it be contempitible in it self, yet it is instrumentall for a great good; and hereby is denoted, That faith hath a peculiar nature in this work of Justification, which no other grace hath, for none faith love in his blood, or Patience in his blood. Lastly,
Propositions clearing the Nature of Justification.

Lastly, Here is the finall cause, To declare the righteousness of God for the remission of sinnes past. Some observe those words sinnes past, as implying, no sinne is forgiven till it be committed; it must be past before it can be forgiven: But the Apostle might use this speech in reference to sinnes past before his coming, to shew the efficacy and power of Christs death, that it was not the blood of Rams and Goats, but that of Christ, which could expiate our offences. My intent is to speak of the Benefit first, and then the Causes: The Benefit is Justification: And for the better understanding of this, consider the Propositions following, which will be subservient to clear the nature of it, although the more exact opening of the word, and the nature of it, is to be looked for when we come to speak of imputed righteousness.

First, It is of great consequence to have this Doctrine kept pure. Luther called it, Articulus fantis aut cadentis Eccle(50), as if this were the soul and pillar of Christianity. Pighius, though a Papist, calleth this the chief part of Christian Doctrine, confessing that it had been obscured, rather then cleared by their own Writers: yea, this Doctrine about Justification, is that which discerneth the Orthodox from Pagans, Papists, Socinians, and Arminians. Now there are divers reasons why we should keep the Philistims from throwing in earth to stop up this pleasant spring: As 1. Because herein is the grace and good favour of God especially revealed. Therefore the Gospel is called glorious, because God did not so much exalt and manifest his excellency in creating the world, as he did in providing of a Saviour, and Pardon for a poor sinner: Hence it's called the riches of his Grace, rather then of power or righteousness. We are therefore solicitous (whatsoever the Antinomians say to the contrary) that the Doctrine of Gods Grace in Justification may be fully improved to the uttermost, and that every broken heart may be put into a ravishment and admiration of it. We bewail those times of Popery, when the Name and efficacy of Christ and his Grace were obscured, by the works and pretended righteousness of men. 2. It's very necessary to keep this pure, because of the manifold truths that must fall, if this fall; if you erre in this, the whole truth about Original sinne, Free-will, and
Propositions clearing the Nature of Justification.

and obligation of the Law will likewise perish. 3. It’s of great influence into practice; for what doth the heart smitten for sinne, and filled with the displeasure of God, but runne to this Doctrine as the City of refuge? This is the water their souls pant after, this is the bread that their fainting stomacks would gladly feed on: now if this water be turned into mud, if this bread be made into stones by the corrupt Doctrines of men, how must the soul perish for want of sustenance?

Secondly, Satan hath endeavoured severall waies the corrupting of it. You may judge of the preciousnes and excellency of it, by Satans malicious endeavours to suppress it: Herod not more diligently seeking to take away the life of Christ, while he was in the Cradle, then Satans instruments were busie to stifle this truth in the infancy. Chemnitius relateth, that he did sapè cuborescere, many times tremble when he thought of a speech which Luther would often say (and it was ominous) That after his death the Doctrine of Justification would be corrupted: And indeed when those first Reformers had made the body of this Truth in all the severall parts of it, like that of Absaloms, comely and beautifull, without any blemish; there presently rose up many perverted in minde, and set upon it, as those thieves upon the man going to Jericho, leaving it wounded, and half dead. There are errours about the very nature of it, making it to be the infusion of righteousness in us, for which God doth accept us: Thus they speak of Justification, as Aristotle would about Physicall motions. Some take away the imputation of Christ’s righteousness; some take away the satisfaction of Christ; some make Faith to be accounted for righteousness; some make such a Justification, that thereby God shall see no sinne in those that are justified, wh...soever they do. Thus in the nature, parts, instrument, consequences, and subject, here are manifold errors, and hereby Satan bringeth much mischief to the Church, for by this means our lives are spent in disputing about this benefit, when it were far more comfortable to be enjoying of it. And when Satan could not overthrow the Truth by mingling of our works with the Grace of God, as in Popery, then he bendeth himself to errors on the right hand, by setting it up in such a seeming way, by amplifications of it, that
Propositions clearing the Nature of Justification.

that thereby all repentance and godly humiliation shall be quite evacuated: Even as we see the devil, when he could not by his instruments, the Pharisees, disprove the Deity of Christ, then he sets instruments on work to confess that he was the Son of God, thereby to get in some errors:

Thirdly, God in this way of Justification goeth above our thoughts. And certainly when a Christian will set his heart to think about this Truth, he must lay this for a foundation, that, In this matter of justifying, God's thoughts and his thoughts do differ as much as heaven and earth; so that the Doctrine of Christ's Hypostaticall Union is not more above our thoughts and expectation in the truth of it to be believed, then that of Justification is above our hearts, in the goodness of it, to be imbraced. It is in this case with us, as with Sampson, who found hony in the Carnage of a Lion, this could not be expected, how could it come there? Had he found it in some holes of a tree in the Wood, where Bees will sometimes Hive themselves, there had been some probability, but here is none: Thus thinketh the soul troubled to finde this hony of Justification in the death of Christ, how unlikely is it? if I should look for it in the works I do, in my holiness and righteousness that is wrought by my own hands, this were according to rules of righteousness.

And this is the ground of all that dangerous error in Popery, they look upon it as against the principles of reason, that we should be accounted righteous any other way, then by that which is inherent in us; and this made Luther profess, that when he did rightly understand the Doctrine about free remission of sins, yet he was exceedingly troubled with the word Justifie, for that old opinion had much soaked into him, that it must be to make righteous, as sanctificare is to make holy, or calcacere to make hot, some positive quality to be brought into a man, which he might oppose against the judgment of God. And hereby you may see, that its no wonder, if the people of God are so difficultly perswaded of their Justification; if they be again and again plunged into fears about it; because this way which God taketh is above our thoughts: It is a great matter to deny our own righteousness, and to be beholding to Christ only for pardon.

III. God in the way of Justification, goes above our thoughts and reason.

Fourth-
Fourthly, As the Doctrine itself is by peculiar revelation, so the Scripture hath proper words to express it by, which we must wholly attend to. This would be a good Pillar and Cloud to direct us; for then men began to decline from the truth, when they left off a diligent search of the use of the word in the Scriptures. What makes it so confidently and generally asserted by Papists, that Justification is a transmutation, a change from the state of unrighteousness, to the state of holiness, but only neglect of the Scripture-use of this word?

And though this matter was agitated seven months in the Councill of Trent, yet because they did not follow the Starre of the Scripture, they came not to the lodging where Christ was. There are some kinde of words, which the Scripture takes from the common use and custom amongst men, and they are to be interpreted, as commonly they are taken; but then there are other words, which the Scripture doth peculiarly use, as being subservient to express that peculiar matter, which the holy Ghost only teacheth, and such is this word, to justify, for the Greek word ἠμαρτάνον, is observed by learned men to have two significations, one to punish a man, or condemn him, which is clean contrary to the Apostle his use of the word; or else to determine and judge a thing as just, but then it doth not come up to the Apostles meaning; for he speaks of persons, but the Grecians use it of things themselves: Thus the word justify is not used by any approved humane Authors, no more than sanctificare, and glorificare. As therefore we must go to the Scripture only for the knowledge of the nature of the thing, so we must express it in such words as the holy Ghost useth; and this is the ground which hath made our Learned men call upon all to consider the Grammaticall use of the words in this matter.

1. The word doth imply an accounting just: And this is acknowledged by the Papists themselves, as more frequent, though they plead much for such a sense, as to make just. Now the truth is, there needs not much quarrell even about that signification, though the Scripture doth not manifest it. For we confess, that he is made just, who is justified, and that not only in respect of the inward renovation of a man, but also in respe-
Propositions clearing the Nature of Justification.

Spect of Justification; for God doth not account him just who is not so; and certainly to esteem a man just without righteousness, is as absurd, as to account a man Learned without Learning, or the wall-white without whiteness; only we say This righteousness that doth make a man just, is not inherent in him, but reckoned to him by the satisfaction of another: for a man is accounted righteous two ways, either when he is not guilty of the crime charged upon him, or when he doth make satisfaction; and in this latter sense by Christ we become righteous.

2. So that if the word should signify as much as to make righteous, as to sanctifie doth signify to make holy, still we could grant it, though not in the Popish way; and indeed the Apostle Rom 5. faith, many are made righteous by the second Adam, which if not meant of inherent holiness, doth imply that the righteousness we have by Christ is not meerly declarative, but also constitutive; and indeed one is in order before the other, for a man must be righteous, before he can be pronounced or declared so to be. But the Hebrew word doth not signify this sense primarily; for whereas the Hebrew word in Cal doth signify to be righteous by a positive quality; The word in Hiphil, according to that Rule in Grammar, signifieth to attribute and account this righteousness unto a man by some words, or other testimony, even as the word that in Cal signifieth to be wicked, doth in Hiphil signifieth to condemn and judge a man as wicked, so that there are these two things in justifying, whereof one is the ground of the other; first to make righteous, and then to pronounce or declare so.

From these two followeth a third, which is to deal with a man so justified as a just man, so that condemnation, crimes, reproach, and fear shall be taken away from him. This declareth the admirable benefit of being justified before God, for when this is done, Rom 5.1. We have peace with God, Ephes. 3. We come with boldness into his presence, and open face; so that unbelief and flaviash fears in the godly are great enemies to this grace of Justification; yea, they are a reproach and dishonour to it: Thou thinkest if thy heart were not conscious to sin, if nothing but holiness were in thee, thou wouldst be bold, thou wouldst not.
Propositions clearing the Nature of Justification.

not fear or be troubled, but thou dost not consider that God walketh towards thee as a righteous man, looketh upon thee as so, so that if Christ be bold thou mayest; if God will not reject Christ, or thy sins cannot condemn him, so neither will God reject thee, or shall thy sins overwhelm thee; this is the sweet consolation of the Gospel, to a sinner broken-hearted, who would give a world for a perfect righteousness, to make him accepted.

4. This is a judicial word, and taken from Courts of Judgment. It is good to consider this also, for this supposeth God as a just Judge offended, and man summoned to his Tribunal to appear before it. This work of Justification may be excellently compared with that parable, Mat. 18. Where a man owing many talents to his master, is called upon to pay them, and although the servant prayed his Master to have patience, and he would pay him all, (which we cannot say) yet, it is said, his Master forgave him all the debt. That the word is a judicial word in the general appearance, Deut. 25.1, where the Scripture speaketh of a controversy between men brought to judgement, and the Judge justifying the righteous, so 2 King. 15.4. There Absalom wished he were judge in the Land that he might justify him who brought his case to him; so Psal. 51. That thou mightest be justified, and overcome when thou art judged: As it is thus in general, so in this particular case, it is a word taken from Courts of Judgment: thus, Rom. 3. That every mouth might be stopped, and the Whole World be conscious guilty.

Hence there is an Accuser, and our sins called debts, and the opposite to this justification is condemnation, and the Apostle calleth it a charge that is laid upon men. Therefore Christ is called an Advocate, and he is said to make intercession; all these expressions denote a Judiciary proceeding: Thus David, Enter not into judgement with thy servant, for in thy sight no man shall be justified, Psal. 143. and Paul, 1 Cor. 4.3. It is a very small thing to be judged of men's judgement, where a man's judgement is called a day, according to the Cilician phrase, (as from faith) and having spoken this, he addeth something of his Justification before God; so that there is nothing clearer then that the word is a judicial word, and with John who in his Epistles
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Epistles never uses the word justifie, the sense of it is expressed, by not to come into judgement, or to be translated from death unto life. And certainly, if to justifie were to make righteous inherently; it would not be an abomination in that sense to justifie the wicked.

Fifthly, There can be properly no justification, but where there is accuilation, or a charge. Therefore condemnation is opposite to it. Hence it is that though it be said that Angels and Adam were justified, and that by works, yet if we would speak properly, they were no more justified, then they had an Advocate or Intercessor. Thus when Christ is said to be justified in the Spirit, that is, declared to be the Sonne of God by the Spirit; that is spoken in reference to those calumnies and reproaches that were cast upon him: so that this consideration may comfort a godly man even in that particular wherein he is most troubled; for thus the godly argue, My heart chargeth me with such folly, and so the devil doth, Oh it is too plain, I cannot dissemble it, I cannot hide it; Oh what shall I do? even this very thing may support; for how could there be Justification, if there were not a charge? What need a Christ to justifie, if there were no fault?

Sixthly, No man can do any thing, whereby he should be accounted just before God. This is the grand Truth that is such a stumbling block to the world; this makes the Papist gibe and scoff; this makes God (say they) to dissemble; this makes him a liar, to account that ours, which is his Sonnes; who will say a lame Vulcain goeth upright with another mans legs? who will compare some deformed Thersites to a fair Absalom, because of some imaginary beauty which is not in him? But the Scripture is too plain, 2 Cor. 5. to be eluded. Ipse factus est peccatum, sicut nos justitia non nostrra sed Dei, nec in nobis sed in ipso, sicut ipse factus est peccatum non sum sed nostrum, nec in se sed in nobis constitutum. He is made sin as we are righteousness, not our righteousness, but the righteousness of God, not in us but in him: as he was made sinne, not his own, but ours, not in himself, but in us. Neither do we say, we are made righteous without a righteousness, that indeed were absurd, but we say it is not in us.

V. There can be no justification but where there is accuilation.

VI. No man can do any thing whereby to be accounted just before God.

Seventh-
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VII. We are made just only by Christ.

Seventhly, That righteousness whereby we are made just, is only by Christ; of this more hereafter; only the Scripture doth carry us always from our own righteousness to that of Faith, which is by his blood; this made Bernard say, Quid tam ad mortem, quod morte Christi non saluetur? Meum meritum est miseratio Domini, non plane sum meriti inops quam in ille miseratio non fuerit inops. Though we want, Christ doth not want: though we sinned away our good, yet not Christ his merits: And if a man were made perfectly holy, yet he could not be justified for all that, but he needs a Christ to satisfie for his former transgressions.

VIII. Terror and comfort in the word Justification.

Eightly, This description of Justification in a judicia! way containeth much terror, and also much comfort. It is good for a Christian to meditate, why God describes the way of pardon by these terms; And first it may be to rouse up secure and Epicurean consciences. Thy heart will not always be quiet, neither will thy sinne always lie still at the door, but it will awaken thee, and hale thee to judgement. O the terror thy soul will then be put into! And as it doth thus terrifie, so it doth the more comfort; nothing is so welcome as a pardon after a man is condemned, and his head laid upon the block: Thus when all this charge is laid upon thee, and thou summoned before the tribunal, how precious must grace then be to thee?
Lect. II.

Of the Reality of Justification by Christ;
That the Scripture speaks of it as to us in a Passive sense, and as God's Action, not ours. And of other equivalent phrases to it in Scripture. With some necessary Cautions.

Rom. 3. 24, 25.
Being Justified freely by his Grace, &c.

The ninth Proposition is, concerning the reality and truth of this Justification, for when we say, God doth justify, that is, account and pronounce righteous, this is taken by Papists, as if there were nothing, but a meer fiction and imagination, without any truth indeed: Therefore the godly are for their comfort to know, that this Justification of theirs, is no leffe a real and solid foundation for comfort (yea it is more) then if they had the most perfect and compleat inherent righteousness that could be: for all things that are constitutive of this Justification are real; God his gracious accounting, and esteeming of us so, is real; and seeing he is most Wise, Just and Holy, what he doth judge must needs be so; we many times justify our selves, but then it is sometimes a meer opinion, we are indeed condemned at that present, but it cannot be so with God. Again, the foundation of this Justification, is as solid and firm...
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as any rock, it being the righteousness of Christ, if therefore the righteousness of Christ be not a fancy or imagination, no more is this. And lastly, the effects of this are real, viz. deliverance from wrath, peace with God, joy in the holy Ghost, and the spirit of Adoption. Now in this treasure the godly heart may much enrich himself; he is not in a dream when his soul is ravished with this privilege; thou mayest be in this transfiguration, and say, It is good for us to be here, and still know what thou sayest; What shame then is it to thee, when if thou hadst inherent perfect righteousness, thou wouldst bid thy soul take her spiritual case, for she hath much good stored up for her, and thou canst not do this upon an imputed righteousness? Imputed righteousness and inherent, differ only in the manner, not in reality: It is all one as to God's glory, and as to thy comfort, whether righteousness be thine inherent, or thine imputed, if it be a true real righteousness.

X. The Scripture speaks of Justification as to us in a passive sense.

Tenthly, Consider the Scripture speaks of this justification, as to us, still in a passive sense. We are justified, and that whether it speaks upon a supposition of Justification by works of the Law, or in an Evangelical manner; and this it doth to shew, that God only doth justify: for sin is only against him, and therefore none but himself can remit his own offence. Besides, none can condemn but God, therefore none can justify. Who can lay trouble on thy soul, binde thee in chains, and throw thee into hell, but God? and who but God can command all the tempefts and waves in thy troubled soul to be still? When therefore others are said to justify, that is only to be understood declaratively, and no more. Now this particular may suppress all those proud pharisaical thoughts in us, whereby we are apt to be puffed up within our selves: what if we justify our selves and clear our ways? yet if God doth not, we remain still obnoxious, and bound in God's wrath.

Again, It is for comfort to the godly, what though Satan, thy own heart, and the world doth condemn thee? yet if God justify, thou mayest rejoice; you see Rom.8. what a challenge Paul there makes, Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth. Who shall charge any thing? The devil, thy own heart, can lay much pride, hypocrisy, flothfulness
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Lothfulness to thy charge, it is true, but God through Christ doth justify. What a Cordial and reviver would it be to God's people, to live in the power of this gift bestowed upon them? It is God that justifieth thee, O my troubled soul! who can then condemn? who can hinder it, or invalidate it? Certainly we are therefore in dejections, despondencies, and perplexities often, because we drink not of this water of life, Lay and apply this excellent Doctrine, to thy fainting, dying soul, and it will become to it, like Elisa applying himself to the dead childe, cause spirit and life again to return to him; right thoughts here, will sweeten all thoughts in other things.

Eleventhly, Although Justification be a Court action, and drawn from Judicatories, yet God is not in this action, considered merely as a Judge, but as Paternus Judex, a Fatherly Judge, having an admirable temperament of Justice and Mercy, so that God pronounceth this sentence from the Throne of Justice and Mercy also; of Justice, in that he will not absolve till satisfaction be made, and he will not pronounce righteous, but where there is a perfect righteousness: Therefore that opinion, of making Faith to be accepted of for Righteousness, is a dangerous and false Assertion. God in this work of Justification, is never described, as accepting of an imperfect righteousness for a perfect. No, God doth not cease to be just, while he is thus gracious. Again, his Justice and Righteousness is herein seen, that none shall be justified, but such sinners who feel their guilt, and desire to be eased of that burden, believing and rolling their souls upon him. It is very hard to give the right order of the benefits of Vocation, Justification, Adoption and Sanctification; but yet this may be made good against the Antinomian, That a man is not justified, till repenting and believing. Here is Justice then, but there is also a great deal of Grace and Mercy; As in the accepting of a Surety for us, that he would not keep to the Law, of having us in our own persons to pay the utmost farthing. This was great love; So likewise to finde out a way for our Reconciliation; that when the Devils had no remedy provided for them, we have. Further, that when this prize is laid down, we have the application of

C 3 this
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this benefit, and so many thousands have not. Two in a Bed, in a Family, in a Parish, one justified, and the other condemned; what Grace is this?

Twelfthly, This grand Mercy is described in Scripture by God his giving something to us, not our doing any thing to him. It is described by God's actions, and not ours to him, which may abundantly satisfy the heart against all doubts and fears; Thus the Scripture calls it forgiving, not imputing sinne, imputing righteousness, making righteous, all which are actions from God to us, not ours to him, so that we are no where said in a good sense to justifie our selves, or commanded to it, as we are to repent or beleive, and to crucifie the lusts of the flesh, because it is wholly God's action: by faith indeed we apprehend it, but it is God's action, as the window letteth in the light, but it is the Sunne that doth enlighten. And from this particular, we may gather much comfort, for when we look into our selves and see no such righteousness, or holinesse, that we dare hold out to God, then we may remember, this is not by our doing to God, but receiving from him; and in this sense, it is more blessed for us to receive then to give. This made the Father say, Justitia nostra, est indulgentia tua, Our righteousness, is thy indulgence. Therefore let not the troubled heart say, Where is my perfect repenting? Where is my perfect obedience? but rather ask, Where is God's forgiving? Where is God's not imputing? How hardly is the soul drawn off from resting in it self? it is not thy doing, but God's doing; thou must not consider what do I, but what God doth. The Antinomian he indeed wringeth these breasts of Consolation, till bloud cometh, but the true sweet milk of the Word must not therefore be thrown away. Do not then as they fought for Christ, look for him in the grave, when he was risen out thence. Do not thou pour in thy self for this treasure, when it is to be looked for from Heaven; duties, graces will say, This is not in me.

Lastly, The Scripture hath other equivalent phrases to this of Justification, which likewise do amplify the comfort of this gift. It is called Blessedness, as if this indeed were the true Heaven and happiness. If thou art justified, thou carriest Heaven about
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about with thee, and thy name may be Legion, for many are the mercies that do fill thee. Nothing can make thee blessed but this. It is not Blessed is he to whom the Lord giveth many riches, and honours, many parts and abilities, but to whom the Lord impute no sinne; and howsoever those who wallow in a Laodicean fulnesse, judge not this such blessednesse, yet, ask a Cain, ask a Judas, demand of the tormented in hell, Whether it be not a blessed thing to have sin pardoned? That thou shouldst be able to look on thy sins as so many Serpents without stings, as so many Egyptians dead upon the shoar, as if they never been; that thou shouldst be able to say, Lord, Where are such lusts, such sins of mine? I finde them all cancelled: Is not this blessednesse indeed?

Another expression is of accepting us in Christ, and herein lieth much of Justification. That it is an acceptance of us to eternal life, Ephes. 1.6. This must needs embolden and encourage the heart, when it knoweth, that both person and duties are accepted; though so much frailty and weaknesse, yet God will receive thee. The third phrase is to make just, Rom. 5.9. For God doth not pronounce that man just, which is not so. Therefore when we are justified, this is not absolutely and simply against a righteousnesse of works, but in a certain respect, as done by us, and as obedience coming from us, and this must needs support the soul: for when Satisfaction is made, when God hath as much as he desireth, why should not this quiet the heart of a man? Will nothing content thee, unless thou thy self art able to pay God the utmost farthing? A fourth word is, not imputing of sinne, or imputing righteousnesse, and this, as you heard before, is a very sure and reall thing, though it be not in us, for there are many reall benefits do come to us, when yet the foundation is extrinsecal, as when a mans debt is discharged by his Surety, he hath his reall benefit, is discharged, and released out of prison, as if it had been his own personal paiment. Now when God doth this, he goeth not against that Text, To justify the ungodly, for it is an abomination to do so, because it is against Law: but when God doth not impute sinne, because of the Satisfaction of Christ intervening, that is most consentaneous and agreeable
agreeable to Justice. There is one word more equivalent, and that is Reconciliation; Some indeed make this an Effect of Justification; Some make Reconciliation the general, and Remission of sinne a particular part; but we need not be curious, where Justification is, there is Reconciliation; and this doth suppose, that those who were at discord before, are now made friends, and where can friendship be more prized then with God?

Having laid down these introductory Propositions, which describe most of the matter, or nature of Justification, I shall now come to shew, wherein it doth particularly consist, where in the true nature is, oneely let me premise two or three Cautions.

I. Caution. First, We must not confound those things, which may be consequent or concomitant to Justification, with Justification it self, for many things may necessarily be together, and yet one not be the other: so Justification is necessarily joyned with Renovation, yet a man is not justified in having a new nature put into him: The water hath both moistnesse, and coldnesse in it, yet it doth not wash away spots as it is cold, but as it is moist. We will not enter into dispute (as some of the Schoolmen have, and concluded affirmatively) Whether God may not accept of a sinner to eternal life, without any inward change of that mans heart: It is enough that by Scripture we know he doth not.

II. Caution. Secondly, To place our Justification in any thing that is ours, or we do, is altogether derogatory to the righteousness and worth of Christ. Some there are who place it partly in our righteousness, and partly in the Obedience of Christ, supplying that which is defective in us; Some of late have placed it in our Faith, as if that were our righteousness, and not for any worth, or dignity of Faith, but God out of his meer good pleasure (say they) hath appointed Faith to be that to man fallen, which universal righteousness would have been to Adam: and hence it is, that they will not allow any trope, or metonymy in that phrase, Abraham believed, and it was imputed to him for righteousness. But here appeareth no lesse pride or arrogancy in this, then the opinion of the Papists, and
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in some respects it doth charge God worse, as is to be shewed in handling of that point: Therefore let us take heed, how by our distinctions we put any thing with Christ's righteousness in this great work.

Thirdly, In searching out the Nature of Justification, we must not only look to the future, but that which is past. For suppose a man should be renewed to a full perfection in this life, yet that absolute compleat holiness could not justify him from his sins past. Those committed before would still press him down, though he were now for the present without any spot at all. Therefore though now there were no defects, no frailties in thee, yet who shall satisfy the Justice of God for that which is past, though there were but the least guilt of the least sin? there is no Samuel strong enough to bear the weight of it, but Christ himself.

Fourthly, The Orthodox sometimes make the nature of Justification in remission of sin; sometimes in imputation of Christ's righteousness, which made Bellarmine charge them, though falsely, with different opinions, for some make these the same motion: its called Remission of sin, as it respecteth the term from which; but Imputation of righteousness, as it respecteth the term to which; even, say they, as the same motion is the expulsion of darkness, and the introduction of light. But I rather conceive them different, and look upon one, as the ground of the other; Remission of sin, grounded upon the imputation of Christ's righteousness, so that his righteousness is supposed to be in order before sin forgiven; and although among men where righteousness is imputed, or a man pronounced just, there is, or can be no remission of sin, yet it is otherwise here, because righteousness is not so imputed unto us, as that it is inherent in us; so among men the more a man is forgiven the less he is justified, because forgiveness supposeth him faulty, yet it is not so in our Justification before God.

Lastly, We must not confound Justification with the manifestation, and declaration of it in our hearts and consciences. This is the rock at which the Antinomian doth so often split, he supposeth
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poseth Justification to be from all eternity, and that therefore a man is justified before he doth believe; Faith only justifying by evidence and declaration to our consciences: but this is to confound the Decree of God, and its execution, as shall be proved. Hence it is a dangerous thing, though some excellent men have done it, to make Faith a full persuasion of our Justification, for this supposeth Justification before Faith; It is one thing to be justified, and another thing to be assured of it. It is true, we cannot have any peace and comfort, nor can we so rejoice in, and praise God, though we are justified, unless we know it also.
Wherein Justification consists.

**Lect. III.**

The Possibility of Pardon; How many ways sinne may be said to be forgiven; What things are considerable in sinne; The Difference between Originall and Actuall sinne; That when sinne is forgiven, it is totally and perfectly forgiven; Also the Subject and Extent of Remission.

**Rom. 3. 24, 25.**

Being Justified freely by his Grace, &c.

Justification consisteth in these two particulars, Remission of sinne, and Imputation of righteousness; Indeed here is diversity of expressions among the Learned, as you have already heard: Some thinking the whole Nature of Justification to be onely in Remission of sinne, and therefore make it the same with Imputation of righteousness; Others, make one the ground of the other: Some make imputation of righteousness, the efficient or meritorious cause of our Justification, and Remission of sinne, the onely form of our Justification: Others make Remission.
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Remission of sin, the effect only of Justification. But however we call these two things; yet this will be made plain, That God in Justification vouchsafeth these two privileges to the person justified; First, He forgiveth his sins; Secondly, He imputeth righteousness, or rather, this later is the ground of the former, as I shew'd before.

That Justification is remission of sins, is generally received, the great Question is about Imputation of Christ's righteousness, (but of that afterwards) only here may be a doubt, How we can properly say, That Justification is pardon of sinne, for a man is not justified, in that he is pardoned, but rather it supposeth him guilty: It is true, Remission of sinne doth suppose a man faulty in himself, but because Christ did take our sins upon him, and we are accepted of through him, as our Surety, therefore may remission of sinne be well called Justification: Indeed pardon can never be called an inherent righteousness, or a qualitative Justice (but rather it opposeth it) but it may be called a legal or judicial righteousness, because God for the Obedience and Satisfaction of Christ, doth account of us as righteous, having pardoned our sin, and withall imputing Christ's righteousness to us, both which make up our Justification.

For the understanding therefore of the first particular (viz.) Remission of sins, take these Propositions, which will be the foundation upon which many material Questions will be built.

1. That forgiveness of sin is possible, there may be, and is such a thing. Hence in that ancient Creed, we are said to believe a remission of sins, where faith is described, not in the meer historical Acts of it, but fiducial, the remission of my sins. Now this is some stay to a troubled sinner, that his sins may be forgiven, whereas the devils cannot; God no where saying to them, Repent and believe. And although Salmeron holdeth, That God gave the lapsed Angels space to repent, before they were peremptorily adjudged unto their everlasting torments; yet he hath scarce a guide or companion in that opinion; were not therefore this true, that there is such a thing in the Church of God, as forgiveness of sin, How much better had it been for us, if we had never been born?

2. Consi-
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2. Consider, That a sin may be said to be forgiven divers ways: First, in the Decree and purpose of God, as Christ is called, The Lamb slain from the beginning. Though I do not know where the Scripture useth such an expression, yet the Antinomians build much upon it. Secondly, A sin may be said to be forgiven in Christ meritoriously, when God laid the sinnes of his people upon him, which the Prophet Isaiah doth describe as plainly, Isa. 53, as any Evangelist; hence some have called Isaiah the fifth Evangelist. Now you must not conclude, such a mans sinnes are pardoned, because they are laid upon Christ a long while ago, which is the Antinomians perpetual panalogizing; for to this effect of remission of sinne, there go more causes besides the meritorious, faith the instrumental cause, which is as necessary in its kind for this great benefit, as the meritorious cause is in its kind, that though Christ hath born such a mans sinnes, yet they are not pardoned till he do believe; for as the Grace of God, which is the efficient cause of pardon, doth not make a sinne compleatly forgiven, without the meritorious cause; so neither doth the meritorious without the instrumental, but there is a necessity of the presence, and the cooperation of all these. Thirdly, A sin is said to be pardoned, when the guilt is taken away; and this is properly remission of iniquities. Fourthly, Sinne is pardoned in our sense and feeling, when God takes away all our fears and doubts, giving us an assurance of his love. And lastly, Sinne is forgiven when the temporal affliction is removed; and in this sense the Scripture doth much use the word, forgiveness of sins, and his not pardoning, is when he will punish.

3. There are several things considerable in sin, when we say it is forgiven.

First, In sinne there is a privation of that innocency which he had before; as when a man is proud, by that act of pride he is deprvd of that innocency and freedom from that guilt which he had before. This is properly true of Adam, who lost his innocency by sinning; it cannot be affirmed of us, but in a limited sense, thus far, that when a man commits a sin, that guilt may be charged upon him, whereof he was innocent before. Now, when sinne is forgiven, the sense is, not that he is made
Propositions concerning Remission of sin.

made innocent again, for that can never be helped, but that it
must be affirmed that an one hath sin'd, this cannot be repaired
again. It is true, the Scripture useth such expressions. That
iniquity shall be sought for, and there shall be found none. Jer. 51.20.
But that is in respect of the consequences of it. We shall have as
much joy and peace as if we had not sinned at all.

2. Desert of the wrath of God.

A second thing in sin, is the dignity and desert it hath of the wrath of God, and this is inseparable from any sin; if it be a sin, there is a desert of damnation; and thus all the sins of the godly, howsoever they shall not actually condemn them, yet they have a desert of condemnation.

Thirdly, There is the actual ordination, and obligation of the person sinning to everlasting condemnation: and forgiveness of sin doth properly lie in this, not in taking away the desert of the guilt of sin, but the actual ordination of it to condemnation. Therefore it's false that is affirmed by some, that remans est forma peccati. Guilt is the form of a sin, for a sin may be truly a sin, and yet this actual ordination of it to death, taken away.

Fourthly, There is in sin an offence done unto God, or an enmity to him, so that now he is displeased, and this is taken away in some measure by forgiveness; yet so as his anger is not fully removed. If we speak exactly, God doth not punish his children, yet as a Father he is angry with them, and that makes him to chastise them, though the sin be forgiven.

Fifthly, In sin is likewise a blot or pollution, whereby the soul loseth its former beauty and excellency; and this is not removed by remission, but by sanctification and renovation. Hence it is ordinarily said, that Justification hath a relative being only, but Renovation an absolute inherent change.

And lastly, In all sin there is an aversion from God; either Habitual, in Habitual sins; or Actual, in Actual: And in this aversion from God, the soul abideth, till it be turned to him again; as a man that turneth his back on the Sunne continueth so, till he turn himself again: Now Conversion, and not Justification, doth rectifie this; so that by this you may see, what it is to have a sinne forgiven, not the soulness or the disformity of it to Gods Law removed, nor yet the dignity and desert of Gods wrath; no, nor all kinde of anger.
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anger from God, but the actual ordination of it to condemnation.

4. There is a great difference between original sin and actual sins: For that of original sin is much more perplexed in the matter of remission, then those of actual sins; when an actual sin is committed, the act is transient; that is, quickly passed away; there remaineth only the guilt, which sticketh, till God by pardon doth remove it, and then when he hath forgiven it, there is all of that sin past. But now in original sin it is otherwise; for that corruption adhering to us, cleaving to our Nature, like Ivy to the Tree (as the Father expresseth it) though it be forgiven, yet it still continueth, and that not only as an exercise of our faith and prayers, or by way of a penal languor upon us, but truly and formally a sin, so that its both a sin, and the cause of sin, and the effect of sin at the same time. Now in this particular lyeth the greatest part of the difficulty in the Doctrine of forgiveness of sin; for here sin is in the godly, and truly so, yet for all that it doth not condemn. The Papists finding by experience, such motions of original sin in us, yet do say, they are only penal effects, and remain as opportunities by spiritual combat to increase the Crown of Glory: and this they urge, as impossible they should be sins, and yet not condemn the godly, because guilt is inseparable from sin. And the Antinomian doth expressly stumble at this stone [Dr. Crisp's Serm. vol. 2. pag. 92.] For my part (faith he) I do not think it some do, that guilt differ from sin, but that it is sin it self: They are but two words expressing the same thing. Now if it were so, that sin and guilt, or the ordination of it to punishment were the same thing, there could be no sin in the godly. It is true, guilt cannot be, but where sin hath been, yet guilt of punishment may be removed, when the sin is past. But this the Author doth shew, that sin was so laid on Christ, that from that time he ceaseth to be a sinner any more. Thou art not a Thief, a Murtherer, when as you have part in Christ, pag. 89. ut supra. But of this hereafter.

5. When a sin is forgiven, it is totally and perfectly forgiven. This is to be considered in the next place, for when the Antinomian would have us so diligently consider that place Jer. 30. 20. where

IV. There is a great difference between original and actual sin.
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where God faith, The iniquities of Israel shall be sought for, and there shall be none. If (I say) this were all his meaning, sin shall be as if it had never been in respect of condemnation, he shall be as surely freed from hell, as if he had never sinned; all this is true. But they have a further meaning, and that is, That the sin was so laid upon Christ, that the sinner ceaseth to be a sinner, as if because a Surety payeth the debt of some lead bankrupt, that very paiment would make him cease to be a bankrupt, that is false; yet God doth so forgive sin, that it can be forgiven no more perfectly then it is: Those sins cannot be forgiven any more then they are, which is matter of infinite comfort; and as it is totally, so irrecoverably, God will not revive them again: Hence are those expressions of blotting them out, of throwing them into the depth of the sea; And howsoever that Parable, Mat. 18. which speaks of the Master forgiving a servant so many talents, yet upon the servants cruelty to some of his fellows, his Master calleth him to account, and throweth him in prison for his former debts; howsoever (I say) this be brought by some to prove that sins forgiven, may upon after iniquities be charged upon a man, yet the ground is not sufficient. For first, The main scope only of a Parable is argumentative. The Fathers do fitly represent Parables to many things; to a Knife whose edge doth only cut, yet the back helps to that; to a Plow whose Plough-fshear only cuts, yet the wood is subservient: So in a Parable, The main scope and intent is onely argumentative; the other parts are but like so many shadows or flourishes in the picture to make it more glorious: Now this instance was not mainly intended by our Saviour, but forgivenesse of one another; so that this part doth only shew, what is in use amongst men, or what sin doth deserve at God's hands; not that God revoketh his pardon, or repenteth that ever he hath forgiven us: But this is more expressly answered afterwards.

VI. Though sin be forgiven yet the sense of God's displease- sure may remain.

6. Though sin be forgiven, yet there may be the sense of Gods displeasure still; For as though God doth forgive, there are many calamities and pressures upon the godly: So though Christ hath born the agonies that do belong unto sin, yet some scalding drops of them do fall upon the godly; not that the godly is by these to satisfy the justice of God, but that hereby we might feel
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feel the bitterness of sin, what wormwood and gall is in it, that so we may take heed for the future, and that we may by some proportion think on, and admire the great love of Christ to us, in undergoing such wrath. Didst thou not judge the least of his anger falling upon thee more terrible, then all the pains and miseries that ever thou wast plunged into? And by this then thou maist stand amazed, and wondering at this infinite love of Christ to stand under this burden for thee. David is a pregnant instance for the truth of this. As when Saul was angry with Jonathan, and run a Javelin at him, he escaped, and that run into the wall; so the wrath of God, which was violently to fall upon thee, missed thee, and ran into Christ. But the sense of God's displeasure for sin, may be retained in us two ways:

First, Servilely and slavishly, whereby we run from the promise and Christ, and have secret grudgings and repinings against God, this is sinfull for us to do.

Secondly, There is a filial apprehending of God's displeasure, though we are perswaded of the pardon; this is good and necessary, as we see in David, who made that Psalm of Repentance, Psal. 51, though he had his absolution from his sin. Tears in the soul by the former way, are like the water of the Sea, salt and brackish; but those in the later are sweet, like the rain of the Clouds falling down on the earth.

7. No wicked man ever hath any sin forgiven him; For seeing remission of sins, is either a part or fruit of Justification, no wicked man is more capable of the one then the other: Indeed we may reade concerning wicked men, Ahab, and the Israelites, when they have humbled themselves, though externally and hypocritically, yet God hath removed those judgments, which were imminent upon them, and thus farre their sins have been forgiven them; but God did not at the same time take off the curse and condemnation due to them. Though they were delivered from outward calamity, yet not from hell and wrath. This therefore doth demonstrate the wofull condition of wicked men, that have not one farthing of all their debts they owe to God paid, but are liable to account for the least sins, and it must needs be so, for Christ the true and only
paymaster of his peoples debts doth not own them; so that when their sins shall be sought for, every one in all the aggravations of it will be found out.

8. This remission of sin is only to the repenting, believing sinner. To the repentant, Act. 5.31. To give repentance to Israel, and forgivenes of sins. So Luk.44.47. That repentance and forgivenes of sins should be preached in his Name, Act.8.22. Repent and pray, if the thoughts of thy heart may be forgiven thee, 1 Joh.1.9. If we confess our sins he is faithful to forgive, &c. These, and many other places do abundantly prove, that there is not forgivenes, but where there is repentance. Therefore look upon all those doctrines, as false and dangerous, which make justification to be before it. Not that we do with Papists make any merit or causality in repentance, or that we limit it to such a measure and quantity of repentance, nor as if we made it the Condition of the Covenant of Grace; but only the way, without which (not the cause for which) remission of sins is not obtained, neither can there be any instance given of men forgiven, without this repentance; and the same likewise is affirmed of faith, though faith is in another notion than repentance, this being the instrument to apply and receive it. But of this hereafter.

9. This remission of sin is not limited to persons, times, or the quantity and quality of sins. Indeed the sinne against the holy Ghost cannot be forgiven: we will not explain that (cannot) by difficulty, as if indeed it might be forgiven, but very hardly. The ordinary answer is, That therefore it cannot be forgiven, because the person so sinning, will not confess, humble himself, and seek pardon. God is described by pardoning iniquity, transgressions and sins. Christ is said to take away the sinne of the world. David and Peters sins were voluntary, yet God forgave them.
Lect. IV.

Of the Afflictions that come upon the Godly after the Pardon of their Sins.

Rom. 3: 24, 25.

Being justified freely by his Grace, &c.

The Doctrine about remission of sin being thus particularly declared, we come to that great question, How afflictions come upon the Godly after the pardon of their sins? For the Antinomian goeth into one extremity, and the Papist into another, so true is that of Tertullian, Christ is always crucified between two theives, that is, Truth suffers between two extreme errors. Therefore in prosecuting this point, which is of great practical concernment, I will lay down, First, What the Antinomian faith. Secondly, What the Papist. And lastly, What the Orthodox. The Antinomian in his Book, called the Honey Comb of Justification, explaineth himself in these particulars, by which you may judge that his Honey is Gall. Having made this Objection to himself, that the children of God are corrected by God, therefore he seeth sinne in them, maketh a large Answer: Distinguishing first of afflictions, calling some Legall, and some Evangelical, and then he distinguisheth of persons, making some unconverted, others converted; the unconverted again, he makes to be either such as are reprobate, or else elected; now (faith he) the Legall crosses have a two-fold operation, either vindicative or corrective: Vindicative,
are such afflictions as God executeth upon the wicked and reprobates, in which sense God is called the God of vengeance: corrective, are such lashes of the Law, as are executed upon those persons that are the children of God by election, but not yet converted, and so under the Law, therefore these afflictions are not in wrath, to confound them, but in mercy to prepare them to their conversion, for God seeing sins in them, layeth crosses upon them. Now these elect persons he calls unconverted, actively and declaratively, in a very ambiguous and suspicious manner, as if conversion were from all eternity, as well as justification, so that as they say, a man in time is justified only declaratively, being indeed from all eternity, thus he must be said to be converted: and if this be true, then it will likewise follow, that a man in heaven is glorified likewise only declaratively, but actually and indeed glorified from all eternity, even while he is in this miserable houle of clay. In the next place he comes to Evangelical crosses, which fall upon them that are actively and declaratively (as he calls it) converted, and these he denieth expressly to be for their finnes, for this were (faith he) to deny Christ's satisfactory punishment, because by his death we have not one spot of finne in us: therefore he makes them to be only the trial of their faith, and to exercise their faith: so that (by his divinity) when a Godly man is afflicted, the fleshi would indeed persuade a man hath finne in him, but this is to try whether thou canst believe thou art cleansed from finne for all these afflictions. Therefore if a man yield to this temptation (viz. that he hath finne in him when he is afflicted) what is this (faith he) but to deny Christ and his blood? Think you this to be the voice of the Scriptures? Hence he laboureth to shew that twelve absurdities would follow from this Doctrine of Gods afflicting his children for their finnes, the strength of which shall be in his place considered; I have now only laid down his judgement; and he makes the Doctrine of the Protestants opposing this to be Popish, and confounding the Law and the Gospel together. Hence intending the Protestant Authors and Ministers, he faith, They paint God like an angry Father ever seeing finne in us, and ever standing with a rod and staff in his hand, lifted up over our heads, with which by reason he seeth sinnes.
finnes in us, he is ever ready, though not to strike us down, yet to crack our crowns, and sorely to whip us; whereas the Gospel describeth him to be not only a loving Father, but also our well-pleased Father, at perfect peace with us; so that the upshot of his position is to shew, that they are taskmasters and do degenerate to the Legall teaching in the Old Testament, whosoever preach that God doth correct Believers for their finnes: and I have, faith he, somewhat the more largely hunted this Fox, because it is so nourished, not only by the Papists, but also some of us Protestants, who by lisping the language of Asbod, do undermine the very roots of the Lords Vine. And that you may see't is not one mans judgement amongst them, see what their great Generall faith in a Sermon, pag. 162. Know this, that at that instant, when God brings afflictions upon thee, he doth not remember any sinne of thine, they are not in his thoughts towards thee. Again, Whatsoever things befall the children of God, are not punishments for finnes, they are not remembrances of finne, and if men or Angels shall endeavour to contradict this, let them be accounted as they deserve. Thus the Antinomian, The Papift goeth into another extremity, for thus they hold, Bellar. de peni. lib. 4. cap. 1. & 2 do, That when God hath forgiven a sinne, yet it is according to his Justice that the sinner should suffer, or do something to satisfy this justice, not in respect of the sinne as it is against God, (for although some say so, yet others reject it) but in respect of some temporall punishment, either in this life, or in the life to come, which is the ground of purgatory. And that this may be made good, they say, When God doth forgive a sinne, he doth not presently remit the temporall punishment; therefore men may by some satisfactory penalties voluntarily taken upon themselves, rescue themselves from these temporall punishments. Now this is a doctrine extreamly derogating from the full satisfaction of Christs death, as the Orthodox shew against the Papists. Therefore in the third place, the truth is this, That God when he forgiveth a sinne or finnes, he doth likewise take off all temporall punishment, properly so called, viz. in order to any vindicative justice, as if a further supply were to be made to Christs sufferings by what we endure; yet we say withall, that God indeed doth take notice of the finnes of those.
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those that are justified, and doth correct them for them; so that when he chastiseth them, it is in reference to their sins, they are the occasion, or the impulsive cause (as we may say, though improperly when we speak of God.) Although the final cause; and the end why God doth so, is not to satisfy his justice, but for other ends. It is doubted whether we may call them punishments or not; but we need not litigate about the word. I see Chemnitus and Rivet calls them so. And if we make a distinction in Gods end, why he afflicts the Godly for their sins, from that when he puniseth the wicked, though both for their sins, we speak the truth fully enough, though we call them punishments; and certainly the words punish or punishment, used Hos.4.19. Ezek.9.13. Levit.26.41. do not take the word punishment in such a strict sense. The Greek word παθων is used of the damned Angels and men, 2 Pet.2.9. Matth 25.46. and this word seems not applicable to the afflictions of Gods people for their sins, and so the word παθων seemeth to be an act of some Judge, who doth not attend to mercy, παρασ σω, δουλω σων, παρεσ τω αντι ω βασιλεω, Suidas in voc. But the word ριμων to Judge, is attributed to God when he doth correct his children, 1 Cor.11.31. where the Apostle useth three words in an elegant paronomasia, ριμων, δαιμων, and νικονικων; so then when God doth afflict his people, he may be said to do it as a Judge, and afflictions are called Judgments, 1 Pet.4.17. only when God doth thus correct and punish his people, he is paternus Judge, a fatherly Judge. But the most expressive word of these afflictions, is μακάω, which denoteth God affliction his people, as a Father his child; and although he doth it, because of their faults, yet he hath tenderness in what he doth. This is the truth, and for the proving of it, consider these Propositions,

First, That God doth not afflict any but where there is sinne in the subject; for so was the threatening at first, in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt die. By death is meant all kinde of evil and punishment, so that had there been no sinne going before, there had no curse, either upon man or creatures followed after. Hence it is that Divines say, The very hunger and thirst which Adam had, while in the state of integrity, was with-
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out that pain and provocation as it is in us. So that the state
of man in righteousness, was like the heavens that admit of
no corruptive alterations. As for that dispute, Whether God
may not by his absolute Sovereignty adjudge man without the
consideration of sin to everlasting misery, the affirmative
lecion of it will not much accommodate this truth, seeing
that even then (they say) God doth this per modum simplicis
 Cruciatm, by way of a mere naked trouble and pain: not per
modum pana, by way of a punishment. As for Christ, he though
innocent, was a man of sorrows, because our finnes were laid
on him.

Secondly, That God may, and sometimes doth afflict, yet not in
reference to sin. Thus God doth exercise Job, who though he
was not without sin, yet God seemeth not to do it for sin: Therefor thecalamities were rather exercises of his graces,
then correctives of his finnes: they were to him, what a storm
or a tempest is to a skilfull Pilot, what a valiant adversary is
to a stout Champion: and to this purpose is that answer of
our Saviour, when the question was, Whether the parents,
or the blinde man himself had sinned, that he should be born
blinde, (speaking according to the opinion of some Philo-
phers, that was now also received among the Jews, (as Learned
men think) viz. That there was a pre-existency of the souls
before they were united to their bodies :) our Saviour returneth
this answer, Neither hath this man sinned, (because he had no
being before his birth) nor his parents, (viz. some grievous
sinne, for which God would punish the childe) but onely
that the works of God may be made manifest. This also must be
granted.

Thirdly, That all afflictions and crosses are to be reduced to the
Law. We may acknowledge this Truth also, if so be by Law
we mean stricly whatsoever doth command and threaten, and
the Gospel to be only promissory, though if largely taken, the
Gospel hath its curses and afflictions; so God threatening or
afflicting of a godly man, doth so farre use the Law as an in-
strument to make him sensible of his sinne: and therefore this
is a sure Argument, that the Law is not abolished as to all uses
to the Believer, because still there do be fall afflictions to the
Godly,
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Godly, not only from sinne, (as the Antinomians speak) but for sinne; only as the Law without the grace of God worketh all evil, so do all afflictions likewise to men that are not godly. Therefore wicked men in afflictions are as garlick, or any ill-smelling herb, the more it is pounced, the worse smell it sendeth forth; so that there must be teaching, as well as chastening to make that affliction blessed.

Fourthly, That in the calamities which fall upon the godly there is a great difference, some are common and absolutely determined, others more special and not necessary. This distinction must be attended, for God hath so peremptorily and irrevocably concluded upon some miseries as the fruits of sinne, that no repentance or humiliation can ever take them off. Thus though a man should have as much Faith as Abraham, as much meekness as Moses, as much uprightness as David, as much zeal and labour for the Church as Paul; yet all this would not free from death, nor could it remove the curse that is upon the ground; so a woman's holiness and humiliation, cannot take away the pains and throbs in child-bearing, for these are absolutely decreed. But then there are special calamities, which many times by turning unto God are taken away; yea and God very frequently when he pardoneth sinne, he taketh also away those outward miseries, as we see in many whom he healed both in soul and body at the same time. So that we say not God is bound alwaies when he doth pardon sin, outwardly to afflict for it.

Fifthly, There are again some calamities that come upon them because of sinne, others for other ends. We acknowledge it as clear as the sun, that many troubles upon the godly, are by way of tryall and temptation upon them, and because of the good that is in them; of these the Apostle James speaks, when he bids them count it all joy, when they fall into divers temptations; of these Paul speaks, when he saith he will rejoice in his infirmities; so that the persecutions and miseries which come upon them are an Argument of the good in them, more then of the evils; as the tree that is full of fruit, hath its boughs more broken then that which is barren, and the Pyrates watch for the Ship that is fraughted with gold. And thus a Martyr comforted
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comforted himself; That though he had many sins, for which he deserved death, yet he thanked God that his enemies did not attend to them, but to the good that was in him, and for that he suffered: so then all the grievances upon the godly are not of the same nature.

Sixthly, The afflictions for sins upon the godly do differ much from those that are upon the wicked. This we also grant, that when God doth punish the godly and the wicked for their sins, though the punishment for the matter of it may be alike, yet they differ in other respects very much, as in the cause from which, one cometh from a God hating their persons, the other from anger indeed, but the anger of a Father. Hence secondly, they differ in the fittedness of these afflictions to do good, God doth moderate these afflictions to his people, that thereby grace may be increased; but to the reprobate, they are no more to their good, then the flames of hell fire are to the damned: The Butcher he cuts the flesh farre otherwise then the Chirurgeon, faith August. Again, in the end they differ, All afflictions to the godly, are like the beating of cloathes in the Sun with a rod, to get out the dust and moths, but it is not so with the wicked: Many other differences practicall Divines prove out of the Scripture.

Seventhly, Yet God doth in reference to the sins of his people, though forgiven, sometimes chastise them. This is proved,

1. From the Scripture, that makes their sinne the cause of their trouble: Thus of David, Because thou ( faith Nathan, 2 Sam.12.14.) hast given great occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme the child also that is born of thee shall die: Thus God speaks to all the godly in Solomon, 2 Sam.7.14,15. I will be his Father, and he shall be my sonne: if he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men, but my mercy shall not take away. In these places sinner is expressly made the cause of those afflictions; and it is a poor evasion to say, this was in the Old Testament, for was not the chastisement of the godly mens peace, in the Old Testament, laid upon Christ, as well as in the New? but their folly herein, and their contradiction to themselves, will be abundantly shewed, in answering their Objections.

6. Affliction for sins of the godly and wicked differ.

7. God sometimes chastises his people in reference to their sins though forgiven. This proved, 1. from Scripture.
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2. In the places that do assert Gods judging of his people, and
rebuking of them: and they are divers, 1 Cor. 11. For this cause
many are sick and weak: where again, you have not only the
affliction, but the cause why, viz. irreverent prophaning of that
the Elders, and let them pray for him, and if he have committed
sins (faith the Text) they shall be forgiven him. There is none
but hath committed sins; yet the Apostle makes such an if, because
he speaks of such sins that may provoke God to lay that sick-
ness upon him. Thus in the Old Testament, Psal. 99.8. Thou
forgavest them, though thou tookest vengeance on their inventions:
Here the Psalmlift calls the chastishments upon those whose sins
were forgiven, vengeance; as in other places, his anger is said to
smoke against the sheep of his pasture; but we must not under-
stand it of vengeance strictly so called, as if God would satisfie his
justice out of their sufferings.

3. From the incouragement to duties by temporall Arguments,
and threats of temporall afflictions. If the godly have these gods,
then certainly as they may conclude their temporall mercies to
be the fruit of their godliness, which hath the promise of this life,
and the life to come; so they may conclude that their afflictions
are the effects of their evil waies, which have the threatening of
this life, and the life to come; only here is this difference, that
the outward good mercies are not from their godliness by way
of merit or causality, but their afflictions are so because of their
sins: Hence the Apostle urgeth the godly, Heb. 12.19. with this,
that even our God is a consuming fire: Thus 1 Pet. 3.10,11. He
that will love life and see good daies, let him eschew evil, and do
good. So that the Scripture presssing to holinesse because of out-
ward good mercies, and to keep from sin because of externall
evils, and presssing these to the godly, doth evidently declare
this truth; and certainly the Apostle speaking of the godly,
Rom.8.10. faith, the body is dead because of sin; for by body, Beza
doth well understand our mortal body, and not the mass of sinne,
as some interpret it.

4. From the comparison God useth concerning his afflictions upon
his people; and that is, to be a Father in that act, correcting
of them. Thus Heb. 12. 6,7,8,9,10,11,12. compare this with
Rev.
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Rev. 3. 19. As many as I love, I rebuke; now rebuke is alwayes for some fault: and this is further cleared, because he makes this conclusion, Be zealous therefore and repent; therefore sin was precedent. Now in these places God compared himself to a Father, and believers to children; and we all know that Fathers never correct but for sin; it would be ridiculous, to say, the Father whips the child from sinne, not for sinne. It is true, he doth it from sinne by way of prevention to the future, yet for sinne also. The Antinomian faith this is spoken of many believers together, where some were not converted; but this is weak, because the persons whom he reproveth, God is said to love them, and they are children not bastards. Again he faith, There is no sin mentioned, therefore it was not for sin; but I answer, the very comparison of God with a Father, correcting his child, doth evidently argue it was for sin, though it be not expressed.

5. From the command not to despise, or to make little account of Gods afflictions, but to humble ourselves, and search out our waies. Why should this be spoken, but because they are for our sins? 

Heb. 12. 5. Despise not the chastening of God, neither faint when thou art rebuked of him. Where two things may seem to be forbidden, though some make them all one; one not to faint, εἰστίνειν, a metaphor from those who faint in the race, through languor and dissolution of minde. The other is in the other extrem, not εἰστίνειν to despise, or to make little or nothing of it: as it were a great fault in a child, to slight or make nothing of his fathers corrections. Now let all the world judge whether the Antinomian Doctrine doth not open a wide gate to despise Gods afflictions: this makes them cry down Falt daies, repentance, humiliation and confession of sin: yea, they make it Popery and hypocrisie what is done this way. Ποίοι νῦν βοήθειν εἰποῦ we may say with Homer.

6. If God hath commanded Magistrates to execute outward evils upon some godly men that have hainously offended, then its Gods will to afflict them for sin; but he hath done so. If a godly man, being through the Dalilah of some corruption, persuaded to have his hair cut off, his spirituall strength gone, and so he fall into the sin of murder: Is it not Gods will that the
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Magistrate should put him to death for this sinne? And what God would have the Magistrate do, is it not as much as if God himself had done? And must not all say, this is a chastisement upon him because of his sinne? Thus have I brought Reasons to prove that, which I think was never denied before till this age, which every day like Africa bringeth forth some Monster. And certainly the Doctrine of Afflictions upon the Godly is so sweet and wholesome a truth, that none but a Spider could suck out such poison from it, as the Antinomian hath done.

Lect. V.

Of Afflictions: Whether God chastiseth his Children for their sins.

Rom. 3. 24,25.

Being justified freely by his Grace, &c.

We come now to consider how the Antinomian can make good that Paradox of his, [God chastiseth not believers because of their sins] and indeed the Author forementioned doth much sweat and tug, in bringing in several absurdities, which he conceives will follow upon the truth asserted by us. But before we examine them, let us take notice of the Authors great contradiction to himself in this point, and that within very few Pages; Falshood is not only dissonant from truth, but also from itself; for whereas in the fore-quoted place he makes his Assertion universal, That God seeth no sinne in persons converted, and therefore there are no afflictions befall them because of sinne: Now see how flat contrary that
Antinomians Arguments answered.

The same Author speaks in the same Book, pag. 117, for there making an opposition between the condition of believers in the Old Testament, and those in the New, he expressly gives this difference. God (faith he) saw sinne in them, as they were children that had need of a rod, by reason of their non-age, but he feeth none in us, as being full grown heirs. And again, God saw sinne in them, and punished them for it, as they were under the Schoolmaster of the Law, but he seeth none in us. Hence Pag. 99. he makes it peculiar to the time of the Law, that Moses for an unadvised word was strucken with death, and Uzzah, and Jenah, and Eli, with others, temporally corrected. Therefore (faith he) came those terrible Famines, whereby mothers were driven to eat their own children, all was because they were under the severity of the Law, that if they did but a little step awry, they were sharply scourged for the same.

Now how great a contradiction is this to his other Assertion? For were not the godly under the Old Testament actually converted? Had they not Christ's righteousness made theirs? Were they not elected? How cometh it about then, that they were afflicted for sin, and not believers under the New Testament? When a man can bring the East and West together, then may he reconcile these Assertions: but self-contradiction is no strange thing in that Book.

But I come to his Arguments; The first place he urgeth, is Rom. 5:1, 2, 3. Being justified by Faith, we have peace with God, that is, all beating, blows, and anger, are ceased (faith he;) and hence it is that we glory in our afflictions: but now if they were for our sins, we had no more cause to glory in them, then the child hath in his whippings for his faults.

For the opening of this place, consider these things: Some ancient Commentators reade the word imperatively (ευλογεω for ευλογεων) Let us have, in stead of, We have, and thus they have interpreted it, [Being justified by Faith, let us take heed how we sinne again, but preserve our peace with God.]

The words taken this way would much confirm rather than debilitate our Assertion: But I do not judge this so futable to
the scope of the Apostle in this verse; we will take them as they are, indicatively, or assertively: And first, we may mean by Peace, either that reconciliation which is made with God; or the sense and feeling of this, which is nothing but tranquillity, and security of conscience, through the persuasion of God's favour to us. Now these may be separable one from the other, a believer may be reconciled with God, and in the state of friendship with him, yet he not feel this, or know this, as many passages in David's Psalms do witnesseth; even as the child in the womb knoweth not the great Inheritance and Rich Revenues it shall be possessed of, or as Agar did not see the Well of water by her, but thought she must perish, till God opened her eyes. There is a seal of the pardon of sinne, when yet the Proclamation of it is not made in the conscience. If we take peace in the first respect, it is an absolute universal Proposition, and true of every justified person; but in the later sense it is true only of some persons, and at some times, for the sense of God's favour is a separable privilege from those that are in it.

If by Peace we should understand the sense of God's favour, and the declaration of it in our consciences (as by their Arguments they must do) then it proveth against their opinion, as well as any others: For they hold, That a believer needeth to pray for pardon in the declaration, or sense, and feeling of sin, though not for the pardon itself of sin; now there cannot be at the same time a want of the feeling of pardon of sinne, and the tranquillity of conscience together: So that this place must needs be a thorn in their side.

But secondly, the true and direct Answer to this place is, That there is a two-fold Peace, one which is opposite to the hatred of God, as he is a terrible enemy to sinners unreconciled with them, in which sense he is often described in Scripture. The other, as it is opposite to that Fatherly anger and displeasure, whereby though for the main reconciled, yet he may for some particular faults be displeased: Now the Apostle speaks of the former kind of peace, Being justified, that is, God being once reconciled with us in Christ, he hath no more hostile enmity against us, and if we do sinne afterwards, he will
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will not become an enemy to us, or satisfie his Justice by punishing of us, but as a Father he may in his displeasure chastise us. The sense of Gods displeasure as a Father, may well stand together with an Assurance, that for all this he is no enemy. A child that bitterly crieth out, because of his Fathers chastisements, yet even then hath that hope and comfort, which he would not have, if fallen into the hands or rage of an enemy that would kill him. Hence it is that we press all believers, though sorely punished for their sins, as their hearts can tell them, yet they must never passe such a sentence, Now God is become my enemy, he deals with me as with a Judas, as with a Cain; these (we say) are sinfull inferences, but they may conclude thus, God though a loving Father is now very angry, and much displeased with me.

Distinguish then between a peace that doth oppose the hatred of God to a sinner as an enemy, and a peace which doth oppose onely the frowns of a Father; and this Objection is answered. I will acknowledge, the people of God are apt under his sore displeasure, not to discern between a Father, and an enemy. They have much ado to keep up this in their hearts; God he smites, he frowns, he chides, yet he is a Father still: but this is their temptation and weakness, and we are apt to endeavour some kind of compensation to God in our troubles for sin: Therefore it was a most blessed thing, when God at the Reformation out of Popery, caused this truth to break out, That punishments for sin, were not Satisfactory to God, but fatherly chastisements. Thus you have this answered, and as for that which followeth, we glory in tribulations, the Apostle must be limited to those which fall upon us for professing of Christ and his truth. In these we may glory, as the Sounder doth of his marks and wounds he hath received in the wars for a good cause; and to this purpose, we told you in one Proposition, That there was a great difference between those troubles that fell upon us, because of the good in us; and those which come upon us, because of the evil in us. What glory is it (faith Peter, 1 Pet. 2. 20.) if ye be buffeted for your faults? Now who can deny but that even a Godly
a Godly man may fall into some hainous crime, for which he may receive a sentence of death: This man, though he may rejoice in God, who doth pardon the sin to him, yet he can no more glory of this tribulation, then a child doth of whipping for his faults.

Another place of Scripture is, Isa. 53. 5. The chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed: This Text of Scripture is again and again pressed by them, and certainly it is more sweet then the Honey or Honey-comb: but truly they do with it, as the thieves with the man of Jericho, leave it half dead, and much wounded.

First, Let us open the place, and then see how farre they are from the meaning. The Prophet Isaiah in this Chapter, may be called, as we said before, the fifth Evangelist, for he seemeth rather to write an History of Christ, then make a Prophecy of him. Among other passages these two are to our purpose.

1. That the chastisement of our peace was upon him. By Peace here, Calvin doth well understand, not that of quietness in the conscience, but a Reconciliation made with God through his sufferings. And it is observed by some, how emphatical the Scripture is in that Pronoun [He] He hath born, and he hath been wounded.

The second follows, with his stripes we are healed: Some think that this is spoken to debase that condition Christ so voluntarily put himself in, that so his love might appear the more to us; it being an allusion to the state of servants, who used to be chastised by their lords. The phrase is the same with that, He hath born our griefs, or diseases, which Matth. 8. 17. is applied to Christ's healing of diseases, and 1 Pet. 2. to that suffering upon the Cross. And well may this be, because the outward healing of diseases, was a Symbole or Testimony of his inward healing. Although Grotius observeth, That Christ is therefore said to bear our diseases when he cured them, because of the great pains and travail he took therein, for it was after Sun-set, and the multitude did much throng him; so then, by the words, you see the whole price of our peace laid upon Christ, and by him all evils, both temporal and spiritual removed: But what is this to the purpose?
Antinomian Arguments answered.

pole? Yes, say they, here our chastisements are laid upon Christ, therefore we have none for sin. But first, If this prov'd any thing it will be more then the Antinomians will yield; for it would infer, that there are no chastisements at all, either for sin, or no sin. Now the Antinomians cannot deny (and experience confuteth them) but that the godly have afflictions, though (as they say) not for sin; and this will inevitably follow by their Argument; for as they would prove from hence, they have no sin at all, not only sin that will not condemn (as the Orthodox say) but even no sin; so it will by the same reason follow, that believers have no chastisements at all. I do not say (not for sin) but none at all.

But secondly, The Antinomian in that place, (pag. 129.) doth fully answer himself. All chastisement (faith he) for sin needful for the making perfect peace between God and his justified children, was laid upon him: very true Therefore (say we) though these chastisements be for sin, yet they are not upon the godly as upon Christ, they are not to satisfy Gods justice, to work a reconciliation, but onely to humble them in themselves, and make them the better feel how much they are beholding to Christ, who bore so much wrath for them. To say therefore as the Papists, Christ by his death did only remove the spiritual evil, and we by our sufferings must take away the temporal punishment, this would indeed be derogatory to Christ, and take off in a great measure from his glory.

A third place brought in to maintain their error, is James 1. 2, 3, 4, 5. Count it matter of all joy, when you shall fall into divers temptations; Therefore (faith he) they are not for sinne, because they are matters of joy; and mark how he baptizeth (goeth on the Author) crosses and afflictions, as it were with a new name, taken from the nature of the change of them through the Gospel, calling them temptations and trials. But mark the ignorance of the Adversary, rather then the name of afflictions: For is it peculiar to believers under the Gospel, that their afflictions are trials; what then will he return to that place, Dent. 8. 2. God faith, the afflictions upon the people of Israel for fourty years in the wilderness, (and they were not all believers, much
Antinomians Arguments answered.

If believers under the Gospel were to humble them, and prove or try them? And Jer. 9.7. God speaking of the Israelites faith, He will melt them and try them. See also Dan. 9.25. Zech. 13.9. Whereby you will presently judge of the man's bold ignorance. But as for the place itself, certainly the words are very emphatical. Count it (implying a man in his choicest deliberation ought to do so) all joy, an Hebraism, full perfect joy, when ye fall, the word is so fall, that ye are compassed round about. And lastly, divers temptations; By temptations, Austin seemeth to have understood Incitements or provocations to sin, and whether such temptations may be desired, or do give ground of a just joy, is disputed by the Schoolmen, but that is impertinent: we see the Apostle speaketh of afflictions, as appeareth by the word following, and not all kinds of afflictions, but such as are for Christ's name: certainly the Apostle writing to the Corinthians, and speaking of the chastisements of God upon them for their sins, he doth not bid them count that all joy, but rather exhort them to judge themselves that they be not condemned with the world. He doth not then speak of all kinds of afflictions, but some only; and his meaning is not, that under even those afflictions, they should have no grief (for he faith, No affliction is for the present joyous, but grievous) but he giveth one respect, why they should rejoice, because of the good work of their faith manifested thereby, though in other considerations they may be humbled. And I see not but even in those persecutions which befall the godly for the Gospel's sake, they may, not, some of them at least, and sometimes, be humiliations for the godlies former sins, as well as explorations of their graces, and more eminent glorifying of them here and hereafter. I deny not but even in afflictions for their sins, the people of God may take comfort to their fouls from several considerations; but I think not that the Apostle doth refer to them in this place. Let us now consider what dangerous Absurdities would flow from this Doctrine of ours.

And

First (faith he) This is to confound Law and Gospel together.
The Law should be preached only to secure sinners, the Gospel to broken sinners only; whereas if you tell the godly, when they are afflicted, that it is for their sins, you preach Law to them.
Absurdities objected by Antinomians, answered.

But first, it seemeth then a Godly man though fallen into murder, adulteries, &c. his conscience must not be troubled: Peter if he denieth Christ, must not weep bitterly.

2. We give many Cordials and Antidotes against despair, while we say they are afflictions even for sinne, for we adde further, that they are all bounded within a due measure; God considers our strength, and will lay no more then he will enable to bear.

3. There is a two-fold trouble, one that is holy and effectual for good, such a trouble as that was which the Angel made in the pool of Bethesda; and there is a trouble by way of torment, driving from, and raging at God; now we all forbid this later, neither will this Doctrine give any ground to such a di-stemper.

Lastly, If a Doctrine shall be branded for such an event as shall come through the corruptions of men, then we may say, their opinion will encourage believers, or men that do presume they are so, to act all manner of flagitious crimes, and yet to have no fear that God will plague them for those things.
Lect. VI.

Of the Perfection of Justified persons, and their freedom from sin; Whether God see sin in Believers? Divers Scripture expressions about Pardon of sin.

Jer. 50. 20.
In those days, and at that time the iniquity of Judah shall be sought for, and it shall not be found, &c.

Although the Apostle say true, 1 Tim. 6. 4. that there is a doting about questions, whereby the soul of a man is made sick and spiritually diseased, as the Greek word ῥοξαῦπι impliceth, weakening and debilitating grace, as much as fretting doth waste away the flesh; and this is done when men encounter in controversies, as beasts in their combats, seeking only victory; yet there may be such a Doctrinal clearing of truth by answering of Objections that may tend much to edification, both in knowledge and affections; and by the striking of these flint stones together, there may fly out sparks enough to kindle godliness and zeal in our breast. This I shall endeavour by Gods assistance in that necessary and famous Question, of Gods forgiving sin. For to preach in crabbed Controversies, is like Gideon, Judg. 8. 16. to teach men with briars and thorns, as the phrase there is. The Antinomian placeth this Text in the foremost
Absurdities objected by the Antinomians, answered.

But first, Then the Apostle mingled Law and Gospel, when he commands the Corinthians to judge themselves under God's hand upon them. And how legal was Peter, when he said, judgment must begin at the house of God?

2. The Gospel and the Law are to be mingled in all spiritual administrations, but for different ends. As they must not in preaching be confounded, so neither divided.

3. The people of God have still sin, pride, and hardnesse of heart remaining in them, and shall a Minister preach the Gospel to his pride? Shall we comfort them, because their hearts are sometimes dull and froward?

Lastly, Though we say, they are afflicted for their sins, yet this is not to make the crosses Legal, but Evangelical; but we do not say, they are so for their sins, as that thereby they must satisfy the justice of God in their own persons, but for other considerations.

A second Absurdity will be, say they, hereby to make the Gospel insufficient to abolish the old man, unless it borrow help from the Law.

But first, Observe his contradiction, The Gospel doth abolish sin in the believer; How can that be, when he holdeth, there is no sin to be abolished? Certainly that which is not needs not to be abolished, for it is not already.

2. If the Gospel be so powerfull to abolish sinne, why will he have the Law preached to obstinate sinners? Certainly by his rule the Gospel would sooner melt the toughest and molt ironny sinner that is.

3. That which he would have such an absurdity, is an eminent truth: The Law and the Gospel are mutually subservient to each other, and are to be preached as conjoincd, though not confounded one with another.

Another Absurdity (for I cannot take them in order, seeing he doth absurdly make one thing severall Arguments, and so doth but tautologize) This would be to deny Christ's perfect righteousness, and that we are not made without all spots or blemishes.

But first, It doth not derogate from Christ, that we are not freed from sin, while here in this life, for he himself holdeth, the
Absurdities objected by the Antinomians, answered.

Believers in the Old Testament had sin in them, and God scourged them for it, yet Christ bore their sins, and took away their iniquities.

2. If this place prove any thing, it would the Popish Tenet, That we are inherently without sin: And the Antinomian denieth that; for he faith, We are made perfectly holy; not actively, but passively, whereas those places speak of an active holiness.

3. If so be the sin remaining in us, did not only bring temporal evils, but eternal; did not bring only a disease, but hell also; then this would evacuate the fulnesse of Christ's death, but now it doth not.

A fourth Absurdity he would fetch from an Argument of Bishop Babingtons, Ejus quod non est, non est poena, but sin when it is forgiven, is not; Therefore to forgiven sin there is no temporal punishment.

Answ. I answer, first, If by that which is not, should be meant, that which hath a physical and natural existence, then the Argument would prove, that no sinne, whether forgiven, or not forgiven, could damn a man, because no sinne (according to the received opinion) hath any positive natural being: Therefore it must be understood of a moral being, that is, a desert of punishment. Now when sinne is said to be forgiven, the reason is not, as if Remission of sinne made sinne no sinne, drunkennesse no drunkennesse; or as if that sin did not deserve punishment, for that is inseparable from the nature of it: but forgiveness of sins takes away the actual ordination of them to condemnation. So then, a sinne, though forgiven, hath some kinde of being, though not that of actual ordination to everlasting death; when therefore sins are said to be thrown into the bottom of the sea, and they shall be no more, that is to be understood quoad hoc, in respect of actual condemnation. So David's sinne was forgiven, viz. as to damn David, yet though forgiven, it was still, viz. to affliet David, and to make God angry with him.

A fifth Absurdity, If you say the people of God are afflicted for sinne, this would trouble the conscience of Gods children exceedingly, and make them fearfully to expect horrible, temporal plagues,
What Remission of Sinne is.

First, To deliver them from their temporal evil: They shall be brought out of their captivity into their own Country again: we need not dispute how many came back again, its enough this mercy was offered them, howsoever they might neglect it.

Secondly, Here is a promise to remove their spiritual evil, which was the cause of the former; God will pardon their sinnes: and by this a profitable Doctrine is taught, that a people ought to be more desirous of Gods pardon, then of removall of their calamities; whereas commonly like unwise diseased men, we complain more of the Symptoms then of the diseafe it self. The evil of sinne depriveth us of an infinite good; but the evil of afflictions, only of a finite. Now this promise is not to be stretched out only to the times of the Gospel, but is particularly true of the Jews, when removed out of their Banishment, yet not to be limited to that time only; and howsoever the promise for pardon be general to all, yet it is to be understood in this manner, that to the wicked, their sin was no farther forgiven, then in this sense, that their captivity was removed, but to the true believers there was a real taking away of Gods wrath and displeasure from them. The promise of pardon is described very emphatically and comfortably to the truly humbled Jews, There shall be none of their sins, and none shall be found when sought for: This expression doth suppose a judicial inquity, (as when God is said to make inquisition for blood) and to be found, doth imply, God judicially taking notice of a man to punish him; so Rev.20.15. In her was found the blood of the Saints: So Beza amplifieth that word, Phil.3.9: be found in him, as if the justice of God were pursuing Paul as a malefactor, and Christ was a City of refuge unto him.

Observ. Remission of sin is such a taking of it away, as if it had never been: he that denieth sins forgiven to be quite removed, denieth Pharaoh and his hoast to be drowned in the red sea, faith Gregory.
Antinomian Errors concerning Remission of Sin.

This Point practically improved is the treasure of a believers comfort: But there is the Antinomian error on the right hand, and the Papish on the left, whereby a godly heart, if not well instructed, may when it calls for bread, meet with a stone, and when for fish, with a serpent. Therefore for the more orderly proceeding, let us consider what the Antinomian faith; then what the Papist; and lastly, what the truth is. The Antinomians opinion may be discovered in these particulars.

1. That a justified person having on Christ's wedding garment, hath thereby all his sinnes quite taken away from before God, and so utterly abolished, that we have not any spot of sinne in the sight of God, (Honey Comb of Justification, pag. 24. Cap. 3. per totum.)

2. This is extended by them (pag. 27.) not only to actuall sins, but originall sins, for we easily grant that in actuall sins, if once forgiven, there remaineth no more defilement, but that he is made in that respect of remission, as white as snow, though there may remain a further disposition to evil, by that sinne once committed, if renewing Grace help not.

3. This abolition of sin, they understand both of the fault and the guilt; so that God doth not only take away the punishment, but both the form of the sin also is wholly removed, so that there is neither punishment, nor cause of punishment, in one thus justified. Hence they say, there is no sin in the Church now, and they express it thus, As a Physician, though he healeth a man, yet he cannot take away the scars; but God healeth sin so, as no scarre remaineth, yea he giveth a fresh colour again. They say likewise, our sin is consumed, as if one drop of water should be abolished by the heat of the sun, yea pag. 39. the Author affirmeth, that whosoever have not confidence in this one point, that our sins are so taken away by Christ, that God doth not see our sins in us, without doubt are damned as long as they continue to rob the blood of Christ of this honour: Therefore (faith he) true Divinity teacheth that there is no sinne in the Church any more.

4. He distinguisbeth (pag. 51.) of a two-fold abolishing, the one mysticall and secret, wrought only by Christ and his righteousness: The other gross and palpable, wrought by us, by the help of God's
Popish Errors concerning Remission of Sin.

God's Spirit, to our sense and feeling; so that they grant sin in us, and sin to be mortified, but this is not in God's sight, although it be in our own.

5. Whereas it might be, and is objected, God hath an all-seeing eye, and therefore he cannot but see sinne if it be in us. They answer, God indeed seeth all things, saving that which he will not see, but undertakes to abolish out of his sight, and they distinguish of God's knowing and his seeing, (pag. 68.) God knoweth believers sinnes, but he doth not see them. To know, is to understand the nature of a thing; but to see (according to them) is to behold the real existence of a thing; now that cannot be of sinne, because its taken away. Thus (say they) God did know the sinnes of Abraham, and men did reprove him, but God did never once rebuke him in all his life after his calling, for any one sinne.

So that by these positions you may see their meaning to be, that a justified man is by Christ so cleansed, that God seeth nothing but what is perfectly holy in him: sin not only in the punishment, but in the existence of it is removed quite away as to God's sight. Hence God takes no notice, never chastiseth them, never reproveth them, because he seeth nothing but what is exceeding good; and therefore because the Justified feel the contrary, that they have sin, they commend and press faith, to live above sense, reason, and all our experience; for (they say) as a man that looks thorow red glas, seeth every thing red; so God looking thorow Christ, seeth not only our persons, but all our actions, perfectly righteous with Christ's righteousness. What else may be said of their opinion, is to be spoken of, when we treat of imputed righteousness.

In the next place, let us consider what is Popery in this point. The Papists, as Bellarmine, lib. de Justific. Cap. 7. say with the Antinomian, that forgiveness of sin is the quite abolishing of it, and that whether it be original or actual, so that no sin abideth any more in a man so justified, till he falls from it; and, faith Bellarmine, if the Scripture would have invented words on purpose, to shew that sin is quite extinguished, it could not use other than it doth; and they think it impossible to conceive that there should be sin in a man, and yet justified; for this is (say they)
they) to make him at the same time a childe of God, and the devil. The devil to dwell in him by sin, and Christ by justification. Thus they distinguish not between sin reigning, and sin being. Though sin be in a godly man, yet it neither hath vim damnovirem, or Dominatrixem, condemning power, or reigning power. Now its wonder the Papists should conceive this so impossible, when they hold that the godly have veniall sins, which yet are truly sins, and so by their own argument God must hate and punish them, yet God doth not break off his friendship for all that: now compare these two errors together in their agreement and difference.

1. Both Papist and Antinomian agree in this, that remission of sin is quite abolishing and extinguishing of sin, both in the existence of it, and punishment, (although some Papists hold for the later, viz. of punishment, at least temporall, that that may abide, though the sin be forgiven.)

2. They both agree in the places of Scripture, as Christ cleansing us from all sin, Thou art all fair my love, To purchase to himself a Church without spot or wrinkle; these and the like, they both insist much upon.

3. They both agree in reason to prove it, viz. That sin is so odious to God that he hateth it wheresoever it is, and therefore a godly man must at the same time be the object of God's hatred and love, which (say they) is absurd to affirm; but here they differ; the Antinomian makes a believer without sin, because of Christ's righteousness which he is cloathed with: The Papist he makes him to be without sin inherently, because of the Grace of justification perfectly renewing him. And indeed though the Antinomian seem to shew more zeal to Christ and grace, yet the Papist speaks more to reason; and if those places of Scripture did prove an utter extinguishing of sin, it would carry it fairer, for an inherent perfect holiness then such a mystical perfection as they imagine. In the third place, I shall lay down the Truth, and wherein Scripture doctrine doth indeed fail between these two rocks.

And 1. The Orthodox do distinguish of the nature of sin, especially originall, and the guilt of it, now (say they) the Scripture makes forgiveness to be the removing of the guilt, but the nature doth still abide in some degrees.
2. This sin even in the Godly, is seen by God, taken notice of, he hates it, and doth punish it, only he doth not punish it in their own persons, but in Christ; so that the sin of a godly man doth offend God, and he abhorreth, and will punish it, but Christ intervening, it falls upon him; so that our being in Christ, doth not hinder God's taking notice of our sins, and hating of them, but only freeth us from final destruction by them.

3. If by seeing of sin, should be meant judicial, and small punishing of a man, then we would say, God doth not see sin in the godly in that sense, and this some Orthodox have spoken, which the Antinomian mistaking, have lost the truth. Thus Parens, lib. 2. de Justif. cap. 9. p. 491. maintaining that the godly man's sins are covered, which (faith he) supposeth not that sins are not, but that they are not seen, maketh this objection, but nothing is covered or hid to God; and then answereth, True, but what he would have covered, but he will not fasten his eyes upon believers sins, because through Christ he turneth away the eyes of his justice, that he may place the eyes of his mercy upon them; and to this purpose he quoteth Austin, Tefta peccata, quare dixit, ut non videre rust, quid enim erat Dei videre peccata, nisi punire? Brockman likewise de Justif. cap. 2. qu. 10. pag. 526. In vain is it objected, that nothing is covered to God, for that is true with this restriction, unless it be that which he would have covered, so that if by seeing were meant Gods judicial punishing and condemning, in that sense God doth not see the sins of believers, for he throweth them behind his back; but if by seeing be meant (as the Antinomian doth) Gods not taking notice of, nor being offended with the sins of the godly, so that he doth not chastise them for them; this is a very dangerous error, and is farre more then a difference about words; for the truth is, that the sins of a godly man do offend God, and he is angry, not as a Father, but as a Judge: Hence (as you heard) the afflictions upon the godly are for their sins, and called judgements; only he is a fatherly Judge. There is an excellent temperament of both these in God relatively to his people. For the further discussion of this main point, let us consider practically, the sweet and full expression of the Scriptures about pardoning of sin.
Expressions in Scripture about Pardoning of Sin.

One word frequently used is *Nasa*, which signifieth to lift up, and take away a thing so, as that it was an heavy burden, and so some translate that Psal. 32. 1. Blessed is he who is easied of his sin, for you may see in that Psalm, David feeling an un-supportable weight upon him by his iniquities, such as he could not stand under; now to pardon, is to take this weight off; to Gen. 4. 15. *My sin is greater then can be born or taken away, i.e. forgiven* again, if thou doest well, is there not Levatio, that is, pardon and ease? It is then no marvell if forgiveness of sin be accounted such a blessed thing, by those who truly feel the burden of their iniquities. Hence you have it excellently; Zech. 3. 9, 10. made the cause of all quietness and content, when their sins were pardoned, then they called to their neighbours to sit under their fig-trees. And well doth Calvin call this the chief hinge of Religion, and the truth of this Doctrine is to be sought out with all care, for what quietness can a man have till he know what judgement or esteem the Lord hath of him, and in what manner it is wrought?

Another expression of it is called covering of sin; there are two words for this, the one is Chasab, and is used properly of such a thing that is put between the object and the eye. Num. 9. 15. it is used of the cloud that covered the Tabernacle: its applied to a garment, or any other thing that doth cover. Gen. 3. v. 21. its applied to God covering Adams nakedness; Hence a Learned man thinks those skins were of beasts sacrificed, which did presage Christ; and God by this covering would as by an outward Symbole teach them, by whom their sins should be covered, and to this an allusion seemeth to be, Rev. 3. 18. I counsel thee to buy of me white garments, that thy nakedness may not appear. A like word is Caphar, which signifieth covering with pitch, or the like, which doth so cleave to the thing it covereth, that it can hardly be removed. Its applied Exod. 15. 27. to the propitiatory or covering made of pure gold, wherein God shewed himself gracious. It is used, Levit. 16. 30. The word also is used of the pitching of the Ark, and as that pitch kept the waters from coming in, so doth the blood of Christ our sins from overflowing us; and this doth excellently describe the nature of pardoning of sin. God doth as it were hide it from us, he will not punish; but you must not
not stretch this word too far with the Antinomian, as if indeed God did not take notice of them, for Davids when it was covered yet was visited afterwards by God, but its covered so farre, as that it shall not condemn. We do not therefore as the Antinomian faith, make God peep under the covering again; but we say the word is a Metaphor, and must not be understood grossly and palpably, as if there were any real thing put before the eyes of God, that he could not behold our sins, but only that God will not finally condemn us for sin. Furthermore, when a sin is pardoned, it is said to be hid from Gods eyes, as if God did not know it, Jer. 16.17. the Hebrew word Zaphan, is applied to the Northern part of the world, because it is hidden from the heat of the sun. Hence Joseph is called, Gen. 41.45. Zaphnath paaneah, because he was a revealer of hidden things. Those iniquities therefore which are so often before thee, they are as it were hidden from God.

Another is Mechah (and I will name no more) which is to blot out, or wipe out, a Metaphor from those who cancell or blot out their debts when once discharged.

Now besides these verball expressions, you have many real phrases that do declare this great mercy, as Micah 7.19. he will subdue our iniquities, and thou wilt cast them into the bottom of the sea, where the Prophet doth admire the goodness and freeness of God herein, Who is a God like thee, passing by iniquity, subduing sins! The word implieth, that our sins were as our enemies, the guilt of them did inslave us, and keep us like vassals in fear, but now they are mastered. And further he throweth them in the bottom of the sea, there is no more memory or footsteps of them; as when the Egyptians were drowned in the bottom of the sea they could never hurt the Israelites more. Thus God doth to thy sins when they are pardoned. Another expression you have, Isa. 44.22. some expound it thus, As the sun rising doth make the thick clouds to vanish away, and there is nothing but serenity to be seen; so it is with God pardoning: but Junius understands it thus, As the thick cloud dissolved into rain, washeth away the soil and filth of the earth, so will the Lord in pardoning take away that noisomeness and offence their sins made. Consider Hezekiachs expression, Isa. 38.17. Thou hast cast all my sins behind.
Comfortable considerations

**hinde thy back;** It is an expression from men, who when they will not regard a thing, cast it behind their backs, and thus God doth, not as if he did not take notice to chastise for them, but they shall not have their proper effect, which is to condemn. And these expressions are very necessary to a contrite heart, which is apt to imagine God as always beholding his sins, and sending forth his judgements because of them, whereas it must be as a foundation laid, That God is gracious and mercifull, not only in the general, but even to us in particular. The laft I will pitch upon is Psal. 13.12. As farre as the East is from the West, so farre hath he removed our sins from us; where the Psalmist makes Gods mercies as much above our sins, as heaven is above earth; and left the guilt of sin should hinder the descent of it, he makes God to throw away our sins from him, as far as it can be. Thus you see how abundant the Scripture is, in describing this mercy of mercies: This mercy, which if not enjoyed, every thing, our beds, our fields and houses will be an hell to us. The sum of these words and phrases amounteth to these comfortable Considerations.

First, That God pardonneth sin, and removeth the guilt of it totally and perfectly, so that a sin cannot be more forgiven then it is: not that all the pollution of sin is likewise totally taken away, for that would contradict other places of Scripture, which say, sin isstill in us, but only the condemning power is subdued; and therefore this Doctrine doth afford as much comfort as any Antinomian would desire, and yet doth not fall foul with other places of Scripture. Those sins committed by thee and repeated of, are as absolutely forgiven as can be desired: they can be no better pardoned if thou waft in heaven, or hadst perfect righteousness bestowed upon thee. It hath pleased God that the guilt of thy sin should be perfectly remitted, though the power be not fully mortified.

Secondly, These phrases imply, That its Gods meer all without us, which doth expell the guilt of sin, not any thing done in us, or by us; and therefore thou art not to build thy hope of pardon upon any work of Regeneration or Mortification within thee, but Gods goodness without thee; even as a Creditor doth forgive many thousands to a Debtor, by his meer voluntary act.

Now
arising from the fore-going phrases.

Now we are apt to think, according to the principles of Popery, that our justification is no better than our inherent holiness is, whereas any godly man may sit down and consider that he is not able to go out with his five thousand, against the justice of God that comes against him with ten thousand. Grace justifying takes away all guilt of sin; Grace sanctifying doth not, because as Bonaventure well observeth, the remedy given by grace against original sin, is not ordained against it, *prout corrupta naturam, sed prout personam*, as it doth infect our nature, for so it sticketh till death; but as it doth defile the person; measure not therefore the perfection of grace justifying, by the perfection of grace sanctifying.

Thirdly, This Scripture language doth infer, *That sin forgiven is as if it had never been*; now the troubled soul crieth out, Oh that I had never been thus, done thus! Why, God when he doth pardon, makes it as if it had never been: do not fear the drowned Egyptians will rise up and pursue thee again. We may tell a David, a Paul, it is so with them as if no adultery, murder, or persecutions had been committed by them.

Fourthly, *As God doth indeed really thus remit, so the Scripture commands the repentant sinner to believe this, and with confidence to rest satisfied.* Oh what holy boldness may this truth believed work in the tender heart! You may see a poor man, though he hath much ado to live, yet if his debts be discharged how glad he is, he can go abroad and fear no Sergeant to Arrest him, no writ issued out to attach him; and thus it is with a sinner repenting and believing; and if there be any whose heart is not ravished with this glorious mercy, it is to be feared he never felt the burden of sin, or else never strongly believed this gracious way of God. Let not then any Antinomian say, we put water into the believers wine, or wormwood into their bread; for who can rationally desire more than this doth amount to? but to expect such a pardon, such a justification, as that God shall take no notice of sin, to chastise or afflict for it, is to say, There is forgiveness with God that he may not be feared; contrary to David's expression.

Lect.
Lect. VII.

Arguments to prove, That God doth see sinne in the Justified as to be offended and displeased with it.

Jerem. 50. 20.
In those dayes, and at that time, the iniquity of Judah shall be sought for, &c.

Fifthly, From this Scripture expression is gathered, That gross sins are as blotted out, as well as sins of an inferior nature; Though there be sins that waste the conscience, yet they do not waste the grace of remission; how is the true repentant affected with lavish fears sometimes, as if his sins did blot out God's mercy like a thick cloud? as if our transgressions had subdued his goodness, and thrown it into the bottom of the sea? what a comfortable expression is that Isa. 1. 18. Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow? &c. It was wonderfull mercy that ever so horrid, and bloody sinners (therefore their sins are said to be like scarlet) should become so clear; yet the grace of Justification doth as totally remit great sins as lesser sins, as Christ did with the same easiness cure several diseases. Thus David also Psal. 51, after he had wallowed in that mire, he prayeth to be purged, in an allusive expression, with hyssop, which was the last thing used in their legal purifications, and therefore doth imply the total and compleat cleansing by Christ, and upon this David faith, He shall be whiter then snow, which phrase is neither with the
from the foregoing Phrases.

cethe Papist to be extended to sanctification, as if such perfect clean righteousness were vouchsafed to him, as that there were no sin in him; nor with the Antinomian, as if God did quite abolish sinne from David out of his sight, so as to take no notice of it, or chastise him for it (for after the pardon was past, yet his child was to die, and much more evil to come to David's house) but in respect of final condemnation, God having thus pardoned David through Christ, would no more adjudge him to everlasting punishment, then he would one that was innocent, or without any spot of sin. And this is to encourage great sinners; ten thousand talents was a great summe of money, yet how easily forgiven by that kinde Master? Thus Exod. 34. 7. God is describ'd forgiving sins of all sorts, and this he proclaimed, when his glory passed by; and how necessary is this for the contrite heart, which judgeth his sins, because of the aggravations of them to be unpardonable? If they had not been of such breadth, and depth, and length, they would not fear overwhelming as now they do. There are sins of all sorts described, and which is to be observed, God putteth no term, or bounds to his mercy, whereas he doth set some to his anger. Let not therefore the greatness of sin be thought more then the greatness of mercy pardoning, and Christ's obedience suffering; as it is hypocrisie to extenuate and make our sins lesse then they are, so it is unbelief to diminish his grace; and God's greatness above us is as much celebrated in this his kindness, as in any other Attribute. The sins of all the world, if they were thy sins, were but like a drop of water to his mercy, no more then our essence or power is to his Majesty: Take heed then of saying such and such sins may be forgiven, but can he forgive such as mine are also?

Lastly, In that Honey-comb (for we may say of these places, if of any, they are sweeter then honey) this sweetness may be pressed out. That all their sins, though never so many, shall likewise be blotted out. The sea could as easily drown an whole holt of Pharaohs men, as twenty soouldiers. The Apostle is excellent (Rom. 5.) in this, making an opposition between the first Adam and second, aggravating the superlative power of the gift by grace, above the evil through sin: Hence it is called, The riches of his grace, rather then power or wisdom, because of the plenty and abundance
Arguments against Antinomians.

Arguments proving that God doth see sin so in the justified, as to be offended with it.

1. Rank of Arguments from Scripture.

bundance of it. Who would not think that while God's goodness in the Scripture is thus unfolded, there should not be a dejected unbelieving Christian in the world? Shall our sin abound to condemnation more than his grace to Justification? because sin is too strong for us. Is it therefore too much for the grace of God also? you see by this, that we may drink wine enough in the Scripture wine-cellar, to make our hearts glad, and yet swallow not down any dregs of Popish, or Antinoman dregs.

These things thus explained, I come to confirm you with several Arguments, That God doth see sin so as to be offended and displeased with it, in those that are already justified.

And the first rank of Arguments shall be taken from those places of Scripture, where the godly do aggravate their sin, under this notion, that it was in God's sight, that he especially beheld it, and was offended with it. And this aggravation the Prophet Nathan doth set home upon David, 2 Sam. 12. 9. Why hast thou despised the commandment of the Lord, to do this evil in his sight? Now this would be a falsehood by the Adversaries Doctrine, and not fit to be confessed by the justified; but rather to be looked upon as robbing God of his glory. Let us observe the places, Ps. 51. 4. Against thee, the only have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight; Observe that, in thy sight; Therefore God did see and take notice, so as to be displeased with David; and of all considerations this did most wound and break his heart; so that indeed the Antinomian Doctrine doth properly overthrow that which is the choicest ingredient in godly sorrow, viz. Because God is angry. For what is David's meaning but this, Although men do not know how wicked I was in the matter of Uriah and Bathsheba, yet thou dost; and although the world would flatter me, yet as long as thou art angry, I can have no peace. Has regula tenenda est, si vero pœnitentia sensu imbus velimus, faith Calvin upon the place, that is, This rule is to be observed, when at any time we would be truly affected in a way of repentance. This Argument seemeth to be cogent; but see what an answer the Antinoman giveth, whereby you may see that true of Tertullian, that besides the Poetica and Pictoria, Tertinian est, eaque heretica licentia, Befides the boldness of Poets and Painters to invent any thing, there is a third, and that is of Hereticks.
Arguments proving God offended

The Answer is this, David doth here judge according to his sense and feeling, what he was to finde at God's hand by the Law, so that he doth not speak this (according to their Divinity) in a way of faith, but sense and failing; and therefore the Author doth compare this with that place Ps. 31. 22. I said in my haste, I am cut off. Oboldnues! Shall David be thought in haste and rashnes, to say, Against thee have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight? Then all the other verses, Have mercy on me, Thou delightest in truth, may be said by David to be spoken in haste. How unpardonable is this error, to make that which was a special tenderness of godly sorrow upon David, to be a part of his humane weakness? But (faith the Author) he speaketh in the Gospel-way afterwards, when he faith, Purge me, and I shall be whiter then snow: But in what sense that is true, you have already heard; when a grosse actual sin is committed, is repented of; the sinfull act is quite passed away and gone, the guilt by forgivenesse is quite extint, and so as to that respect, remission of sinne doth make us as white as snow. But it is not thus with original sin, whose guilt though removed, yet the proper stain of it doth still abide. But of this more when we declare what that is which doth denominate a sinner. Therefore David doth not here speak contradictions, but his soul may be made white by justification, and yet in the committing of new sins God be angry, and much offended with it.

A second Text to this purpose is, Psal. 90. 3. Thou hast set our iniquities before thee, our secret sins in the light of thy countenance. Where Moses the Penman of the Psalm, speaks in the behalf of the Church then afflicted, that God had put their sins before him; so that God did not only take notice of them to chastise them, but he put them before his eyes. How the sin of a justified man may at the same time be covered, and yet put before God, is to be shewed in answering their Objections. And the Text, to put the matter out of all doubt, addeth in close, They are before the light of his countenance, which is very emphatical. God (as is to be shewed) hath in the Scripture a threefold eye, to our purpose, the eye of Omniscience (which the Antinomian will grant) and all agree in; the eye of his anger, which they deny; and an eye of condemnation, which the Papist pleads for. Now we go further then the Antinomian, we say, God hath an eye of omniscience, and of anger, upon
Antinomian evasions answered.

1. Evasion answered.

Upon the sins of justified persons, but not so far as the Papist, to say he hath the eye of condemnation upon them. You would think this Text stood unmovable; but let us hear how they would shake it.

1. It may be said, That these are places in the Old Testament, whereas they speak of believers under the New.

I answer first, the chiefest places which they bring for seeing no sin, are in the Old Testament. Thus God seeth no iniquity in Jacob: Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be white as snow: Thou art all fair my love: Their sins shall be blotted out. These places and the like were true in the Old Testament, and applied particularly to the godly Jews then living, by way of comfort to them, as the context plainly evidenceth.

Secondly, (As I shewed in the Treatise of the Law) there can be no sound reason given, why God should see sin in the justified person then, and not now: For did not God elect them from all eternity? Were not they in Christ, and their sins laid upon Christ? Now these are the great Arguments why God seeth no sin in believers (as they hold) and were not all these as verifiable upon the godly in the Old Testament?

2. It may be answered, That Moses speaks here in the behalf of the whole Church then, and there were many among them that were not justified. But this is easily taken away.

1. The Scripture speaks universally, and Moses reckoneth himself in the number with them.

2. The calamity was general, and who can say, none of the justified suffered under it? and this chastising of them, is that which is called setting of sins before God's face.

Lastly, Some places of Scripture which they bring, and the chiefest ones, for seeing no sin in believers, are universal, as this is, and spoken of the whole Church, thus my Text, The iniquity of Judah and Israel shall be sought for, and not found: So God seeth no iniquity in Jacob, that is spoken of the body of them, when yet they must acknowledge all were not justified among them.

I will name one place more in this rank, and that is Luk. 12.21, where you have a confession of a penitent son, I have sinned against heaven, and before thee. This penitent was a son, and therefore calleth God Father; and indeed he could not cease to be a son, therefore he doth not say, I am not thy son, but I am not worthy
At fane in, thy to be called thy son. As for Grotius his observation upon the place, Hac fabula declarat, quod omnes homines sunt ortu filii Dei, sed e juure excidunt semel à Deo alienando, that is, This fable declareth that all men are by birth the sons of God, but they fall from that right, by alienating themselves from God, it deferveth a double Animadversion, one for calling this Parable fabula, which although in a critical notion, it may have a right sense, yet use doth not now endure it; It would be very offensive to call Christ's Parables Christ's Fables. 2. He sheweth unfound Divinity, worse then Pelagians or Arminians, as his very expression declareth (but to paffe that) The Parable doth represent a godly man foully lapsed in sin, and now returning to God, and he accuseth himself, aggravating sin, that his Father took notice of it; and whatsoever other Doctors teach, yet this is the best way for godly persons repenting, to aggravate their sinfulness, in reference to God's beholding of them, and being angry with them, Quicunque sibi se excusat, accusat Deo, whosoever excusat himself to himself, accuseth himself to God, said Salvian and Tertul. In quantum nos peperceris tibi, in tantum tibi Deus (crede) parcet, so much as thou shalt not spare thy self, God (believe it) will spare thee.

Lastly, This is to be observed, that after his Father had kissed him, which was a sign of reconciliation and pardon; yet the son confesseth he had sinned against heaven, and before him.

A second rank of Arguments shall be from those places where the Spirit of God is said to mortifie our sins, or we by his help to crucifie our sins. If the Spirit of God do enable us to crucifie and mortifie sin, as that which is an enemy, and loathsom to him, then notwithstanding Christ's righteousness imputed, God doth take notice of that which is filthy, and to be removed in the godly: But we are aslifted by God's Spirit to this: Ergo, Rom. 8. 11, 13. If ye be by the Spirit mortifie the deeds of the body, Gal. 3. 18. If ye be led by the Spirit, ye shall not fulfill the deeds of the flesh: In these words are two plain Conclusions,

First, That the godly have still sins in them, for these are called the deeds of the flesh. By deeds of the flesh are not meant grosse sins, but all the inward motions and thoughts of the soul corrupted.
Secondly, That the Spirit of God seeth them, takes notice of
them, they are loathsome to him, and therefore he mortifieth
them. Now the Spirit of God being the same with God, that
which he mortifieth, must needs be taken notice of by him as
offensive.

To this, what do they answer?

They say, We do not mortifie sin, no not by Gods Spirit, out of
of Gods sight, but only out of our own sight, so that when the Spirit
of God overcometh a corruption in us, this is not by removing it out
of Gods sight, but our own only, Hony. comb. p. 164. For (say they)
Christ's righteousness being made ours, we are all clean before God,
and that which the Spirit of God doth afterwards in sanctification,
is cleansing away sin only declaratively before men. Hence (as you
heard) they distinguish of a twofold cleansing, one secret and mys-
tical by Christ's righteousness, and the other palpable and gross
to our sense and feeling, which is by Gods Spirit in us; but here are
many mistakes and errors.

1. That they oppose Christ's cleansing, and the Spirits cleansing
together; for what Christ's blood doth meritoriously cleanse away,
the same Christ's Spirit doth by efficacious application. Hence
Christ by his death doth quite remove sin, in respect of the guilt
of it here on earth, and doth give his Spirit to crucifie the pow-
er of it; so that both Christ's cleansing, and the Spirits cleansing,
do relate to Gods sight: for it is Gods will that we should not
only be clean by imputed righteousness, but also by inherent
holiness.

2. It is false, that we only mortifie sin declaratively to men, for
it is really and indeed done, even to Godward. Hence this is the
great difference between a pharisical, or external mortification,
and a spiritual: The former is from humane principles to hu-
mane motives; the other is from God, and to God, and through
God: so that as that is not a divine Faith, but humane, which is
not from a divine principle, and because of Divine Authority;
so neither can that be divine and spiritual mortification, which
is not from divine efficiency, and because of divine grounds.
Hereby it is that the whole work of Grace is called a new crea-
ture, and it is a new creature not only manward, but Godward,
and who can think when Ephes. 4. we are exhorted to put on the
Arguments proving God seeing, &c.

new man, which after God is created in righteousness, that any other sense can be drawn out of it, then that, the putting off the old man, and putting on the new, have relation to God as well as man? It is therefore well observed by Musculus on the former Text, that both these are put together, If ye through the Spirit do mortifie, we and the Spirit. The Spirit, and that sheweth all the Popish means of mortification to be unprofitable, the Spirit of God neither appointing them, or working by them: Then he addeth ye, denoting that we also are to work and act (being first quickned with a spiritual life put into us) and not as some do now dangerously maintain, give up all, expecting the operation of the Spirit only.

3. The falsehood of this Assertion will further appear; If the Spirit of God by mortification doth not remove sin out of us as to God's sight, then by further sanctification, it brings no good thing into us as to God's sight likewise; and thus as God shall see no sin in his people, so neither no good thing inherently in his people; for this must necessarily follow by their principles, as God takes no notice of sin inherent in believers to be angry with them, so likewise no notice of inherent grace to be well-pleased with them; for if the Spirit of God do not cleanse our corruption from God's sight, then still the more corruption is washed away, God still doth no wayses approve that holiness, but it is only the imputed holiness of Christ, which he regards. Therefore he that maintaineth God seeth no sin in believers to chastise, must maintain he seeth no graces in them to reward them; and take their own similitude, as he (say they) that looks thorow a red glasse seeth every thing in it red; if there be dirt in it, it looks red, if there be pearls in it, it looketh red, all is one to the sight; so when God looketh upon us in Christ, if there be sin, if there be our own inherent holiness, it is all one, God seeth only Christ's holiness. Thus while the Antinomian laboureth to have our sins covered from God's eyes, he likewise spreads a covering over all the fruits of God's Spirit in us, that they shall not be taken notice of; whereas none ever denied but that the graces of God's people are acceptable to him, though not to justification; and many promises he makes to them, the Imperfection being done away by Christ. But in their way, as God takes no notice of Paul's sinful motions to be offended
offended at them, so neither of all his labourings and sufferings
in the Gospel-way.

Lastly, If the Spirit of God do only mortifie, as to our feeling,
and not to God's sight, then when the soul departs into glory, all
that inherent purity, must only be declaratively also; but in hea-
ven we are made holy perfectly in God's sight, and that without
any imputed righteousness of Christ, though Christ did pur-
chase and obtain that for us. Now what the Spirit of God doth
finish and consummate upon the souls dissolution, he had begun
even in this life.

A third sort of Arguments is from those places which com-
mend repentance, humiliation, and godly sorrow for sin; for if
God takes no notice of our sin, be not offended at it, we may in-
deed be sorrowful for sin because of men, but not because of
God. Shall I be sorrowful because God is offended when he is
not offended? Shall I weep because God is angry when he is not
angry? If you ask Peter why he weeps bitterly, will he not say,
because he offended God? If you ask the Corinthians, why they
are so deeply humbled, will not they say, because by their sins
they provoked God to bring temporal calamities upon them? So
that the poisonous nature of this doctrine, appeareth in nothing
more then in this, it taketh away all grounds of humiliation and
repentance of sin in those that do believe. Therefore mark it, he
that faith, There is no sin in the Church of God now (which is their
express opinion) he must likewise say, there is no godly sorrow
in the Church of God now. For what is the reason there can be
no godly sorrow in heaven, there was none in the state of inno-
cency, but because there was no sin there? and it must be thus
now in the Church of God. This error eateth into the vitals of
godliness, therefore beware of it. Say, I will have no such free
grace, as shall take away godly sorrow; remember the gracious
promise, Zech.12, where God promiseth a spirit of prayer and
mourning for sin, as well as to blot out sin, he shall not obtain
the promise for the later that feeleth not the promise for the
former. And certainly if this Doctrine were true, why did Paul
say, Though I made you sorry, I did not repent: We Ministers
ought to repent, that ever we made you sorry; and you are to
repent that ever you have been sorrowful.

A fourth
A fourth kinde is from all those places, where God is said so to take notice of the sins of justified persons, as that he doth grievously afflict them for their transgressions. This Argument doth properly and directly overthrow the whole Antinomian Asser-
tion; but because I have largely proved this already, I will not insist on it. To make good their Assertion, That God seeth no sin, they are forced also to hold, That all the afflictions upon the godly are only trials of their faith, preservatives from sin, but not correc-
tives for sin. But did not God see sin in Moses, when for his unbelief he kept him out of Canaan? Did not he see sin in David, though pardoned, grievously chastising him afterward? Did he not see sin in Jonah, who would fain have run from God's face, that he might not have seen him? Did he not see sin in the Corinthians, when many of them were sick and weak, for abusing the Ordinances, yet many of them were such, that therefore were chastened, that they might not be condemned of the Lord.

There are more Arguments, but at this time I conclude with a Use of Exhortation to broken-hearted and contrite sinners, again and again to meditate upon the great and glorious expres-
sions which the Scripture useth about forgiveness of sinne. Your fears and doubts are so great, that only such great remedies can cure you. Tell me ye afflicted and wounded for sin. Is not this the best oil that can be poured into your sore? Tell me ye spiritual Lazarus's, that lie at the gate of God daily, who is rich in mercy, desiring the very crumbs that fall from this Table of grace, Are you thankfull because God provideth food and raiment, and not much rather because of a pardon? How great is God's goodnesse! he might have removed us out of his sight, and he hath done so to our sins; he might have thrown us into the bottom of hell, and he hath cast our iniquities into the bot-
tom of the sea; he might have blotted our names out of the book of life, and he hath blotted out our sins from his remem-
brance.
Lect. VIII.

Jerem. 50. 20.

In those days, and at that time the iniquity of Judah shall be sought for, and it shall not be found, &c.

V. Rank of Arguments.

A Fifth rank of Arguments, is from those places of Scripture, wherein the people of God in their petitions and supplications, do necessarily imply this Truth, that God seeth, taketh notice, and is angry with their sins. Now all Petitions use to be in a two-fold faith, one applicative and fiduciall, the other doctrinall and assertive, which is the foundation of the former. If a Papift pray for the deliverance of any out of purgatory, it is a vain prayer, because there is not a theologall verity to ground his prayer upon: thus a Socinian cannot truly pray to God in Christ, because he hath not a dogmaticall or assenting faith to the truth of Christ's Divine nature, and so cannot have a fiduciall faith in the same.

Thus it would be with the people of God, how can they in their prayers intreat God to turn away his anger from them, to hide his face from their sins, if he were not indeed angry? Now that the Petitions of Gods people are for this end, will appear by several places. I shall not here mention that Petition we are directed to in the Lords prayer, viz. Forgive us our sins; for that is a noble instance, and derives with a single consideration of itself; but we have many other instances, as Psal. 51. 9. Hide thy face from my sins. Its plain by this prayer, Gods face, and so his eyes was upon Davids sins though justified, and that a godly man falling into grievous sins, hath them not presently covered from Gods eyes; for his meaning by this phrase, is, that God would not regard them to visit them on him, the contrary whereof is Psal. 119. 15. Let their sin be continually before thee; and this
is observable, that David doth again and again Petition for pardon, whereby is shewed how difficult a thing it is to obtain the favour of God, after we have offended him by our sins. Neither let that be replied, That this is done by believers in the Old Testament; for Paul bringeth a proof from Psal. 32. 1. to shew what is the nature of justification, even under the Gospel. And that I may once for all dissolve this objection of theirs, I shall handle distinctly this question, Whether the justification of believers under the Old Testament and New, be not uniform and altogether the same, which is to be affirmatively maintained, and therefore remit you to that question. For the present, we see how David here doth twice and thrice with much vehemency desire that God's face would not be upon his sins. Here may be one considerable question made, Seeing Nathan the Prophet had told David his sin was forgiven him; was not this great unbelief and diffidence, to pray for pardon after that consolation? To this it may be answered,

1. That Nathan's comfort might be given after this penitential Psalm: for although 2. Sam. 12. 13. the History makes mention of Nathan's oyl poured into David, as soon as ever he was wounded, yet it is a frequent thing in Scripture to have those things immediately connected in story, when yet there was a great distance in the practice. But grant it was immediately upon David's repentance; yet faith in God for pardon may well stand with prayer for pardon; The deep sense and feeling of God's offence, cannot but provoke to earnest Petition, though faith at the same time persuade the heart God will hear: Hence David doth not here pray in unbelief, thinking God would not pardon him; therefore some translate, v. 7. in the future tense, Thou wilt purge me with hyssop, because of his assurance. Again, though God removed David's sin in respect of condemnation, yet not in respect of all other effects of his anger, for so his sin did still lye as a burden on him, and in this respect he still seeketh God's face. In the next place consider, Psal. 32. 1, 3, 4. Of all parts of the Scripture, the Psalms have this excellency, that they do in a lively experimentall way set forth the gracious works of God upon the soul, and David doth in many Psalms, still as it were, play upon the Harp, to drive out the evil spirit of unbelief and
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diffidence out of a man's heart. Now this Psalm is a most excellent directory for the obtaining of pardon after sin committed; wherein David being for a while grievously crushed by God's anger for his sins, at last feeling the sunshine of his favour breaking through the Clouds, he doth in the beginning of the same, joyfully break out, admiring the happiness of those who have their sins pardoned, and he doth in several words repeat the same benefit, because of the excellency of it: and certainly were your hearts touched with the sense of God's displeasure for sin, neither riches, nor good trading, or any advantage in the world, would so glad your heart, as to have a pardon of sin. For how cometh David to be thus affected with forgivenes of his sins, even because he confessed it not, was not humbled under it, till God's wrath was heavy upon him, and then he resolved to acknowledge it, whereupon God immediately forgiveth him. Now left any should think, What is this to us in the times of the Gospel? observe v. 6. For this every one that is godly shall pray unto thee; that is, for this remission, for this pardon every one that is godly shall pray; so that its angeredliness by David's judgment not to confess sin, or to pray for the pardon, which how can any Antinomian do by his principles, that holdeth, God seeth not, or taketh notice, so as to be offended with the sins of justified persons? and so they are not only Antinomists, but Anti-Confessionists, Anti-Petitionists, and Anti-Penitents.

Take one more instance, Pf. 6. 1. where David prayeth God would not rebuke him in his hot displeasure. Compare this with Jer. 10. 24. where you see the servants of God do suppose an anger from God will fall on them for their sins, and they do not refuse his rebukes, only they desire God would moderate, and set bounds to his wrath, that it may not overwhelm them. Many other places there are, where its plain, the people of God praying, do suppose him to be angry with them for their sins; and it is a truth so ingraven in the heart of a godly man, that no error can ever quite obliterate it.

VI. Argument. A sixth sort of Arguments shall be from those places, where God is said to take notice of our sin, more then we can or do, 1 Joh. 3. 18, 19, 20. where the Apostle presseth believing to a sincere love of one another with this Argument, that hereby we shall assure
as they are before him: the Greek word signifies to persuade, and doth excellently set forth the difficulty of being assured in God's presence. Now this great benefit be illustrates by the contrary, if our hearts condemn us, God is greater than our hearts; and this holdeth universally in every holy duty, as well as that of love: if our hearts condemn us for hypocrisy, and insincerity in them, God doth much more, for he knoweth more evil by our selves then we do. Now how can this Apostolicall assertion be true, if so be God took no notice, or were not offended at the sins of his people? Its an argument of sweet meditation to humble us, that if where there is but a drop of grace, our sins are so loathsome and offensive; how much more must they be to the ocean of all purity? To this the Antinomian replieth, (Honey-Comb p. 89.) that John speaks this of hypocrites and not the justified children of God; but first, he gives the express title of little children to them, v. 18. and my little children, so that he taketh upon him the bowels of a father to them. Again, let it be granted, that he describes hypocrites; yet there is no godly man but this text will in some sense belong to; for there is no man so godly, but he hath some hypocrisy and insincerity in his best love: there is that worm in his best fruit, that dross in his best gold. It followeth then by proportion, that so far as the godly do discern imperfections, and insincerity in their duties, so farre they are to be humbled before God, who knoweth much more by them then they discern; as you see little moats are discerned by the sun beams in the Air, which were not discerned before: therefore when John addeth, If our hearts condemn us, not, then have we confidence with God, his meaning is not, as if we could have no confidence where our hearts do condemn us in some degrees, for then none in the world could have confidence; but he speaks of condemning our selves, upon a discovery of a total and willfull hypocrisy, and so we will indeed grant that he speaks of hypocrites, but yet it proveth as much as we desire, namely, that where there is any condemnation of our selves for any degree of insincerity in any duty, we are to tremble, and to remember that God is greater then our hearts, knoweth more by us, and so his wrath might break out hotter then we can imagin. Neither is the former answer weakened, though we grant it to be
be understood of totall hypocrites, for it is usuall with the Apo-
istle to threaten even those that are godly, and dear to him, with
the condition and punishment of hypocrites and apostates, as
Heb.6. See another instance, 1 Cor. 4.4. I know nothing by my self,
yet am I not thereby justified, for it is God that judgeth me; where
the Apostle doth not speak of an Anabaptisticall perfection, as
if Paul knew no sin by himself; but his meaning is to be restrained
to the faithful dispensation of the office committed to him, in which
though he had not perfection, yet his conscience did not accuse
him of gross negligence or unfaithfulness; but for all this he
doeth not think himself justified by any godliness in him; and why
so? because God judgeth him, who takes notice of, and is offended
with more sins then he understands by himself; so that Paul
doeth acknowledge God to see sin in him, and therefore he can-
not be justified by any thing inherent; and this made Bernard
say excellently, Tutie ref. justicia donata, quam inherens, Imputed
righteousness is safer to rely upon then inherent. Think it there-
fore a small thing to be acquitted by Antinomian principles,
when it is God that judgeth; and whatsoever the adversary
speaketh about a righteousness of Christ communicated unto us,
so that thereby God seeth no sin; yet because they say, he seeth
no sin in us inherently, they must conclude for some perfect inhe-
rent righteousness. Lastly, Psal. 19. David crying out, Who can
understand his errors? prayeth thereupon, cleanse thou me from
secret sins; and this doth imply that there were many sins that
David had, which were loathsome and foul in God's eyes, though
undiscovered by himself, and therefore he would have God
wash him, and make him clean.

VII. Rank of Arguments.

A seventh rank of Arguments shall be from those places
wherein God hath commanded Ministers to binde and retain the
sins of scandalous offenders, and hath promised to ratifie that in
heaven, which they according to his will, do on earth. Experience
witnesseth that a justified person may fall into some scandalous
sin, whereby the whole Congregation may be much offended,
and God highly provoked. Now in this case God hath com-
manded the Ministers of the Gospel to binde and to retain such
a mans sins till he doth repent. This binding is not by way of
authority, but ministeriall declaration, and effectuall application
of
of God's threatenings in his word to such a person sinning, and when this is done, God hath promised, that all this shall be ratified and made good in heaven against that man. Now how can God make good the Ministers threatenings applied to that godly man, if he take not notice, and be not offended with the person so hainously sinning? The places that prove such a binding of sin, and God's ratifying of their sentence, are John 20:23. Mat. 16:19. Mat. 18:18. Can any man say, that when a godly man is cast out of God's family, the seals of God's grace denied him, and he delivered up to Satan, that God is not angry with him? yea, is not he bound then to apprehend God estranged from him? when a godly man is excommunicated, he is not only cast out from the external Church society, but likewise there is a deprivation from internal communion with Christ; not as if he were cut off from the purpose or decree of God's election, or as if the habituall seed of grace were quite extinct in him, but only as the outward seals of God's favour are denied him; so also doth God being angry with him, deny him any inward testimonies of his favour; and it would not be faith against sense (as the Adversary calls it) but presumption against Scripture to say, God was at that time well-pleased with him; yea Divines say (Synopsis puri. Theol. disp. 48.) that there is a conditional exclusion of the person so offending from future glory, for the Church threatens him, that as they judge him now, and bid him depart from their society, so if he do not repent, Christ at the last day will command him to depart from his presence, and the holy Angels, according to that of Tertul. in Apologetico, Summum futuri judicium praedicntium est, qui quis ita deliquerit, ut à communicatione orationis & conventus, & omnis sancti commercii relegens; The eighth kinde of Arguments is from those places, where Christ is said still to be an advocate, and to make intercession for believers after they are justified, which would be altogether needless, if God did not take notice of their sins, and were ready to charge them upon believers; consider the places, 1 John 2:1. Heb. 7:25. In the former place John having said, that Christ's blood cleanseth us from all sin (a place the Antinomian much urgeth, not considering that at the same time, the Apostle v. 9. requireth VIII. Kind of Arguments.
Arguements proving God seeing, and quireth confession and shame in our selves, if we would have pardon) in the first verse of the second Chapter, he faith, he writes these things that they should not sin; all true doctrine about Christ and free-grace tendeth to the demolishing, & not encouraging of sin, but the Apostle supposeth such fragility that we will sin, and therefore speaketh of a remedy, if we sin we have an advocate; now this makes severall waies against the Antinomian.

First, That sins committed after our justification need an advocate; it is not enough that we were once justified, our new sins would condemn us for all that were it not for Christ.

Secondly, In that Christ is an advocate, it supposeth that though God be a Father to his people, yet he is also a Judge, and that he so taketh notice of, and is displeased with their sins, that did not Christ intercede and deprecate the wrath of God, it would utterly consume them. Thou therefore who saiest God the Father is not offended, why then doth Christ perform the Office of an advocate? If thy sins be not brought into the Court, what need any pleading for thee? In the other place, Heb.7.25: The Apostle acknowledgeth a two-fold function of Christs Priestly Office: The one is, the offering up of himself for our sins. The second is the continual intercession for us, which the Apostle Ch.9.v.24. calleth appearing before Gods face in our behalf; now we must not so advance Christs sufferings in the taking away of sin, so as to exclude the other part of his Priestly Office, which is continually to plead our cause for us; for the Apostle makes Christ to stand before the face of God, as some great favourite before an earthly Prince, to plead in the behalf of those who are accused; so that the Doctrine which denieth God seeing of sin in his people, doth wholly overthrow Christs intercession, and the efficacy of it. Concerning the manner of Christs intercession, it is not to be conceived in that way as he prayed here upon the earth; but it is his holy will and express desire of his soul, that God the Father should be reconciled with those for whom he hath shed his blood: and truly that point of Divinity, viz. Christs affections and sympathizing with his people now in heaven, is an ocean of infinite comfort.
LECT. IX.

How greatly God is offended at the sins of those that are Godly.

Jerem. 50. 20.
In those days, and at that time, the iniquity of Judah shall be sought for, &c.

Shall now conclude with the last sort of Arguments, which are from those Scriptures that speak how God is affected with his people when they have sinned, which affections do necessarily imply God's seeing of sin, so as to be angry with them, yea in some respects God's anger is more to them than others, and we say, in some sense God doth more see and take notice of the sins of believers then others.

The places of Scripture which speak in what manner God takes the sins of believers, are these, Ephes. 4. 30. Grieve not the holy Spirit of God, &c. where the godly in their sins are said to grieve God's Spirit. Now can the Spirit of God, which is also God, be grieved (to speak after the manner of men) at our sins, and not take notice of them? Certainly, if they grieve God, they ought to grieve us, let us not neglect that which the Spirit of God is so offended with. This place seemeth to be taken out of Isaiah 63. 10. They vexed his holy Spirit. So that it is such a grieving, as doth vex and imbitter the holy Spirit of God. O what a dreadful consideration should this be against all fallhooks in this point? Doth not God, Doth not the Spirit of God take notice of thy corrup-

IX. Sort of Arguments.
The greatness of the Guilt of sin in Believers.

Furthermore the aggravation of this sin is seen, in that it is against the Spirit that doth seal us to the day of redemption. A Metaphor (faith Zanchy in locum) from Merchants, who having bought such goods, seal them as their own, that so leaving others, they may transport them. Now for the godly to sin, it is to deface this seal, and if it be so great an offence to violate humane seals, how much more Divine? Observe likewise that passage of God to Moses, Exod. 4.14, where Moses out of the sense of his infirmity, refusing the office God called him to twice or thrice, it is said, The Lord's wrath was kindled against him. In the Hebrew it is very emphatical, The fury of the Lord was angry against Moses, and the Septuagint ἡμόρραια, by which expression was signified, God was not lightly, but grievously angry with him, to Psal. 74.1. The Church crieth out, Why doth thine anger smoke against the sheep of thy pasture? and in many other places. Now can God be angry, and that in so high a degree, with that which he doth not see, or take notice of? It is true Isidor. Pelus. lib. 1. Ep. 144. will not suffer, that notice and affliction which God layeth upon us, to be called ἐμπόλιον or ἐγνωστὰ, but then anger is to be taken in a strict sense, for punishment by way of Satisfaction, but otherwise the Scripture doth frequently use this word, and that of God to his own people, yea vengeance which is more, Psal. 99.8. But that it may the better appear, how great the guilt of sinne in believers, even in the sight of God, is, and what his account is of it, take notice of these particulars,

First, What the Scripture styles them, 1 Sam. 2.29. There God reproveth Eli in his indulgence about his sons, with this remarkable expression, Thou honourest thy sons above me. Is not this an aggravation which God taketh notice of? and yet Eli did reprove his sons, but because he failed in the measure of zeal, therefore is God thus angry with him; so that God doth not only see the grosse sinnes committed by his people, but a lesser measure of their graces, and is angry for that. So Revel. 2. because the Church abated in her first love, and her works were not perfect, therefore doth God threaten her. As the
the godly are said to honour the creature above him when they sinne, so they are likewise said to despise God; and can God but be offended with them that despise him? 1 Sam. 2:13. They that despise me, shall be lightly esteemed, faith God again to Eli. Thus likewise to David, 2 Sam. 12:9. Wherefore hast thou despised the commandment of the Lord? God cannot but take notice of that which is a despising, and contemning of him. As their sinnes are a despising of God, so are they said to displease God, which cannot be if God see no sinne; for if God see no sinne, it is all one in reference to God, whether a believer wallow in the mire of sinne, or whether he live holily; so that this Doctrine must needs eat and consume like a Gangrene. Is God as well pleased with Peter denying Christ, as Peter repenting? as much pleased with David in his adultery and murder, as when making his penitential Psalm? The Papists indeed would fasten such prodigious consequences upon the Protestants Doctrine, but they abhorre it, whereas it followeth naturally from the Antinomian Assertion. Indeed the Orthodox say, David and Peter in their lapses, did not fall from the state or grace of Justification; but wherein the Antinomian and they differ, is hereafter to be shewen. That God is thus displeased with Justified persons, when they thus sinne, is plain, 2 Sam. 11. 29. where what we translate (displeased) according to the Originall, is, Was evil in the eyes of the Lord; where you see express Scripture, that God did see sinne in David, because that which he had done, was evil in Gods eyes: So again, 1 Chron. 21:7. Davids numbering of the people, is said to be evil in the eyes of the Lord. Thus the very letter of the Scripture is against them. Lastly, Their sinnes are offences against God, and can God be offended with that which he doth not behold? Elihu speaks true and excellent Doctrine, Job 34. 32. though he erred in the application, Surely it is meet to be said unto God, I have born chastisement, I will offend no more, where he acknowledgeth, that chastisements are for sinnes, and that sinnes are offences. If then the sinnes of Gods people are a dishonour to him, a despising of him, a displeasing of him, they are evil in his eyes, and
and an offence to him, it cannot be, but that he must see sinne in his people.

Secondly, The Scripture describeth Gods threatening and upbraiding of them with all his kindnesses he did to them; so that God doth not onely take notice of them, but in the several aggravations of their ingratitude and unkindnesses unto him, in all that they offend. Thus observe Gods dealing with Eli, 1 Sam. 2. 28. Did not I choose thy father out of all the Tribes of Israel to be my Priest, to offer upon my Altar? Did I not give unto thy father all the Offerings by fire of the children of Israel? Wherefore kick ye at my Sacrifice? What a cutting sword must this needs be in Elies heart? and because the children of God have a Spirit of love in them, these upbraidings must needs wound their heart the more. Again, see the like dealing with David, 2 Sam. 12. 7, 8, 9. I anointed thee King over Israel, and I delivered thee out of the band of Saul: and if that had been too little, I would have given thee such and such things, wherefore hast thou despised the Commandment of God? &c. Must not this pierce into the very bowels of David? Shall God upbraid his people falling into sinne, spread before their eyes the manifold mercies he hath bestowed upon them, and all this while see no sinne in them? Therefore when it is said James 1. 5. That God upbraideth not, that is to be understood, in respect of his frequent and liberal giving, as men use to lay, I have given thus often, and I will give no more; which kinde of giving Seneca calls panem- Lapidosum; but if men walk unworthy of the benefits received, he doth then upbraid, as Mark 16. 14. He is said to upbraid the Disciples, because of their unbelief.

Thirdly, The Scripture appliceth the threatnings of God so believers, as well as to others, making no difference between them, unless they repent. Indeed we say against the Papists, That all the sinnes of justified persons are venial, and not mortal, that is, such as in the event will have pardon, but that is, because the seed of grace will be operative in them, so that they shall either habitually.
or actually repent of their sinnes. Neither when the Orthodox say, That Election is absolute, do they exclude the Media Instituta, means appointed by God, in which the fruit of Election is accomplished, but Conditions antecedaneous, as if that Decree did remain suspense and uncertain, till the will of man had determined, 1 Cor. 6.9, 10. The Apostle layeth down an universal Rule, Such and such grosse offenders shall not inherit the Kingdom of Heaven, that is, those who live so and do not repent: and this is to be extended not only to those who are habitually so, but actually likewise, unless they are reformed. Therefore no godly man falling into any of those grosse sinnes, may deceive himself, and think he shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven without a change. Godly or ungodly, yet if found in the committing of such a grosse sinne, unless they do repent, God will not accept one or the other. As Repentance is appointed for the wicked man as a duty, without which he cannot be saved; so confession and forsaking of sinne, is prescribed a godly man fallen into sinne, without which he cannot have remission, 1 John 1.9. There is no such free-grace or Gospel, as faith to a believer, if fallen into a foul sinne, Whether you repent or no, your sinnes shall be pardoned to you. Hence 1 Cor. 11. the Apostle makes every man that receiveth unworthily (and yet some of them were godly) to receive their damnation, that is, their eternal damnation, without repentance and Reformation; and after repentance, their judgement, though not of condemnation, yet affliction and castigation. How terrible likewise is Paul? Heb. 12.29, where speaking to the godly that are to receive a Kingdom that is eternal, he exhorteth them to duty, Let us have grace (χαρά) that is, Let us retain and keep grace; χαρά is for κεραυνόν, as Rom. 15.4. and observe the manner, with reverence and godly fear, εὐφανής is such a fear as relateth to punishment; compare this place with Psal. 2.12. and thus the words following suppose, for our God is a consuming fire, this is taken out of Deuter. 4. 24. and the meaning is, God is no lesse angry with Christians sinning against him, then formerly with the Israelites, and it is as eafe
for him to destroy whom he is offended with, as for the fire to destroy stubble. How directly doth this place overthrow that Antinomian Assertion, God saw sinne in believers in the Old Testament, and therefore afflicted them, but it is not so under the New?

Now, when its said, God is a consuming fire, this denoteth the great anger of God, compare it with Deut. 9.3. and Deut. 32.22. Fire is most efficacious, and least capable of transmutation as other elements are, for which reason the Persians worshipped fire for a god; but fire might be extinguished, whereas God is such a fire as consumeth all and remaineth immutable. Know then (Brethren) that as there are places in the New Testament, which speak of the riches of his grace, so also of his consuming anger. As therefore the Promises of the Scripture are for Consolation and Hope to the Godly, so are the threatnings for a godly fear. Between these two milestones a Christian is made Dulcis farina, as Luther once said; and neither of these milestones may be taken for a pledge, as the Law was in the Old Testament; because one cannot work without the other. Therefore for a man to take onely those places of Scripture, which speak of the goodnesse of the Promises, and to reject the terrours of the threatnings, is spiritual theft in an high degree. Doth not Paul, 2 Cor. 5. excite himself to run like a gyant in his ministerial race, because of the terrour of the Lord at the day of judgement? See vers.10. We must all appear (so to appear, as to be seen through and made manifest) before the judgement seat of God (as those that are to plead a cause in an eminent place before a Judge) to receive a reward futable to his life: Now knowing this (faith the Apostle) we perswade; it may relate to himself, and to those whom he perswadeth. Yet this apprehension of the Lords terror did not exclude love, for v.14. he faith, The love of Christ constraineth us, either an expression from those who had a spirit of Prophecy upon them, that was very powerfull, whereby they could not but speak, or else from women in travell, Heb. 12.15. which through pain cannot but cry out, so efficacious was love in Paul.

Fourthly, The sinnes of godly men cease not to be sins, though they
even in Gods sight.

they are justified. We may not say, that in Cain killing of another is murder, but in David it is not: We may not say denying of Christ in Judas, is indeed a sinne, but in Peter it is not. No priviledge they have by Justification can alter the nature of a sinne. He that receiveth unworthily, is guilty of the body and blood of the Lord, whether he be a wicked man, or a believer. It is not with a believer and a wicked man, as with a man and a beast comparatively. If a beast kill a man, it is not sinne, because the subject is not reasonable, but a man if he do so, whether godly or ungodly, it is a sinne, because against Gods Law. It is not safe to say, That God doth with the believer and wicked, as if, a Magistrate should make a Law, that whosoever committeth such a crime, if he be a freeman he shall only be imprisoned; but if a servant, he shall be put to death: So God, whosoever murdereth or committeth adultery, if he be a believer, the wages due to his sinne, is onely temporall chastisements, but to a wicked man, its eternal death. I say, this is not safe: For although a believers sinne shall not actu-<br/>ally damn him, yet God hath made the same Law to both, and repentance as a means is prescribed, so that we may by supposi-<br/>tion say, If the wicked man repent, his sinne shall not damn him; If the justified person do not, his sinne will damn him. It is true, it is not proper to say of sinne in the abstract, it shall be damned, no more then that grace shall be saved; but we are to say, the person shall be damned or saved. Yet the guilt of the sinne, will cause the guilt of the person, if not taken off by Christ, as the meritorious, and faith as the instrumental cause. The sins then of believers and ungodly are both alike, only that the guilt of them doth not redound upon the persons alike, is because the one takes the way appointed by God to obtain pardon, and the other doth not. Not that the godly man makes himself to differ from the wicked, but all is the work of grace. In some respects the sins of godly men are more offensive to God, then those of wicked men; because committed against more light, and more experience of the sweetness of Gods love, and the bitterness of sin. What is the cause Heb. 10.28,29,30. the Apostle maketh the condition of a willfull apostate to be so dreadfull, but because of the excellency of
of the object in the Gospel, above that in the Law? If he that despised Moses his Law, died without mercy, of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye shall he be thought worthy? Observe that interposition, doe ye, think ye, do you not easily think that such sins offend God more? Now although the truly sanctified can never fall into such a condition totally and finally, yet their sins committed wilfully against the Gospel, are gradually, and in some measure of such a nature, and therefore they fall terribly into the hands of the living God, when they so sinne against him: and consider how that the Apostle speaks these things, even to them, of whom he hoped better things, and things that accompany salvation, Heb. 6. If therefore we see a godly man, who hath tasted much of God's favour, play the Prodigal, walk looly, we may and ought (notwithstanding Antinomian positions) powerfully and severely set home these places of Scripture upon his conscience. And observe how in the New Testament, the Apostle alledgeth two places out of the Old, Vengeance belongeth to me, Deut 32.35. and the Lord will judge his people, Psal. 135.14. To judge is to avenge; so that the people of God have those considerations in their sins to provoke God, which wicked men cannot have; and therefore have the same motives to humble them; as the Apostle argueth, To which of the Angels said he, Sit at my right hand? &c. So may we, To what wicked man hath God poured out his love, revealed himself kindly, as unto the godly? therefore do they neglect the greater mercies.
Lect. X.

How God's anger manifests itself upon his own children sinning.

Jerem. 50. 20.

In those days, and at that time the iniquity of Judah shall be sought for, &c.

Let us in the next place consider the particulars wherein God's eye of anger doth manifest itself upon his own children, if sinning against him. The effect of his wrath may be considered in that which is temporal, or spiritual, or eternal; in all these God's anger doth bring forth in one respect or other. For the temporal objects, take notice of these particulars; first, when they sin against God, they are involved in the common and ordinary afflictions, which do usually accompany sin in the wicked: Thus 1 Cor. 11. 30. for their unworthy receiving of the Sacrament, (and some even of those were godly, as appeareth, v. 32.) many were weak and sickly: weak, were such as did languish; and sickly is more, such as had diseases on them; now these were strokes from God, and therefore came from his anger for their sins. Though the Lords Supper consist of a twofold bread, the one earthly for the body, the other heavenly, the bread of life for the soul, yet both body and soul did miserably decay, because of unworthy receiving; This Table being as Chrysostom said, mensa Aquilarum, not Graculorum, food for Eagles, not Jades. As therefore those children, who have fainting diseases upon them, and do secretly eat salt, oatmeal, &c. though
though they have never such excellent food at their Fathers Table, yet thrive not, but look pale, and consuming; so it was with the Corinthians by reason of their corruptions, they inclined to death, though they fed on the bread of life. Now that these bodily diseases are the common issue and fruit of sin appeared, Levit. 26. 16. Dent.28. 22. The grace therefore of Justification can give no Supercedes to any disease that shall arrest a believer offending; but are the wicked in Consumptions, Agues, Feavers for their sins? So are the godly; yea, the people of God are in these calamities before the wicked, Amos 3. 2. You only have I known of all the Families of the earth; therefore I will punish you for all your iniquities. I have known you, that is, acknowledged you for mine, see what that is, Exod. 19. 5. A peculiar treasure unto me above all people: The Hebrew word signifies that which is dear and precious, and to be desired of all. This is aggravated by what followeth, for all the earth is mine; that is, seeing there are so many Nations in the world, over whom I have full power and dominion; how great is God's goodness in taking you for his above others? now mark the Prophets reason, because I have done this, therefore I will visit you for your iniquities, for to all your other wickednesses you add an ingratefull heart. So there is another place, 1 Pet. 4. 17. where God is said to judge them before others, and this hath been a great offence to the godly: It is time, that is, a seasonable opportunity by the decree and appointment of God; for judgement, that is, chastisements for former finnes, which are called judgements, because they are publique testimonies and manifestations of God's anger against finnes and are to put the godly in minde of their finnes, (only it is χέιμα, not χέτατιμα in the originall.) The word is used even of the godly, 1 Cor. 11. 31, 32. 1 Pet. 4. 6. By the house of God he meaneth the true Members of the Church, and whereas he faith it begins in them, he thereby intimates, that the godly in this life are more exposed to afflictions for sinne, then the wicked are, and this made David and Jeremiah so expostulate with God in this matter, so that the godly in their afflictions ought to say, as that widow of Sarepta, 2 King. 17. 18. This is to call my sinne to remembrance.
It is thought the Apostle, though he doth not expressly mention a place, yet he takes this out of the Doctrine of the Old Testament, for so God did begin first with his people, Isa. 10. 12. Jer. 25. 17, 18. Ezek. 9. 6. Begin at my Sanctuary, Ezek. 21. 4. There God in publice calamities maketh no difference between the righteous and the ungodly; now this is so great, that the Apostle faith, the righteous is hardly saved: The word μάθεως is used of those things that with much labour are brought about, Acts 14. 18. Acts 27. 7. These tribulations are so great, that they almost destroy the godly themselves: See also James 5. 13. Is any sick? Where the godly man is supposed to be sick, and the cause, (if he hath committed sinne) that is, such sinnes as were the causes of that disease, they shall be forgiven him: So that even justified persons afflicted by diseases, are to inquire what sinnes the Lord would humble them for, and to labour that the sickness of the body, be the sanctified occasion of the health of the soul.

2. Gods anger is seen in bringing extraordinary and unusual calamities upon them because of their sinnes; so that they have strange punishments, which even the wicked do many times escape: Jonah who endeavoured to fly from Gods face (and that he might easily have done by Antinomian Doctrine) with what a prodigious judgement was he overtaken? Jonah 2. The Prophet calls it the belly of hell: and how deeply his soul was afflicted under that punishment appeareth, in that he faith, his soul fainted within him, and he concluded, he was cast out of Gods sight.

He that voluntarily ranne from Gods presence, doth now bewail that he is cast from it. He makes the Whales belly an house of prayer, and this came up to God, in his holy Temple, that is, heaven. You see by this, that God prepareth strange judgments sometimes for those that offend him, though his children: so in that 1 Cor. 11.30, when he faith, that many of the Corinthians were dead for their unworthy receiving, it is to be understood of an immature and untimely death, they did not live out to the term of those dayes, that according to natural causes they might have done, so
How Gods anger manifests it self

that its the same with being [cut off] in the Old Testament, Exod. 12. 15. Whosoever did eat the Pasleover with leaven was to be cut off from Israel: Therefore even godly men may procure to themselves untimely deaths, and may provoke God to cut them off in the midst of their years.

3. Yea further, God may not only afflict them in an extraordinary manner, but even strike them with sudden death, and that while their sinnes are upon them. I will not instance in Ananias and Saphira, nor in Nadab and Abihu, though some have thought charitably of them; we have a clear instance in Uzzah, wherein Gods anger was so apparent, by striking him suddenly dead, that the thing is said to displease David, 2 Sam.6.7. The anger of God was kindled against Uzzah, and he smote him for his errors. His error was not, because he was not a Levite, for its plain he was; but because they put the Ark upon a new Cart, whereas they should have carried it upon their shoulers: Although its thought the carrying of the Ark was limited only to the Levites that were the sons of Kohath, and that no other Levite might touch the Ark, which if so, then it was a second offence against the Law, because he touched it; and indeed this seemeth to be the proper cause, because it was a personall fault of Uzzah, whereas the putting of it on a new Cart, was the error of others besides him.

Thus Uzzah in his very sinnes is stricken dead; you have likewise another sad example of Eli, Lege historiam, ne fas historia, 1 Sam. 4. 18. Because he failed in the measure of zeal about the reproof of his sons, therefore he fell backward, and broke his neck: Eli manifested his pious affections, in submitting to the hand of God punishing, and in being more affected with the publique calamity then his own private, yet this is his sad Tragical end.

Gods anger doth not limit it self to them only, but it reacheth even to their children, and to those that are dear to them. Thus Davids childe is stricken dead, for his sinne; and thus Elies daughter gives up the ghost with sad grief. The family both of David and Eli, have remarkable calamities following them, and
and all because of their sins. When any of Eli's posterity shall be forced to crouch for a morsel of bread, this is a memento of Eli's sin.

Here a man may see the seed of the righteous begging bread, but for their Parents' sins; Therefore that of David, Psal. 36. must not be understood universally. That this calamity may the more wound his heart, God tells him what he will do to his house after his death; if any were left alive, it should be like that indulgence to Cain, to carry up and down a token of God's displeasure; and if you ask for how long should this anger of God endure, 1 Sam. 3.14. His iniquity must not be purged away from that house for ever. Well may the Scripture say, that whosoever heareth this judgement of God, his ears shall tingle. By this instance, how watchful should godly parents be, left for their sins committed, a curse should cleave to the family for many generations? I acknowledge these calamities as they fell upon Eli a godly man, so they were wholesome medicines, and fatherly corrections, but as they came on his wicked children or posterity continuing in wickedness, so they were strictly and properly punishments.

Lastly, Those temporall evils will reach even to the publique Church, and State wherein they live, so that the sins of godly men, may help to pull down publique judgments. Thus it was with Hezekiah, for his unthankfulness and pride, there was wrath upon Judah and Jerusalem, 2 Chron. 32.25. So David's sinne in numbring the people, it was the death of many thousand in Israel; for Eli's sinne, the Israelites are slain in the Army, and the Ark is taken. Hence you have Esay, Daniel and Ezra, joyning themselves in the number with others, who made publike confession of their sins upon daies of humiliation. It is therefore a cursed and secure opinion, that faith, The godly when they keep Fast daies, do it not, because they have any sinsnes that God purseth, but because of wickedmen. The Scripture doth manifest the contrary, and the holiet men living do bring some sparks and fire brands to increase the wrath of God, and therefore they ought to bring their buckets for the quenching of it.

M 3
The aggravation of this anger will appear, if you consider what kinde of finnes they have been for which God hath been so fore displeased, and in them enumerated, or instanced in, you may perceive they were the Belzebub-finnes, the First-born of iniquities: Uzzah failed only in the order God had appointed, what he did was out of care and a good intention; yet the Lord smiteth him; so Moses was denied entering into the Land of Canaan, which was an heavy affliction to him, because he spake unadvisedly with his lips: Commentators are at a loss to finde out what his sinne was. So Davids sinne in numbring the people, its disputed wherein the transgression lay. Elies heavy judgements that came so frequently one upon another, were for a want of that measure of zeal which should have burnt within him. Oh therefore consider that God doth not only see sinnes, that are mountains, but that are molehils comparatively! He doth not only see the beams, but the motes that are in us; he doth not only take notice of our mire and vomit, if we return to that, but of the least spot and wrinkle; how deeply mayst thou humble thy self under every Religious duty performed by thee! How often do we fail in the manner of a command, as Uzzah in the order? How often out of pride and self-confidence do we number our earthly props and refuges, relying upon them? How unadvised are our thoughts and words? now these hairs of sinnes (as I may so call them, both for number and seeming littlenesse) are all numbered before God.

As the Lord is angry with these lesser sinnes and defects in graces; so also for Errors in judgements, and false opinions: How well would it be for the Antinomian, if God did not see this sinne in them, that they hold, he seeth no sinne in Believers? I fear me God seeth and taketh notice of their erroneous Sermons, of their corrupt Doctrines, and seducing Books. There are indeed those, who would make Heresie, almost innocency, and that it is more to be pitied then punished; but the Apostle, Gal. 5. reckoneth Heresies among gross sinnes, such as exclude from the Kingdom of heaven; and how severe God's anger is to those who do erre, though in lesse matters, and although they keep the foundation, appeareth in that notable place, 1 Cor.3. 12,13,14,15.
It is a difficult place, and those that would build Purgatory out of it, they are the Architects of that hay and stubble the Text speaks of. Not to joyn with that exposition of some, who by hay and stubble, do understand evil works; nor with Beza, who denyeth it to be meant of false Doctrine, but only of the manner of preaching: He makes the building of gold and silver, &c. to be the pure and sincere doctrine of Christ; The hay and stubble to be the vain affected of eloquence and words; but I rather go along with those that interpret the place of false Doctrines, but not such as do overthrow the foundation; only they build superfluous and unsound doctrine, upon the true Foundation, which is as uncomely, as if you should see a Royall Palace, which hath Gold for the Foundation, and Precious Stones for the Walls, yet have the covering of straw and stubble; what deformity would this be? yet so it is with the best Preachers that are, who yet adde some errours to the sound Doctrine they deliver. Now for the opening of the place, it is wholly Allegorical; The Preachers of God's Word are builders, and they are to raise up a stately Palace; the materials are compared to Gold and Silver, to precious Stones. The place is an allusion to Isai.54.12. I will make thy windows of Agates, and thy gates of Carbuncles, and all thy borders of pleasant Stones; It is a description of the precious Graces and Doctrines, which the Ministers of God are cloathed with; and this sheweth with what esteem and high price all the Truths of Christ ought to be received by you. The Ark, Exod 25.3,4,5,6. was to be made of Gold, Silver, and other Precious materials; this is the nature of true Doctrine. Now false doctrine, though it be not in Fundamentals, but in meer accessories, is called hay and stubble, and he that preacheth these shall come to a severe triall. Every man's work, faith the Text, shall be made manifest; where you see the spreading of false Doctrine is called the work of a man, as in the second Epistle of John it's called evil deeds; and this evil work hath a two-fold effect; First, It makes the owner to suffer loss, that is, all that labour and pains he hath taken shall bring him no profit; whereas, if he had employed himself in the Truth, his reward would have been great. The lucrum cessans is as great.
great a loss as the damnnum emergens. Oh, what a fearfull thing will it be for false teachers, who have made it their whole business to spread new opinions, to lose all their labour! The other effect is, that though he be saved, yet it shall be so as by fire; that is, he shall be in extrem danger, and he shall have sad tribulations and miseries falling upon him; see the like phrase, Jude v.23. pulling them out of the fire. That which thou comforted thyself with, and gloriest in, as if it were perfection, it may be is nothing but part of the fire in the Text; which is to afflict thee, that thy dross may be purged out: Let therefore all false teachers (though belonging to God) expect a fire of burning, great afflictions and tribulations. And if Antinomians have trouble for their doctrine, they are bound to believe God chastiseth them for this very opinion; that he doth not chastise for sinne. I have been the longer on this place, because of the multitude of hay and stubble that is built everywhere. God will have his day, when a fire shall rise to consume it all, and the true Doctrine will only continue. The Apostle speaks as terribly afterwards, ver.17. If any man defile the Temple of God, him shall God destroy: where the Apostle calleth the Corinthians the Temple of God: now this is not so much true of every single Christian, as when collected together in a Church or body; and the Spirit dwelling among them, is much more admirable then his presence in the Ark; and he defileth this Temple, who by any false Doctrine, and error, corrupts that society; now the greatness of this sinne is seen by the words following, the Lord will destroy him, for so οδηγείς is the same with ἀπολέον, so that as God destroyed Athaliah and Belteshazzar for prophaning the Temple and the offerings or gifts of the Temple, no less punishment (unless they repent) shall fall upon those who pervert the Doctrines of Christ.

Manifestation of God's anger to believers

I come to the second demonstration of God's anger to believers when sinning, and that is in spiritual and internal things: now they are of two sorts; First, The consolations of the Holy Ghost, with the light of Gods favour: Secondly, The flourishing and sprouting of the graces of sanctification; in both these you shall finde the godly man after sinne much withered.
What anger in the first sense, after sinne, the godly may feel, David will abundantly tell you, Psal. 11. he calls it the breaking of his bones; you know how terrible and grievous that is, and in the godly this must be the more terrible, because they are of a more tender apprehension: As they say, Christs bodily pain was more then other mens could be, because of the excellent temper and tender constitution of his body; so it is with the godly, every expression of Gods anger, falls like a drop of scalding lead into a mans eye: The conscience of the Believer, when once awakened, feels every frown of God like an hell. Thus after the committing of gross sinne, God hides his face, and then for the while, they are like so many Cains and Judas's, crying out their sinne is greater then they can bear; and truly this worm would never die, this fire would never be quenched in them, did not God again take them into favour: Here is no difference between a man damned in hell, and a godly man troubled in conscience, but the adjunct of time, one is perpetuall, and the other is not.

Now our Divines say, that eternity is not essentiaall to the punishment of hell, (for Christ suffered the torments of hell for us, which yet were not in time eternall) but accidental, because those in hell are not able to satisifie Gods justice, therefore they must continue there till they have paid the last farthing, which because they cannot do to all eternity, therefore they are tormented for ever. Look upon David again, in Psal. 32.3,4. how it fared with him, because of his sinnes; My bones waxed old, through my roaring all the day long, my moisture is turned into the drought of Summer: Did David speak these things Hyperbolically, and Rhetorically only? Did he not finde such anguish and consumption in his soul, that he thought no words could express it? and all this he faith was because of sinne: Oh then believe this and tremble, left such a Whale of sorrow and grief should swallow thee up, as did David. Thus it was also with the incestuous person, the devil was ready to swallow him up; he was delivered to him to be tormented by him; and can all this be done, yet God take no notice of sinne? As the godly in this life time, may have that joy in the Gospel, which passeth all understanding, and more
then the heart can perceive: so they may have for sinne such trouble, and spiritual desections, that shall make everything, their chamber, the field a very hell to them; and David in many Psalms manifesteth such desolation upon his soul; especially this is seen in lapses, when persecutions do abound, and men through fear, have denied that Truth which in their consciences they were assured of. We may read in Ecclesiastical Histories of the grievous wounds and stings Gods people through frailty have made upon their own souls. And as it is thus in matter of consolation, so in the particular of sanctification, how may you observe some, who have been planted by Gods grace like a Paradise, through their negligence and corruptions become like a parched wilderness? Was not David in his fall, till recovered, like a Tree in Winter? though the moisture of grace was within, yet nothing did outwardly appear; Was he not like Samson when his hair was cut off, not able to break the cords of sinne he was tied in? some have thought a godly man can no more fall from the degrees of grace, then the essence and State of grace; but if sinne increase and grow, certainly grace must decrease, for whether sinne expell grace meritiously only, or formally, still the introduction of the one must be the expulsion of the other. Thus Rev. 2. the Church is reproved for abating in her first love; and the people of God complain, Why hast thou hardened our hearts from thy fear? Isa. 63. 17. not that God doth infuse hardness, but only he denieth mollifying grace. And certainly a gracious tender heart, must fear a deliverance up to hardnells more then up to Satan. Illud est cor durum, quod non trepieder ad nomen cordis duri, saith Bernard; That is an hard heart which doth not tremble at the name of an hard heart. A godly man therefore may so provoke God, that he be left in a senseless stupid way, acting sin without tender remorse, and securely lying down therein.

Lastly, The anger of God eternall cannot indeed be in the event upon him, but yet it doth conditionally oblige him till he doth repent; so that you may suppose a Believer to be damned, if you suppose him not to repent. A conditionall Proposition, Nihil ponis in esse, but it doth in posse; and therefore the Scripture makes
makes such Hypothetical Propositions, wherein a possibility of Apostacy is supposed in the godly, if left to themselves, as in that famous place, Ezek. 18.14. When the righteous man turneth away from his righteousness, and comitteth iniquity, all his righteousness shall not be mentioned, in his sins he shall die. This place is not (as some do) to be understood of a righteous man in appearance only, for its opposed to a wicked man in reality; and it is such a righteousness, that if continued in, he should have lived eternally. Neither may we stretch it to an apostacy from the state of Justification, as others do; but its to be understood as comminatory, by way of threatening and supposition: for its true, that if a godly man should forsake his righteousness, it would not be remembred to him; and therefore if you suppose a justified person not to repent of his grievous sins committed, you may also suppose him to die in the displeasure and eternall wrath of God, but this is more exactly to be considered of when we handle that question, Whether Remission of sinne obtained, may be frustrated and made void by new subsequent actual sinnes.
Lect. XI.

The Antinomians Distinction of Gods Knowing and Seeing Sinne, examined.

Heb. 4. 13.
Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in his sight, but all things are naked and opened unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do.

Although this Text in the general sense of it, will not fully prove Gods eye of anger against sin in justified persons; yet because a more special scrutiny, and search into the words, will make much against the Antinomian Error, and also because the Answers which are given to this Text, and the like, do contain gross falsehoods; so that in the refuting of them, all things in this Controversie will be clearly discovered; as also because that principal and noble Question, How far Gods taking notice of sinne, to chastise and punish it, is subject to the meer liberty of his will? will in some measure be discussed; I shall therefore insist upon this Text. Not that the Orthodox make it their shield of Achilles, as the Antinomian slandereth, Hony Comb, pag. 73. But because the vanity of that distinction, which they make between Gods Seeing, and his Knowing, may be brought out from behind the stuff, where like Saul it had hid itself.

And first, for the Text absolutely in itself, The words are part...
part of that excellent commendation, which is given to God's Word. The purity and power of Religion is kept up by acknowledging the fulness and perfection of the Scripture. Both Papists and Illuminatists agree in this dangerous Error, That they look for and expect a Doctrinal Teaching immediately by God's Spirit, above and besides that of the Word: Hence as the Papists make the Scripture but a sheath to receive any Sword, either of Gold or Iron (words that will bear any sense you put upon them) so do the Illuminatists. That a godly man is above all Books, Teachers, Writings, and feels nothing but God working and acting in him. We have therefore the greater cause to set up the Scriptures in their Divine Authority and fulness, by how much the more others endeavour to diminish it. This noble Encomium of God's Word beginneth ver. 12. where you have the Subject of the Commendation, and the Commendation itself. The Subject is called οὐκότι τοῖς ὕπονοιοις, The Word of God. Bellarmine and other Papists, that they might depress the Authority of the Scriptures, understand this of Christ, who is often called the Word. Their reasons are partly because Christ is in other places called so, as John 1.1. & alibi, and partly because this Word is spoken of as a Person, and therefore all things are said to be open and naked to his sight. But these are not cogent; for although in other places Christ is called the Word, yet the Context doth there clearly evince it, whereas here the contrary will appear: for having before exhorted them to receive the Gospel, and to hearken to the voice, while it cals to day, among other Arguments, he brings this from the Nature of God's Word, which is to be understood both of the Law and the Gospel, and its further observed as a peculiar thing to John only in his Gospel, and the Epistles, to call Christ the Word of God; and although the Text speaks of the Word of God as preached, and not as written, yet because the Word written and preached, differ not essentially but accidentally in respect of the manner, therefore this Argument holds true of the Scriptures. As for the second reason, It is ordinary by a Metonymy to attribute that to the Scripture which belongs to God speaking by the Scripture, as Gal. 3. 22. The Scripture hath concluded all under...
God sees Sin in the justified, and judges it.

So the Scripture is said to speak, Jam. 4. 5. So that it is no wonder if here the word of God be spoken of, as knowing all things, because God by this doth discover and manifest every thing. In the next place, consider the Commendation, and that is, First, From the Adjunct Qualities, Secondly, From the Powerfull Effects. The Adjunct Qualities are [Quick and Powerfull] that is, it is not dead or frustrated, but puts forth its power and efficacy, which our words cannot do. It is thought to be an allusive expression to the fire which was on the Altar of Sacrifices, that was not to go out.

Secondly, Its commended from the Effect, its sharper then a two-edged Sword; its an Hebraism, to give a mouth to the sword, because it doth so devour; but because a two-edged, or two-mouthed sword doth divide more forcibly, therefore is Gods Word compared to that. Such a sword, they say, the Levites in the Old Testament did use in dividing and opening the Sacrifices, in which Metaphor the Apostle continueth afterwards. Now by this comparison two things are insinuated,

1. That God knoweth all sin even the most hidden.

2. This knowledge is not a meer bare knowledge, but such as is of a Judge examining and punishing. For as the sword doth pierce and hurt, so Gods Word doth see and punish, therefore it is said to be discerning, that is, most exactly discerning and separating gold from dross, and judging accordingly: So that the Text speaking not barely of an Omniscient eye of God, but an eye, discerning, judging and punishing, doth in this consideration pertinently belong to the Controversie.

We need not be curious in distinguishing between the Spirit and the Soul (only the Scripture doth not confound these together) nor between the things understood by the Marrow and Joyns, which are translated from the body to the soul.

This is intended in the General; by the Joyns, he means the minima, the least things; and by the marrow, the intima, the most secret and inward things.

Having thus described the efficacy of Gods word, he layeth down two Propositions in my Text: one Negative, the other Affirmative.
Antinomians Distinction of Gods Seeing and Knowing.

Affirmative. Negative, There is no creature, dreams, inapparent, but he seeth through it. Affirmative, All things are naked and opened; opened is more then naked; Naked is that which is not clothed, or covered; Opened is that, whose inwards are discovered, and made conspicuous. Much is said by Criticks concerning the word περιβλητων. Cameron thinks it translated from wrastlers, who are said, περιβλητων, their adversary, when they so take him by the neck, and turn him upside down, so as to object him in every part to the eyes of the beholders: Some say, the Metaphor may be taken from those, who being before the Judge, hold down their neck and face to the ground, as not daring to behold his face: But that which is most received, and which is most consonant to the Context, is of those who take the word from those who begin at the neck, and divide the Sacrifice in the middle, so that all the inwards do appear.

Thus you see how emphatical and full the Scripture is in describing of Gods omniscient Eye of any sinne, wheresoever it is; and that not by a meer bare cognition, but of Judging: So that the Observation is,

That seeing there is sin in justified persons, Gods eye must needs observe it and judge it.

To this it is answered very confidently by a distinction never heard of before, that God indeed knoweth the sins of believers, but he doth not see them, Honeycomb, p.67,68,69,70. and this distinction they plead so boldly for, that (they say) although all men, Devils and Angels, would gainsay it, yet it must stand. For the opening of this silly distinction, they express themselves thus. That although to see and know be all one in the pure, uncompounded Nature of God, yet they are not so to us; even as Justice and Mercy are all one in God, but not to us, yea contrary; and the Author giveth two strong Reasons (as he calls them) to prove this; First, The Scripture (faith he) distinguishes them; Now he argueth, That as it is a sinne to distinguish where the Scripture doth not (and thereupon he instanceth in the distinction of the guilt of sinne, and the nature of sinne, making it a new distinction, and suspecting it for a corrupter of the Gospel, as if Christ had taken away the guilt of.
of our sins, and not the sins themselves) so where the Scripture doth distinguish, there it is a sin for us to distinguish. Now concerning the former, that there is in the Scripture a distinction between the guilt of sin, and sin itself, is in its due time to be proved.

Let us consider, how he proveth this distinction of God's seeing and knowing. The place he brings, is Psal. 94:9, 10. He that formed the eye, shall not he see? He that teacheth man knowledge, shall not he know? Here (faith he) they are distinctly set down, and the Scripture useth this continual practice, saying no where, That God doth not know the sins of justified persons, but in many places, That he seeth no sinne in them. His second Reason is, Because among men and Angels, yea in God himself there is a Reason (to our capacities) of this difference, for to know a thing, is, to understand the nature of it, though the thing itself be abolished, and hath no existence; but to see a thing, is to have a real existence of it before our eye. As for instance, God (faith he) knoweth the flood that drowned the whole world, but he doth not see it, having no existence now; So God knoweth the leprosie of Naaman more perfectly then Naaman did himself, yet he doth not see it upon Naaman; and thus God knoweth the sins of the wicked, and of his justified children more perfectly then they themselves do, and herein is no difference between them; but here is the difference, That God seeth sin in the one, and not in the other, because abolished by Christ.

Thus you have a heap of falsehoods, and non-sense together, as if the Author had no knowing, or seeing, while he speaks of these things.

To let you understand the truth in these particulars; howsoever it would be very profitable in this place, to give you the Scripture-Doctrine about the Eye, or seeing of God; as also the different use of it in Scripture; namely, that sometimes its taken for a meer naked apprehension of a thing; sometimes for the actions or effects that do flow from God's seeing, and then it is used either in a good sense for the eye of his care, protection, and approbation; or in a bad sense, and that two ways; either for an eye of condemnation, in which sense God doth not see the sins of believers,
The Truth of this Distinction examined.

believers, or of displeasure and anger, in which sense its expressly said, The sinfull actions of godly men are evil in God's eyes. Howsover, I say, it would be very profitable to speak of this here, yet I shall put it off.

I shall therefore examine what truth is in this Distinction, which they so applaud, and that shall be by several Propositions.

1. That seeing is attributed to God only metaphorically, God hath no bodily eyes. It is well observed by a Father, That the meaner and more debased the things are to which God is compared, there is the least danger, because every common apprehension will judge it not to be truly, and formally so in God. And thus it is of Eyes, and when to see is attributed to God, it is the same thing with to know, so that to make a difference between these two, is grossly ignorance.

2. Knowledge is attributed likewise to God, but in a far different sense from what it is in us, and therefore differs from our knowledge many ways: 1. His knowledge is his substance: Hence Synesius said God to be etoiz, by his understanding. 2. It is not caused from objects. Gregory expressed it well, Ipse mundus noster non nos esse posset, nisi esset, Do autem nisi notus esset esse non posset. 3. It is simple and one. There is properly no memory of things past, no presence of things to come, but all things are present to him; As if there were a body that were all eyes, that needed not to turn it self backward and forward, to see things; or as a man standing upon an high Tower, doth with one call of his eye, behold passengers at the bottom of the Tower, which go successively one after another. Thus Deum e f. toms lux, & toms oculus, God is altogether light, and wholly an eye. 4. Knowledge in us, is properly taken for to know a thing by its causes, but it is not so in God. This rightly understood will overthrow that distinction of knowing and seeing.

3. That Text, Psal.94. doth no ways suppose such a distinction; For the Psalmist doth there intend, whatsoever perfection is either in bodily seeing, or mental knowing, it is eminently and more transcendently in God; neither doth he limit seeing to the sins of wicked men, and knowing only to the sins of the godly; yea, the
Text maketh thus against the Antinomian, If a believer himself, and others see sinne in him, shall not God much more? Indeed in the Creatures, there is a distinction between seeing and knowing in some respects; for knowing may be of a thing in the abstract, but seeing doth denote the intuitive present apprehension, so that knowing hath a perfection, which seeing hath not, and seeing which knowing hath not: but in God all his knowledge is intuitive, and all things are present to him, because of his eternity and omnipresence: so the Schools determine, and rightly, upon that Text 2 Pet. 3. afterwards to be explained. And therefore it is, because intuitive knowledge, or the apprehension of a thing present, is the most noble knowledge, not that the things themselves do co-exist, or are present to one another, but unto God in Eternity; for as God's immensity is in respect of his Essence, so his Eternity is in regard of time; so that although the things themselves vary, yet God's knowledge doth not: As an Artificer, who hath the Idea, or form of an house in his mind before he makes it; when it is made, and after it is destroyed, he hath still the same form in his mind, though the house be altered.

4. Neither doth the Scripture customarily use such a distinction; yea, to know, when attributed to God, is used many times for a knowledge of approbation, and then we cannot say, God knoweth the sins of believers, but we may as well say, God knoweth no sin in them, that is, to condemn them for it, as well as he seeth none in them, so Hab. 1. God is said to be of purer eyes then to behold iniquity, that is, with approbation; and so in this sense we may say, God seeth no sin, no not in wicked men. Besides, it is very false, that the Scripture doth no where say, that he seeth sin in believers; for it is expressly said of Davids numbring the people, and of his murder, that it was evil in God's eyes, and he confesses that he had done that evil in God's sight. But of this more hereafter.

So then wherefoever the Scripture faith, God seeth no sinne, there we may also as truly say, God knoweth none; and where it is said, he doth see, there we may say, he doth know also.

5. There is no distinction to

5. There is in reason, no distinction to be made to our capacities between
by several Propositions.

between Gods knowing and seeing; for in those instances the Author giveth, we may say, God knoweth in that respect as he seeth, and he doth not see in that respect he doth not know: As for example, God doth not see the flood now to be, no more can we say he knoweth it now to be, for that is false; God doth not see the leprosy upon Naaman, no more doth he know it to be on him: So God knoweth his people in Christ, as well as seeth them in Christ; and therefore if by Christ he seeth no sinne in them, he must likewise know none in them. Now this Error is grounded upon a dangerous conceit, as if Gods seeing were limited to things existent, and his knowledge to things past or future, so that its inexcusable ignorance, to lay with this Author, that God knew the Sun and Moon before he made them, but he did not see them. He did not indeed see them to be before they were, no more did he know them to be before they were; but when they were made, his seeing and knowing of them were all one.

6. If Gods seeing were to be explained oppositely to his knowing, then nothing that had a present being were known by God. But doth not the Scripture give to God the knowledge of all things? and though the things be diversifieid by time past, present, and to come, yet to God they are not so; consider that eminent place, 2 Pet. 3.8. A thousand years with God, are but as one day. The Apostle alledgeth this place out of Psal. 90. 4. with a little variation. The Psalmist faith, As yesterday when it is past: The Apostle, As one day. The Psalmist faith, In thy eyes, O Lord: The Apostle, with the Lord. The Psalmist's expression, In the eyes of the Lord, are very pregnant to our purpose. Here is a Description of Eternity, proving, that God seeth all things with one intuitive cast of his eye; and that although to us things are present, past, and to come; yet to God all things are present; and although we are not able to reach this with our understanding, no more then a pigmy the Pyramids, yet we must rest more upon this Scripture Assertion, then our understanding, Quaecquid de Deo dici (we may adde cogitari) potest, eo ipso est indignum quia dici (cogitari) potest. And again, Dignè Deum assimamus, dum inassimabilem dicimus. The Schoolmen dispute, Whether those things
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which God did once know, he still knoweth; As for example, God once knew that Christ was to die, but now it is not true that he is to die; And their resolution is, that we cannot properly say, God begins to know what he did, or ceaseth to know what he did; but rather that the thing it self begins to be known, or ceaseth to be known; so that the change is not in respect of Gods knowing, but the thing known; as when I see the Sun, and afterwards it is hid in the cloud, the change is not in mine eye, but in the Sun; Hence they also resolve, That God knoweth all things simul together, that his knowledge is invariable, that it admittest not of increase or decrease, that all things are present to him, and that as the Sun is always in acti lucendi, so God in actu intelligendi: So that this very Text doth briefly overthrow all that which the Antinomian in so many pages sweateth to prove; and that the consideration of Gods eternal knowledge in this manner is of profitable use, appeareth by that, when the Apostle faith, Be not ignorant of this one thing.

7. If Gods seeing of things were limited in our capacity, only to things present, then all the by-pass sins of ungodly men, though unrepented of, yet God doth not see them, because they have no present being; and so God shall not only, not see sins in the godly, but likewise not in the ungodly: All the past sins of Judas and Cain, God did not see at the day of their death, for they were past away. Here will be much comfort to unbelievers, as well as believers.

8. If therefore God doth not see a thing, because it is past, what need the Antinomian run to Christs merits taking away sinne out of Gods sight, for this would follow by natural consequence, because the object is taken away? Take their own instances, God doth not now see the flood that drowned the world; The leprosie upon Naaman; The Israelites wound that is healed; why so? Doth there need the blood of Christ to remove these? No, it followeth naturally, because the objects are removed and taken away; and so it would be here.

9. All these instances for Gods not seeing, yet knowing, are contrary to the Doctrine they hold. God doth not see the flood that drowned the world, he seeth not Naamans leprosie, why so? because
because these things have no being; but here is their grand absurdity, that they hold sin hath still an objective existence in us, to God's understanding, and yet he doth not see it. They should have instanced in some thing that hath a being, and yet for all that, God not see it. If Naaman's leprosie had continued on him still, and yet God not see it, then it had been to the purpose: for they grant, that we have truly sin in us, and we are to judge so; yet though it hath such a being in us, God doth not see it.

10. What an empty cobweb is this distinction, even for that very purpose they bring it? Oh, say they, If God see sin, he is of so pure a nature, that he cannot be but horribly and infinitely displeased with us. Those (say they) that hold God seeth sin in believers, consider not how loathsom, even the least sin is in his eyes. But will this comfort my conscience, if they say at the same time, though God doth not see it, yet he knoweth it? Alas, God is of that pure nature, that if he knoweth but the least sin by me, he cannot but be infinitely displeased at it. So that you see this distinction will no ways ease a believer in point of the trouble of his conscience. And thus have I laboured to break the heart of this false and ignorant distinction.
Lect. XII.

Propositions shewing how farre God's taking notice of sinne, so as to punish it, is subject to the meer liberty of his Will.

Heb. 4. 13.

All things are naked and opened to him, &c.

The second answer made by the Antinomians to this Argument from God's Omniscience is this, For when we say, How weak and absurd is it to hold, God doth not see that which we see? They answer (Honey-Comb pag. 61.) Here we oppose the power of God against his Will, for he seeth all things, saving that which he undertakes to abolish out of his own sight, that he may not see it, so that by his mysticall cloathing of us with his Sonnes righteousness, he hath abolished it out of his own sight, though not out of ours. Now we told you that this answer is not universally to be flighted: For our Divines, Parens and others, (as I mentioned before) maintaining that remission of sinne, though it be the utter deletion of the guilt, yet not the full eradication and abolition of the filth, but that it still continueth in us, make this objection to themselves, Nothing is hid or covered from God's eyes: if therefore sinne be there, he cannot but see it: To this they answer, God seeth all, but what he will not see; and that is a known saying of Anstins, Noluit advertere, noluit animadvertere, noluit agnoscere, maluit ignoscere, God will not take notice of the sins of
of justified persons, he will not punish them, he had rather forgive them. It seemeth then by this, That God will not see sinne in believers to condemnation, but yet he will to castigation; but if Christ hath fully satisfied God's wrath, and it be a meer arbitrary thing in God, whether he will chastise or no, why then should not God's anger and his chastisements be removed from the godly by Christ's death, as well as his justice and punishments? It's therefore worthy the inquiry, How far God's taking notice of sinne so as to chastise or punish it, is subject to the meer liberty of his Will: And in answering of this, I will not range as far as this Question will carry me: for the total discussion of it in its large extent, will be when we speak of the meritorious cause of Justification against Socinians. To speak therefore in a more restricted way of this matter; Consider these Propositions, some whereof are ground-workes and foundations, the other more immediately reaching to our scope in hand.

First, There is in God a liberty and free will, whereby he doth whatsoever he pleaseth, so that as the Psalmist faith, He that made the eye to see, shall not be seen? He that maketh man to know, shall not he know? and thus he that gave man and Angels this perfection of freedom, shall not he much more be free? Therefore those titles of ἀνεξάρτητος and ἀναρχικός, which the Greek Fathers sometimes give to the will of man, are too proud and lofty, and do more properly belong to God. Indeed so farre as freedom is conceived in creatures to have some potential ἀναφορά indifferency, or τὸ ἐν ἀμφιέσθεν, a suspendedness to be determined by some other, so farre we are not to conceive it in God; for this mutability or Potential indetermination, is an imperfection; and so that same potestas peccandi, power to sinne, which some make necessary to liberty, and which they call a perfection, though they grant the action of sin itself to be an imperfection, (though this should be granted, which must not) yet neither could this be found in God's liberty: and no marvel, seeing that it is not in the liberty of Christ's humane will, for though Christ's obedience was truly and properly so, being under a command of God, yet not only as he was God, but as he was man, he was ἀνεξάρτητος, and ἀνεξάρτητος impeccable, or free from the temptation of sin. Therefore it's detestable blasphemy of Durand, and other Schoolmen, say-
How far God's punishing of sin is subject

ing, Christ might have sinned, lib. 3. Sentent. dist. 12. que. 2. as also of the Remonstrants, who say, Christ after he had taken this Office of a Mediatorship, might have forsaken it, and given it over, but of this more in its proper place; God, therefore is a free agent, Ps. 135. 6. He hath done whatsoever he pleased in heaven and earth; so that he made not the world as the fire burneth, or the Bees make their Honey Combs, by a natural necessity, but according to the counsel of his will; hence it is, that all his spiritual mercies become commended unto us, under the title of grace: There was no natural or moral necessity, obliging God to elect us, to give his Son for us, or to save us; and indeed it could not be liberality, if it were not a libero, from one that is free.

2. How freedom may be extended to God.

Propos. 2. According to the different descriptions of liberty and freedom, so it may be extended, larger, or narrower unto the actions of God. Those who make liberty consistent with a necessity of immutability, and do not think indifferency necessary, but only knowledge and judgement going before, they extend it even to the goodness and holiness of God; so they say, God is liber bonus, freely good, and doth freely love himself, so they make the confirmed Angels and Saints, freely to love God, though necessarily; thus we sinne freely, though necessarily. But others, who make a power to do, or not do, necessary to liberty, think it a kind of blasphemy to say, God doth freely will that which is good, hence they make liberty not an attribute of his nature, as holiness, omnipotence, &c. are, but an affection of his Will only, and they think that necessarium and contingens, under which liberty is comprehended, are differences of ens in its full latitude, as finitum and infinitum; therefore as the same thing cannot be finite and infinite, so neither necessary and free: but this is to put the definition of liberty into too strait fetter, as in time may be shewn. I joyn with those, that think immutability and liberty may be in the same act, and that God doth freely, though unchangeably love himself; but that freedom of his actions to the creatures, is with a power to do otherwise if he pleaseth.

There is also another kind of liberty mentioned by the Learned, which is opposed to servitude, and is the same with sui juris; now God in all things is this way free: He hath no law imposed upon
upon himself by any other, but only what he prescribeth him- 
selves, that doth he work by; therefore when we say, It's just with
God to damn an impenitent sinner, this justice ariseth not from
any obligation put upon him by another, but what he hath eternally
prescribed himself.

Propof. 3. God's omnisciency, or his bare seeing and taking no-
tice of sin, when it is, is not subject to his liberty. He cannot but see
whatsoeuer is, and also possible to be, so that we cannot say pro-
perly God seeth all things because he will see them; for this is an
attribute founded in the nature of God; but if we take know-
ledge or seeing for the effects accompanying them, as the Scrip-
ture for the most part doth, because God is not an idle spec-
tator of things, but upon his seeing, there is either care and prote-
elion, or anger and punishment, then in this sense, all these effects
are subject in some sense to the liberty and free-will of God. God
cannot but see the adultery of David, but whether he will see it,
as to punish David for it in his own person, or in Christ; or
whether he will chastise him at this time, or in this manner, that
is merely at the good pleasure of God. Whether indeed he is
free to punish at all, or chastise at all, you will hear in the other
Propositions; thus much we may conclude, That God cannot
abolish sin so out of his sight, so that with his eyes of omnisci-
ency he should not behold it, when it is there.

Propof. 4. In respect of God's liberty and freedom, there is great
difference between the attributes of God, as also the exercises and
actions of them. There are some properties that require no ob-
ject for the exercise, but they make it; thus the omnipotency of
God doth not finde, but make its object. Again, there are o-
thers, though they require an object, yet not any condition or circumstance in it; so the wisdom of God can and doth
order every object, let it be what it will be, to a glorious end.
It ordered an harmonious world out of a Chaos, he made all
things, quâ omnipotens, as omnipotent, and ordered them all,
quâ sapiens, as a wise God. But then there are other attributes,
which though essentiell to him, yet cannot be exercised, but
where the objects are so and so conditionated; as that mercy of
God, whereby he doth forgive sins, requireth an object penitent
and believing; so that justice of God, whereby it is punitive

3. We cannot properly say
God seeth all things because he will see them.

4. Great difference in respect of God's fre-
dom between the attributes of God, and the actions of
them.
and vindicative of sinne, requireth an object, that is a sinner and
impenitent; now in the actions about the objects of the former
sort God is every way free, he might have created the world,
or not have created it; but in the actions of the later sort, though
he be also free, yet not so, as to use justice or not justice, when
there is an object, with its due condition. As now it was free to
God, whether he would make man or no, it was free for him,
whether he would permit man to fall or no, but when fallen, not
free whether he would be just or no: Thus God is free, whether
he will procure, or prepare an object of justice; but then when
he hath so prepared an object, then he is not loosed from the ob-
ligation of justice. To procure an object of justice ariseth from
the Soveraigny and meer freedom of God: Hence Gods per-
mission of sinne, or reprobation negative, which is the passing by
of some, are not acts of justice properly so called; but condemna-
tion for sinne is truly and properly justice. The former arise from
Gods supream dominion and freedom. When an object of justice
is, there is an obligation to execute the same upon it, but not when
an object of mercy is, because its necessary to mercy that it should
be indebita, but to justice, debita.

I do not here intend to meddle with that question, Whether
God absolutely might not have let sinne go unpunished, and
yet forgive it, as we see men can: (This is disputed even among
the Orthodox; some are for the negative, as Piscator, Lubertus,
&c. others for the affirmative, as Davenant, Twift, &c. but the
proper place for this will be, when we speak of Christ's satis-
faction,) nor yet with that other of the Schoolmen, Whether
God may absolutely accept of a sinner to pardon and eternall
life, though he do not regenerate or sanctifie him; these are to
be handled in their proper place. You see by this delivered,
how farre the actions of Gods justice may be said to be free, or
not free.

Propof. 5. Whosever may be said in an absolute sense about
Gods justice, yet since that threatening promulg'd, (In the day
thou eateft thereof, thou shalt die the death) God cannot in
justice but punish sinners. Though it be in his freedom whether
he will give thee a being or no, yet if thou art an obstinate sinner,
it is not in his freedom whether he will damn thee or no; so that
as God cannot but love that Image of his holines where he seeth it, so he cannot but hate the contrary wheresoever it is, though that hatred shall not alwaies fall upon the person in whom it is, because removed by Christ.

It is Camerons opinion, that the word justitia, δικαιοσύνη, when attributed to God, doth alwaies signifie goodness, mercy, salvation, redemption, but never in the Scripture (faith he) doth it denote an affection in God whereby he avengeh himself upon sinners; but that the words ira and judicium, anger and judgement express this; But though the word signifie to sometimes, yet in some places it must needs mean this disposition in God, Psal. 9. 5. 1 Tim. 4. 8. 2 Thes. 1. 6. so that in some sense, we may with several Orthodox men say, Justice is essential to God. Sin is not indeed Physically contrary to God, as water is to fire, for if it were so, God would not suffer it to be, because he is an infinite good; as if there were infinite fire or light, there could not be any water or darkness; but it is morally contrary to him, Hab. 1. Thou art of purer eyes then to behold iniquity; even sinnes against any positive command of God, that are sinnes only because prohibited, they are thus far against his nature, and not his will only; because it is against his nature, to have his will and commands disobeyed in any thing, he being the supream and most holy Lawgiver. If God did only punish sinne because he will, and not because he is essentially just, there could no true cause be given, why Heathens should have terrouer in their consciences after sins committed, seeing the word is not revealed unto them, declaring Gods will: and when the Scripture speaks of God punishing sins, it doth not attribute it to Gods meer will, because he will do so, but to his justice, Rev. 16. 5. 7. Thus Exod. 24. God is described by this property, not acquitting the guilty. Now when we say, God cannot but punish sinne with death since the promulgation of the threatening, that is not so to be understood, as if then only the tie and obligation of justice came upon God, but it was from eternity: for as God did in time reveal this threatening; so he did from all eternity will this threatening, and so therefore from all eternity it was just with God to punish a sinner, neither could he forgive him without a satisfaction. This is diligently to be observed, because men speak sometimes, as if vin-
dicative justice were then only due when the actual threatening was; whereas the executions of God in time, are, as his decrees were, from eternity; and truly we should not give way to such Disputes, Whether God could have pardoned absolutely, or provided any other way and remedy, when we see God pitching upon this, and the Scripture only revealing this. Hence the Scripture commandeth us to eschew sins, not meekly because of his will only, but because he is holy in his nature, Lev. 11. 44.Josh. 24. 19. It is true, Gods hatred and displacency of sin cannot but be, yet the distinction of it actually to punishment comes in some sense under his liberty.

Propof. 6. Though God cannot but take notice of sinne, so as to punish it, yet it is under his freedom, whether he will punish it in their own persons, or in a Surety, and by this means the wisdom of God found out an excellent temperament of justice and mercy, so that the one doth not oppose the other; notwithstanding Gods justice, yet his love and wisdom put him upon that remedy, which neither men or Angels could have excogitated; so that God doth not let sin go unpunished, only he provideth a Ram to be sacrificed for Isaac, a mediator to come between his wrath and us. It is true, reason (as we see) doth much gainsay this mystery; but we may say Mulier ifa traeat, Let this woman hold her peace in the Church of God: Though therefore God cannot but execute justice upon sinners, yet his justice did admit of a temperament, whereby God doth proceed to see the sins of his people, to hate them, but yet to punish them upon Christ.

Propof. 7. There is a great difference between Justice, as it is an essential property in God ad intra, and between the effects of it ad extra. These latter come much under the liberty and freedom of God, which appeareth in the variety of his judgements upon wicked men, some being consumed one way, and some another, so that it is meekly at his pleasure, whether he will stir up more or less wrath. Psal. 2. There is a little anger of his spoken of: but you may read a remarkable expression, Psal. 78. 38. He turned away his wrath from them, and stirred not up all his wrath. Here you see the anger of God subject to his free will. If the effects of Gods justice should flow from him as burning from fire, or drowning from water, the whole world were not able to endure.
to the meer liberty of his Will.

dure before him who is a Consuming fire. How could it come about, that the wicked do so overflow with prosperity in this world, if so be, that God did necessarily punish and destroy, which are effects of his justice? so that there is a great difference between justice taken for an attribute, and justice for the effects; God cannot but be always just in the former, whereas there is a liberty in the later. As in man, the power of laughing is an essential property in him, yet the act of laughter ariseth in some measure by the freeness of his will. Hence it is, that God's essential justice doth not receive more or less, but the effects of his justice may be more or less: If many men be in the same sin, and God doth punish some of them with a remarkable temporall judgement, we may not say, God dealeth more justly with these then the other; yet we may say, the effects of his justice are greater upon some then others.

Propof. 8. Christ satisfied God as a just Judge, not as a Father provoked, and by this means, though punishments are taken away, yet afflictions for sin are not; and this doth directly answer the whole question; whereas it is demanded, Seeing Christ fully reconciled God to us, and thereby all punishments are taken away, why not as well all afflictions? if he hath removed greater, will he think much at the least? The answer lieth fully in this, Christ by his blood and satisfaction undertook that the justice of God should never fall upon us to punish us, not that he should never be angry with us as a Father to chastise us. By this redemption, his Christ's will that God should not as a just Judge, require compensation of us; not, that as a provoked Father, he should not scourge us for our sins when committed. The reason is clear, because fatherly anger is an effect of love; but punishment, the fruit of hatred. And thus now you see, why God will not see sin to condemnation, because Christ hath made up that; yet he will see it in believers to angry chastigation, because Christ did not interpose there: it is therefore no derogation to Christ's death, no injury to his sufferings, if notwithstanding them, God doth afflict for sin, even his own children.

Propof. 9. By reason of this anger of God against sin, even still abiding, those afflictions which come upon believers, are from a convenience with the justice of God. Although we cannot say rigidly,
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Afflictions on Believers agreeable to Gods Justice.

That if God did not chastise believers for their sins, he were unjust: yet we may say, his afflicting of them, is becomine his justice, partly because he hath prescribed this Law to himself, 1 Sam 7. 14. Even as to wicked men upon their obstinate sinning, to punish them; so upon his own, if they offend, to chasten them; and partly by afflicting of his people for their sinne, he demonstrates the hatred of it unto the world. Although therefore, God do not alwaies chastise every godly man, but sometimes by their repentance these very chastishments are either prevented or removed, yet when God doth thus break out in his anger against them, this is becoming his just nature, and the world thereby seeth how he is displeased with it. One of the Articles which Arminius relateth, as laid against him, was, that he should hold, the temporall afflictions of believers, were not chastisements but punishments, properly so called. To this he answereth, pag. 103. Resp. ad Articulos 31. That the calamities inflicted upon David for his sin, in the matter of Uriah, may be called punishments properly; and that the Text seemeth to be better explained so, and yet withall, that there will be no favour to the Popish opinion, for he grants that Christ satisfied both for eternall and temporall punishments, but yet God when he takes off the spirituall punishment, may for a while reserve the temporall, as though Christ hath taken away the jus, the power and right death hath over us, yet he hath not quite destroyed actual death: but all this is a meer itching, to innovate needlessly in Religion; for if Christ have satisfied for temporall death, then though it be not removed presently, yet it cannot abide as a punishment strictly.
Lect. XIII.

Sheweth, That Sinnes are Debts.

Matth. 6.12.

And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors.

This Text shall be the last (because the noblest) to prove, That God seeth sin in those that are believers: for if they be bound to pray, that God would forgive them their debts, therefore they are involved in debts, and in deep humility they are to acknowledge this, with all desiring the cancelling or blotting them out; so that as the Church anciently used this place against those Pelagian Doctrines, which dreamed of a perfection in this life, and immunity from all sin, no lefse doth it overthrow those novel Assertions, of being without sin (though not inherently) yet as to God's eye and account. What Tertullian said of the Lord's prayer in general, is most true of this Petition. Quantum substringitur verbi, tantum diffunditur sensibus, it is as comprehensive in sense, as straitened in words. So in this Petition you have few leaves of words, but much fruit of matter. Its like Christ's Mustard-seed, which by a good Interpreters managing, will grow into a tall tree. The material things that belong to remission of sins, I shall inclose as pertinent to my purpose.

In the words you have the Petition it self, Forgive.

1. The Subject, Us, Disciples and Believers. He that thinketh himself without sin, that very thought is a sin in him.

2. The Object or matter of Petition, Our debts, that is, as Luke 11 expounds it, sins.

3. The Condition or Qualification of those who are to ex-
pea pardon [As we forgive our debtors] which words are not to be understood causally and meritoriously of our justification, nor as if we did hereby teach God to imitate us: Therefore those expressions of the Ancients, intimating that in other things we imitate God, but here God doth us, are not rigidly justifiable, Cassianus Coll.9.c.23. reproveth some, that would not forgive others, but yet left they should lie in their prayer, they would leave this part out of the Petition: But our Saviour maketh this a necessary qualification for Remission of sin, whether we express it or not.

Lastly, There is the particle of order, And; so that the very connexion of it to the Petition for daily bread, doth teach us, first, That our hearts are not to stay long in prayer for temporal things, but presently to return to spiritual: As some fowls of the air, suddenly catch their prey off the ground, but dare not abide, lest they should be ensnared; so ought we to do in our affections about heavenly things: many times the Bee is drowned in its own honey. Hence we have but one Petition for earthly things, and two for spiritual things, belonging to our selves; this, and the Petition following; In this, we pray for remission of sinne; in the following, for sanctification; which are the summe of the New Covenant. Besides this order doth well teach us, That although we have all bodily necessaries, yet if our finnes are not forgiven we cannot take any delight in any worldly advantage whatsoever.

I shall begin with the object of the Petition, which is in the Text debts. Sins are so called to aggravate the nature of them, and make us more fearfull and cautelous how we run into them. As Solomon speaks of Suretiship for another, deliver thy self like the swift Roe; the same is much more to be applied to our sins, which are debts of a more terrible nature. Now when sins are called debts, or said to be forgiven, it's a Metaphor from pecuniary debts, as the debtor was said there when he did pay his money, and it is generally used of any that are obnoxious to punishment; so the Grecians say, ἐκλείψεως, and the Latins pœnas debere. So the Hebrew word דָּמָם is used both for debts and guilt, Dan.1.10. Ezek.18.7. as also for sinne, Exod.32. and רעָexpects which is applied to a sinner, Jam.2.20. is also frequently
**Why Sins are called Debts.**

By used of punishments, as Matth. 5. 21, 22. The Observation,

**Sins are Debts.** This is excellently described, Matth. 18. 24. Where our sins against God are not only compared to a debt, but a debt of a vast summe, ten thousand talents, which there is no hope for us ever to discharge, so that the aggravation of a sin lieth in this, that it is against God; therefore observe, that offence which man doth against man, is compared to an hundred pence only, but that which we do against God, to ten thousand talents. O that men therefore who account it such a misery and slavery to be in money-debts, would bemoan their condition of sin-debts.

As sins are debts, so God is said to have a debt-book, wherein he writeth all our transgressions. Hence is that phrase of blotting them out, and of cancelling the handwriting that is against us. This handwriting in the Scripture should as much appal and astonish us, as that on the wall did Belshazzar. So that phrase, melanimede, not to reckon, or impute, is taken from accounts in debts. But to open the point,

1. Let us consider, what in sin is a debt. And

2. Why sins are called debts.

In sin there is the obliquity and dissonancy from the Law of God; and this is not called a debt, for we do not owe this to God, but the contrary, obedience and holiness. In sin there is a guilt and obligation unto eternal punishment, and this is properly a debt: but yet in this Petition we must not limit it to the later respect only, but include both, the deformity and demerit of sin, that God would forgive both. What it is in sin that doth denominate a sinner will in time be discussed.

2. Consider why they are called debts, and that may be in these respects,

1. Because upon our sin, we owe God his honour, his glory, yea, his very Deity again, which as much as lieth in us, we by transgressions have taken away. Omne peccatum est quasi Deicidium, say the Schools. Every sin doth as it were deprive God (as much as lieth in a sinner) of his Godhead and blessedness; so that if God were capable of misery and grief, thy sins would bring it upon him. Hence are those expressions of being pressed by our sins as a Cart is under Sheaves, Amos 2. 13. And the Prophet 

*Ezekiel*
Why Sins are called Debts.

Ezekiel his lying so many days on one side, and then on the other, to his great pain and trouble, was, as some think, to represent, how much God was affected with the Israelites' sins, and how great his patience was to endure them so long. If then they said to David, Thou art worth ten thousand of us: How much rather may we say to God, Thy honour, thy glory, its worth ten thousand thousand of us? Its fitter for us to be damned, or annihilated, then the least glimpse of his glory obscured. For this is such a debt in sinne, as we are never able to make up again. If a mean peafant should defame a great King, and reproach him, he were never able to make satisfaction in way of honour to him, how much rather is this true of us, seeing there is no proportion between that which is finite and infinite?

2. A sinner is a debtor to God's Justice to satisfy that: and hereby it is, that Christ gave himself a price for our sins, and reconciled God to us; for we were not in that condition, as to say with the servant in the Parable, Mat. 18. Have patience, and I will pay thee all I owe. They have low and narrow thoughts of sinne, which think any external or internal humiliation for sin, can be satisfactory to God's Justice. Hence the godly do not (as the Antinomians charge them) put any such meritorious efficacy, and causality in them. They attribute not that to their tears, which belongs to Christ's blood; they do not judge their crucifying sin to be equivalent with Christ crucified; they do not in practice that which some have done in opinion; say, they are the Messiah or Christ; and certainly if the Psalmist say, we cannot ransom our selves from the grave, much lefs can we from hell. Now this debt of God's Justice is in every sin, the least idle thought or word: we may say of every sin pardoned, here is the price of blood, even of Christ's blood.

3. Sinners not able to satisfy God's Justice, in the next place, we by sin become debtors to everlasting punishment in hell; so that as the murderer or flagitious person by his crimes, becomes a debtor to the capital punishments to be inflicted by a Law, so doth a sinner to the Scripture punishments threatened in the Word; so that hell and damnation are the proper wages that are due to him. Oh! how dear doth every pleasant, or profitable sinne cost thee? Thou owest eternal damming for it. Chrysostom in his time
We have the evil Properties of Debtors.

complained of some in his time, who would say, Give me that which is sweet, &c. &c., and let it choke me: so do all sinners, Give me that sinfull profit and pleasure, though I am obliged to eternal wrath thereby. Ambrose thought wicked men were called debtors, because the devil lends them their lusts and sins as so much money, for which he will exact eternal torment as the usu-ry of them. Whatsoever it be, certainly this notion of sins being debts, ought much to affect and trouble thee. Thy sins are worse debts then any thou owest.

4. In sin we become debtors by this means, All the good we have, whether natural or supernatural, we are betrusted with as so many talents, and for abusing of these, or not improving of them we become debtors unto God. You have a full Parable to this purpose, Matth. 25. Where you have every opportunity, even the least that God puts into our hands, compared to a talent, and that for the greatness and preciousness of it, and a man may be accountable unto God, either propter damnum emergens, for the loss that comes to our Master therein, or for lucrum essans, the very ceasing of gain. As that servant who hid his talent in a napkin, and returned it safe again, though he was not guilty of any prodigal decoction of it, yet he is called a wicked and unprofitable servant. Now, because all our talents are many, hence our debts do arise to an infinite summe: none so indebted as those who have great wealth, great parts, Sicut crescent dona, sic crescent rationes donorum, The more mercies, the greater account to be given. This consideration may deeply humble us.

As our sins are thus debts, so we have all naturally the evil properties, and wicked customs of all debtors.

1. We are very unwilling to be called to any account: We do not love to hear of the day of Judgement; we love not that the Ministers of God should tell us of our bills, and hand-writings that are against us. Hence some observe that expressi- on, Matth. 18. 24. When the Master begun to reckon, it is said, One was brought that owed ten thousand talents, as if it were by force; and he was haled to his Master. Into what an amazement and astonishment will that voice from Heaven put us into, Give an account of thy Stewardship,

Q. 2

4. All the good we have, we are betrusted with as so many tal- lents.
We have the evil Properties of Debtors.

unless Christ be our Surety, and he undertake to discharge all? So that the very word debts, may breed in us much love to Christ, who was willing to stand engaged for us. Phocian the Athenian, coming to one in publick office, that was very solicitous about giving up his accounts, and (faith he) I am solicitous how I may give no account at all. Thus, if it were possible, would every man be studious how he may decline that day of accounts: How gladly would he have the grave to detain him there always?

2. We are full of shame and fear. Thus are men in debt, desirous to lie latitants, and not to be seen. Grave vocabulum debitorum, said Ambrose. The name of debts is very dreadful and terrible. Hence Ambrose speaketh of some, who for the shame and distress thereof, have made away themselves, fearing more, opprobrium vita, then mortis periculum, the reproach of life, then the punishment of death. Stidias speaks of a Proverb in lit. A. Απεξ πυρός και ἁνδυς χλωρε, Once red with blushing at the time of borrowing, and afterwards ten times pale for fear of paying. Canis latrat, & cor tum pulpit. Ambr. de Tob.c.7. The dog doth but bark, and thy heart seareth an arrest: and if men have been thus perplexed about worldly debts, when yet death would at last release them; how much more may men be afraid of these spiritual debts? There was a certain Roman died in a vast summe of debts, which in his life time he concealed, and after his death, when his goods were to be sold, Augulfus the Emperour sent to buy his pillow he lay upon, because, faith he, I hope that would make me sleep, on which a man so much indebted could take his ease. It is much that we who have so many debts spiritual, can sleep, or eat, or drink, till we see them discharged by Christ. Oh that every natural man should not like Cain, fear every thing would damn him!

3. Of shifts and delays.

3. To shift and put off, to be in continual delays, and if so, to be no further troubled. This is a custom in worldly debts, if men can shift one way or other, they care not: Hence Horace calls the wicked debtor, Sceleratus Proteus, fret aper, modo avis, modo saxum, & cun volet arbor, become in all shapes, to evade the Creditor, and thus it is in spiritual debts. How unwilling to acknowledge our debts, to confess them to God? I look upon all Pelagian
Spiritual Debts exceed worldly.

lagian Doctrines on one side, and Antinomian opinions on the other side, which would either make no sinne in us, or at least, not to be taken notice of by God, but as so many cozening cheats, of a guilty heart, that is unwilling to be found a debtor before God. Cum delationem inpetraveris, gaudes, said Ambrose, of a Debtor. If men can but delay, they do rejoice. And are we not all thus naturally affected, if we can from day to day, get one worldly comfort after another, and so be able to support our selves, we think all is well? .tabs ngaaparot or aipn apode, nothing is more troublesome then to hear, Pay what thou owest: Do not therefore please thy self with delays and excuses, left thou die in thy misery.

4. To hate those to whom we are indebted: Leve as alienum debitorem facit grave inimicum, A little money borrowed makes a man a debtor, but a great deal, an enemy; and so the more they owe, the more they hate; โิ epeilontes eilota ณ είνας οις epeilous, said Aristotle, Debtors with their Creditors to have no being, such is the hatred that arises thereby: and this is most eminently true in wicked men. They hate God, because they fear him as a just Judge, who will severely demand to the last farthing: Comfortable therefore is this direction, to pray in this Petition, for hereby is supposed, that God is propitious, and ready to release us; we may have a Jubile every day; No Devil hath any warrant to say, Forgive us our sins, God hath cast them into utter darkness, and bound them up in perpetual chains for their debts, but he is ready to forgive us. As therefore we read of David, That men in debt and distress followed him, hoping thereby to be freed from their Creditors hands, so let us follow Christ, who only is able to take off this heavy burden from us, and know the longer we lie in our debts, the more they will increase upon us.

Now in two respects, Spiritual debts do exceed worldly debts:

1. In the danger of non-paiment: Suppose the highest punishments that we reade of in Histories against perfidious debtors, yet that doth not amount to the punishment of our spiritual debts. In some Laws they were bound to sell their children, yea themselves to become slaves, Exod. 21. 7. Exod. 22. 2.

Q 3 2 King.

4. We hate those to whom we are indebted.
Spiritual Debts exceed worldly Debts.

2 King. 4:1. Thus God commanded in the Jewish Laws. This was very miserable, to have children sold for parents debts. Valentinian the Emperor would have such put to death that were not able to pay their debts; but above all, that Law in the twelve Tables, that who was in debt, the Creditors might take him, and cause him to be cut alive in as many pieces as the Creditors pleased. This cruelty, faith Tertullian, was afterwards erased out by publick consent, Suffer the poor to remain in debt; and what is this to that, Mat. 18:30. His master was wroth, and delivered him to the tormentors, till he had paid all that was due? So then chains and imprisonments are the worst of worldly debts, but the eternal wrath of God, falleth upon spiritual debtors.

2. In the impossibility of escaping this punishment. In these debts death will free a man; but then is the beginning of our misery by spiritual debts. So Matth. 5:26. Thou shalt by no means come out, till thou haft paid the utmost farthing; and because we are never able to do that, therefore must our condemnation be eternal. We pity the indebted prisoners, that out of their grates, cry, Bread, bread: But how more dolefull is that cry of Dives out of hell for a drop of water, and none giveth unto him? This is some mitigating consideration to the worst troubles here, that they are not eternal; and it is the aggravation of the least in hell, that they are eternal. Therefore in that the Scripture calls our sins by these names, and we have an innumerable heap of them, let us mourn under the weight of them, and bewail their burden, and this is to be done with all speed, not knowing how soon justice may take us by the throat, saying, Pay that thou owest.

The Use may be of Instruction to the godly, that notwithstanding their justification, and forgivenes of sins past, yet they run into debt daily, and such debts, as for the pardon of them, they must renew daily sorrow and confession, as also sue out continual pardon; for certainly our Saviour did not direct us to say this Petition humiliter only, for humility fake, as some of old thought; but also veraciter, truly, and if it be true, then we are not in a cold customary way of lukewarmness to beg this pardon, but with the same deep sense, conflict and agony of spirit,
We should earnestly desire Remission of Sins.

spirit, as we see malefactors importune the Judge for a pardon. Now if there were a malefactor, that thought the Judge saw no crimes, nor matter of death in him; but on the contrary, that he was altogether righteous and free, how could this man with any deep remorse and acknowledgment bewail himself? So that this Petition containeth excellent Doctrine as well as practice. Tertullian called the Lords-Prayer, Breviarum Evangelii, a Breviary or Summe of the Gospel; for legem credendi, adde & operandi, lex statuit supplianti, said another, The Law or Rule of Prayer, teacheth the rule of Faith and practice; and this is very true in this Petition, which teacheth both Doctrine and Practice against the Antinomians. It is true, they make glosses upon this Text, but such cursed ones, as do wholly corrupt it; Do not therefore think that Justification giveth thee such a quietus est, that new sins daily committed by thee, should be no matter of humiliation or confession; certainly our Saviours command is, That we should desire this forgiveness, as often as we do our daily bread.
LECT. XIV.

That justified persons are to pray for the Forgiveness of sinne in a proper sense, and not only for the sense of Pardon: With the meaning of the Petition, Forgive us, &c.

MATTH. 6.12.

And forgive us our debts.

We have already considered the object in this Petition, viz. sinnes, which according to the Syriak Idiotism are called debts, as alms are called righteousness, v. i. in an Hebrew. The next thing to be treated of, is the Petition itself, Forgive us, i.e., this word is most commonly used by the Apostles to signify pardon of sinne; they have it about seven and twenty times: but more of this when we shew what remission of sinnes is. The work I have for the present to do, is, to shew how comprehensive this Petition is, and what it is we pray for herein. Bellarmine opposing the Doctrine of the Protestants, holding a speciall and peculiar faith, appropriating pardon of sin, mistaking the question, as if we maintained justifying faith to be that whereby we believe our sinnes are certainly forgiven us in Christ, chargeth this absurdity upon us, lib. i. de Justif. Cap. 10. That we take away this Petition in the Lords Prayer: For faith he, If I be bound certainly to believe my sins are forgiven already, it
What is meant by Forgiveness of Sins.

It would be as absurd to pray that God would forgive us our sins, as to pray Christ might be incarnated, seeing we believe he was incarnated already. And 1.4. de notis Ecclesia, c. i. f. he makes this opinion of the Protestants, holding we are righteous before God for Christ's sake, and the believing of this with a special faith, to be comparable with any Paradox in the World, as not being above or besides, but plainly contrary to all reason, and as that which makes it impossible for us to say, Forgive us our sins, unless we lie. It is true, according to the Antinomian Divinity, which faith, there is no sin now in the Church, this Prayer doth no more belong to us than to the Angels in heaven: therefore the Antinomian makes not the meaning of this Prayer to be as if we prayed for the forgiveness which we had not before, but only for more full and rich assurance of it: Honey-Comb pag. 156. But the sequell will shew the falsity of both these Assertions.

Obser. It is the duty of justified persons to pray for the forgiveness of their sins. To understand this, we will shew, first, what is the express meaning of this Petition; and then, what is the implied sense of it.

In the first place, our meaning in this Petition is, That God would not require of us the payment and satisfaction of his justice for our sins. We have a Parable, Luk 16.8. of an unjust steward, who called his Lords debtors, who bid him that owed an hundred measures of oil, set down fifty: but if God should condense thus far to us, in stead of millions of sins we owe, to set down but an hundred; yea, should we come down as low in the number of sins, as Abraham of his righteous men, yet that would not avail us. Yea, as long as there is but a farthing, the least sin unpaid, so long are we unable to give an account to God. We therefore desire of God, That he would not call upon us to pay for the least vain thought, or idle word, much less for those more grievous sins which we have committed. As it is, Not unto us Lord, not unto us, let the glory be given: So not of us Lord, not of us, let thy justice be satisfied.

2. We pray, That God would lay our sins upon Christ, and accept of satisfaction in and through him: for seeing God hath declared his will, that man shall die for sin; if we should pray, that God would absolutely forgive our sins, it would be to pray, that he R

Obser. It is the duty of justified persons to pray for forgiveness of their sins. The meaning of the Petition Forgive us, &c. 1. That God would not require of us the satisfaction of his justice for our sins.

2. That God would lay our sins on Christ,
A two-fold difference between God's forgiving our sins, and our forgiving of others.

There is a two-fold difference between God's forgiveness of our sins, and our forgiving of others. First, we may, and ought in some cases to forgive others freely, without any satisfaction at all, but God hath bound himself to another way. Yet God's grace is much to be magnified and extolled in pardon, as we shall shew against the Socinian. Again secondly, we may and ought to forgive others though they do not repent and ask pardon of us; but God hath declared his will otherwise: we do not therefore pray, that God would out of an absolute Sovereignty and dominion, remit our sins; but that he would account them upon Christ, and take him for our Surety. As the Prophets wife who died in debt, was wonderfully relieved by the Prophets oil, so that she was enabled to satisfy all her creditors; no less advantageous is the blood of Christ to us, whereby the justice of God is appeased towards us. Therefore in this prayer, thus we may argue, O Lord, we call not upon thee to repeal any threatening, to nullify thy word, to become unjust; but thy wisdom hath found out a way that we may be pardoned, and thou satisfied. Neither will this be any injury to Christ, to lay them upon him though innocent, for this he voluntarily undertook, and he is not made a Surety or Mediator against his will, neither in the midst of all his agonies and troubles he grappled with, did he repent of his Suretyship, or desire to give it over: so that there goeth more to make this Petition good, and possible, then did to make the world at first, for there it cost Christ but a word, Let there be light, and there was light, but it is not so here, Let there be pardon, and there shall be pardon; besides Christ's speaking, there must be his doing and suffering.

3. As we pray for justification, so also for continuance and preservation in it. As we pray for daily bread, though our store be full; so, though our justification be sure and persevering, yet by prayer we are to be preserved in it. A certain knowledge and faith of a thing, takes not away Prayers; we know certainly God will gather a Church, and preserve it to the end of the world; yet we pray, Thy Kingdom come. Paul knew, Acts 27. 24. that none in the ship with him should perish, because God had given him their lives, yet none can doubt, but he prayed for their preservation, as well as used other means. Howsoever now
Forgive us our debts.

now grievous sins committed by a David or Peter, may fasten upon them, as the Viper upon Paul's hand, yet by the grace of God, they shall not be able to extate them out of God's favour, but at last their repentance will revive, and so they will sue out a pardon; and certainly God's power and grace is no less seen in preserving of us in the state of Justification, then at first justifying us.

4. We do not only pray for preservation in this estate, but for daily renewed acts of pardon, and imputation of Christ's righteousness. However, as in the controversy part is to be shewed, Justification is not reiterated, but is a state in which we were at first believing put into, without Apostacy from it, either total or final; yet those particular acts of pardon, and imputing of Christ's righteousness, are continually by God communicated unto us: neither may we think that our sins past, present, and to come, are all taken away by one sentence, so that there is no new or iterated pardon. Then indeed Bellarmine's Argument would have strength in it, that it were as absurd to pray for forgiveness of sin, as to have Christ new incarnated, or that we might be predestinated, according as some have fallly said, Si non sis predestinati, ora ut predestineris. If thou art not predestinated, pray that thou mayest be. We might indeed pray for the believing of these things in a more settled manner, but not for the things themselves. But this is the proper answer to Bellarmine's Objection, we pray for pardon of sin, and not for the incarnation of Christ, or the making of the world, because these were so once done, that they are never to be done more. The incarnation of Christ was once done, and is not to be done again; but remission of sin is so done, as that it is continually to be done for us, and the ultimate, complete effect of it will then only be, when sin shall be quite taken away, so that a total and full remission will be only at the day of judgement, as appeareth Act. 3. 19. That your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come: Not but that every sin here forgiven is fully and perfectly forgiven, but because we renew sin daily, therefore there is need of a daily pardon. Away therefore with all such opinions, as shall either plead such an inherent righteousness in the Pelagian way, or such an imputed righteousness in the Antinomian way, that will overthrow this Petition.
5. We pray for the sense and feeling of this pardon in our consciences more and more. For although God hath pardoned our sin, yet if we know not of this, it taketh off much from our comfort, and God's glory; we are in this case like some heir or Prince, that hath many temporal dignities, but by reason of his infancy doth not understand it. Hence David, though Nathan told him, his sin was pardoned, yet Psal. 51, he prayeth for mercy and pardon, and that in a plentifull manner; so that although a sin is perfectly remitted, so that it cannot be more or less forgiven then it is, yet the assurance or knowledge of this may be more or less; and indeed, though to have sins pardoned be an objective happiness, yet to know that they are pardoned, is formal happiness; so that he is compleatly happy, who both hath his sins pardoned, and also knoweth they are so; and this made David, Psal. 103. so exult and rejoice, Bless the Lord, O my soul, who forgiveth all thine iniquities. This particular assurance enlarged his heart to praises. But although this be part of the sense in this Petition, yet this is not all we pray for, as the Antinomian contends; for we pray principally for the real exhibition of pardon, and secondarily for the Declaration and manifestation of it in our consciences. Their conception is, That God from all eternity hath pardoned our sins past, present and to come, and that when we believe or repent, our sins are pardoned declaratively only to our conscience, they being forgiven before. This I shall handle in a question by itself: Only I shall lay down some few Arguments to prove that we do not only pray for assurance and manifestation of pardon, but also for pardon itself. The reasons are these:

First, We might by the same rule interpret all the other Petitions in regard of Declaration only, and not exhibition; when we pray for sanctification and glorification in that Petition, Thy Kingdom come, it might be as well said that we were sanctified and glorified from all eternity, and therefore when we are converted or saved in heaven, this is but to our sense and feeling. This Argument seemeth to be so strong against them, that they have confest
confess a man is already glorified while he is upon earth, most absurdly confounding the Decrees of God from eternity to do things, with the executions of them in time. How ridiculous would it be to expound that Petition, Give us our daily bread, thus? Not that God should give us daily bread, but only make us to see and feel that he hath given it us.

A second reason it, from the nature of forgiveness of sin. When sin is pardoned, it is said to be blotted out: now that blotting out is not only from a man's conscience and feeling, but more immediately out of God's book. So that when God doth forgive, he doth cancel those debts which are in his book, and not only the guilt that lieth upon our hearts, therefore these are very separable the one from the other: A man may feel no weight or burden of sin upon him, and yet it stand in fiery Characters against him in God's book; and on the contrary, a sin may be blotted out there, yet be very heavy and terrible in a man's feeling and apprehension: So sin pardoned is said to be covered or hid, not in respect of us, as if it were taken from our sight, but from God's sight, and he is said to cast our sins behind his back, not ours.

The third reason, This explication, as the whole sense of the Petition, would overthrow all other places of Scripture which make no pardon of sin to be, but where the subject hath such qualifications, as this in the Text of forgiving others, it is not indeed put as a cause or merit, but yet it is as a qualification of the subject, therefore our Saviour repeateth this again, Except ye forgive others, neither will my heavenly Father forgive you. So Matt. 6.43. Whosoever believeth on him, shall have remission of sins Rom. 3.15. He is a propitiation through faith in his blood; here faith is made an instrument to apply and bring that pardon to the soul, which it had not before. So Gen. 1.9. If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins. By these and the like Scriptures it is plain, That remission of sin is given us only in the use of these graces: not that hereby we merit at God's hand, or that God is tied to these ways, but it is here, as in the Sacraments, he hath tied himself to convey his graces in no other Canals or Conduits then he hath appointed.

Lastly, This would make no difference between sins repented of and not repented of, for if they be all pardoned from eternity, then
The meaning of the Petition.

6. We pray that as God forgives the sin, so also he would release the punishments, and take away all the wrath that doth belong to it. It is but a mockery which Papists make about pardon, as if indeed God did pardon the sin, but the punishment that abideth still, and we must work out a release from that by our own selves. It is true as we have proved, God though he doth pardon sin, yet he may grievously afflict; but these are fatherly chastisements, not judicial punishments: but in this Prayer, we desire also that as the sins are removed, so also whatsoever troubles, afflictions and chastisements do remain, that they also may be taken away; that as the gulf of hell is removed, so every Cloud also may be dispelled.

7. In this Petition, we pray, That God would deliver us from those effects of sin, which God hath immutably set upon it; such as are sicknesses, death and corruption; for although God by virtue of the Covenant of grace, hath promised a perfect pardon of sin, yet we cannot come to a full enjoyment of all those privileges which remission of sin doth bring, till we be freed from death and corruption. So that as long as there is the death and grave, till sin hath some power. We therefore pray, that whatsoever mortality and corruption sin hath brought in, it may be taken away, and we made fit for eternal life, which is the consequent of pardon of sin; for you must know that pardon is not a mere privative mercy, freeing us from God's wrath, but there is also a positive investing of us with a title to everlasting life and glory, only our corruptibility hinders us from the actual possession of that which
we have a right unto, we therefore pray, that as God removed our sins, so he would also remove all the sad effects and mischievous fruit which came in by it.

8. We pray not only for pardon of sin, but also for the good concomitants, and effects of it, which are, Peace with God, and joy in the holy Ghost, Rom. 5.1. Hence Luther speaketh of a two-fold pardon, one secret and hidden, when he forgiven sins, but the people of God do not feel or regard it; The other is open and experimental: now both these condonations are necessary; The first (faith he) is more bitter and troublesom, but more noble and acceptable. The first cleanseth, the later pacifieth: The first is of meer faith, and obtaineth much of God; the latter is of experience more, and takes off from the excellency of faith: for as that is the best manifestation of love when it is carried out to an enemy; so is that of faith, when relying upon God, though feeling terrours and an hell within us. God useth the first kinde of pardon to more Heroicall Christians. The later to those that are more infirm. An instance of this two-fold remission we have in Mary Magdalen; the former, when Christ turned his back on her, and told Peter much was forgiven her; the other when he turned towards her, saying, Thy sins are forgiven thee, go in peace. Now in our prayer we must not be limited; but as in the Law every Commandment is spiritual, and hath a great latitude in it; so in Prayer every Petition is spiritual, and hath much in it: let us therefore enlarge our hearts, and open them wide, when we seek to God for pardon of sin. The priviledge is exceeding great, and many are the dignities that do depend on it. If thy sins be pardoned, thou becomest a favourite of heaven, there is no contrariety between God and thee. The devil shewed the glory of the world, and falsly said, All this is mine, but thou maiest shew all the glory of the Gospel, and promises, yea all the glory of heaven, and say, All this is mine. Yea there is a full reconciliation made between God and that person, notwithstanding all former enmity, as appeareth in the example of the prodigall son, he hath all love, favour and honour again, insomuch that such come not into judgement, Joh. 5.24. There is no condemnation to them, Rom. 8.1. yea there is not so much as any charge or inditment.
An exhortation to pray for Forgiveness of Debts.

dictament against them. What devil, what conscience, what Law may accuse thee, when God justifieth thee? Now in this Petition we desire that not only pardon of sin, but all these blessed fruits of it, may be vouchsafed to us. Oh therefore the concealed and icy temper of men, who are no more inflamed in prayer about this! There are many that can heartily and feelingly pray the former Petition, for the necessaries of this life, but how few for the grace of God in pardoning in a spiritual manner? Hearken then O man, to what Christ hath said is good for thee to importune and seek after. Philo. lib. de Somnia faith, and it was also the opinion of Philosophers, That the heavens make such an harmonious melody, that if the sound and noise of it could reach to our ears, it would make men leave off all their inferiour and sublunary labor and profit, attending to that only: Certainly this Doctrine of remission of sin, which is revealed from heaven only, hath such excellent harmony in it of God's justice and his mercy, of God's satisfaction, and our happiness, that it may justly make us forget to eat our bread, or delight in other comforts, meditating of, and being ravished with this excellency. Let this then instruct thee concerning that necessary duty of seeking out the pardon of thy sins; this belongs to every one, though a Paul, though a Moses, though in the highest form of Christianity. It is a great comfort that all voluntary sins after grace received, are not unpardonable, as well as that against the holy Ghost. How often do we sin voluntarily and willingly after we are inlightned? And then the sins of infirmity and ignorance are more then the sands of the sea hoar: Is it not therefore necessary that thou shouldest be continually begging for pardon? Know then that these indulgences are not like the Papall, to be bought by money, but they are purchased by the blood of Christ: Peter thought it a great matter to forgive a brother seven times a day, but if God should not forgive us seventy times seven a day, our condition would be damnable. Those that look to have pardon by their meritorious works, and penall satisfactions, cannot look up to God. Whereas all Nations used to look up to heaven for rain, In Egypto (faith Seneca) nemo aratorum aspirat coelum &c. No husbandman regards the heavens, but Nilus only, from which they have rain;
All Men Sinners.

so in Popery Christ is neglected, and Angels or Saints set up, as those that can give pardon; men therefore look upon their Pilgrimages, their Penance, as if they were to forgive their sins to their own selves.

Lect. XV.

Shews, What this Petition doth suppose and imply.

Matth. 6.12.

And forgive us our Debts.

We come to shew, What is implied in this Petition, and this may be reduced to three heads:

1. What is implied in the subject who doth pray.
2. What in the object or matter that is prayed for.
3. What in respect of the person to whom we do pray.

For the first: There are many things supposed in those who are to pray thus: As

1. That all men, though never so eminently sanctified, yet have sins in them: And this hath been generally urged by Antiquity against Pelagians, who have dreamed of perfect righteousness in this life, as if we might be sons of light, without any spot in us; and that evasion is ridiculous, that we speak this humiliter, for humility false, not veraciter, truly: for if we had no finne, this hypocrisy were enough to make it in us, and Job.1.9. putteth it out of all doubt, If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. He doth not

Three things implied in this Petition.

1. On the part of the subject, or he who prayeth, is implied,
2. That all men are sinful.
not say, we extoll or lift up our selves, and there is no humility in us; but we deceive our selves, and there is no truth in us, but we deceive our selves, and there is no truth in us: Now this the Apostle faith immediately upon those words, *The blood of Christ cleanseth us from all sinne:* So that whether this cleansing of Christ be understood in regard of the filth or guilt of sinne, its not compleatly fulfilled, till we come into Heaven. So true is that of Ambrose, *Quo semper pecco, debeo semper habere medicinam,* I who sinne alaways, need forgivenesse alaways. And whereas the Apostle faith, *We all have sin,* that is to be understood, partly in regard of the vicious affections, and inordinate concipiscence, which is in every one; and partly in regard of the guilt which doth accompany them; neither may we limit this to some, for the Apostle puts himself in the number of those who ought to say so. Neither may this be restraine, as some would have it, to sins past in our former conversation only, although the Apostle speake, v. 10. in the Preterperfect tense, for he faith, we so sin, as that *if we confess our sins,* *God is faithfull to forgive*; therefore he speaks of sins, which are yet to be pardoned, and not of those that are past only.

I acknowledge it is one thing to say, Every man hath sinne, and another thing, that he sinneth in every good action he doth; and if this place did not demonstreatly prove it, yet other places do. It is good to observe the danger the Apostle makes to come from this opinion, That we have no sinne in us, we deceive our selves, and the truth is not in us, and then, which is worst, *we make God a liar,* who in his Word doth testifie of us, as having sinne in us. So that this opinion argueth those who maintain it, neither to understand or firmly believe the Scriptures; and this is to be extended to those, who hold no sinne in us, as to Gods eye, by reason of Christs righteousesse: For the Scriptures do equally overthrow both. The most material Answer that I have observed by any given to this Argument from our duty of praying for pardon of sin, is given by Castalio de justifica.p.63. It is this, *This Prayer is not so prescribed us (faith he) that we should alaways pray so;* and we never reade that any in the Scripture used these prescribed words:
words: Nay (faith he) we never reade that the Apostles prayed for remission of sins, no, nor Christ never prayed for pardon for them. Therefore the meaning of this Petition must be to pray for pardon as oft as they need it, not that they need it always. Therefore be compareth this Petition to such places, Love your enemies, Agree quickly with your adversary, Honour your father and mother, that is, when you have enemies or adversaries, when you have a father and mother: So here, Pray for pardon, that is, when you have sinned. But this very Answer needeth a pardon, because it is fraughted with much falshood; for first, Although we reade not that they prayed those expresse words, yet in very address to Christ to be instructed how to pray, and our Saviour teaching them to pray thus, as one Evangelist; or after this manner, as another hath it, it had been hypocrisie and mockery, never to have conformed to it. Besides, our Saviour supposeth they have need of pardon, when he tells them, Except ye forgive one another, neither will my heavenly Father forgive you, ver. 15. which implieth their need of pardon. Hence Math. 7.11. he calls them evil, If ye then being evil, which is not to be understood comparatively in respect of God only, for so the Angels are, Job 4.18. but inherently, because of the remainder of that corruption in them. Hence (as you heard) the Apostle John puts himself in the number here, If we say we have no sin, &c. Certainly the Apostle Paul was far from these thoughts, 1 Tim 1.18. where he calls himself, The chiefest of all sinners: that is, one in the rank of those whose sins had a scarlet hue; and he faith this in the Present tense, not of whom I was chief, but I am chief; for although Cajetans Exposition be very probable, that makes this relate not meerly to sinners, but to sinners saved. Thus, Christ came to save sinners, of which saved sinners I am chief; yet the former is not to be rejected; and certainly in some sense every man is bound to think of himself, as a greater sinner than others; As the Pharisee said, I am not as other men, adulterers, covetous, &c. The godly man on the contrary, thinketh he is not holy, zealous, sincere, as other godly men are. When Paul, Rom. 7. complaineth of that evil in him, and law of sin, Can we think he never desired the pardon of it? And when our Saviour,


2. A sense of sin within us.

John 17:17 prayeth God to sanctifie his Disciples; what is that but to set them apart for their office, by forgiving their sin, even as Isaiah was purified by a live cole from the Altar? As for his parallel places and duties, it is a most absurd comparison; for he may as well say, That the Kingdom of God, and hallowing his Name, are not constantly to be prayed for, but upon occasion only. Certainly those places of scripture which make original sin to cleave to us, even as Ivy to the Oak, and which is as leaven in us souring every thing we do in some measure: And those places which speak of such a perfection in the Law, that we are never able to perform it, argue a constant abiding principle of sin in us: we may conclude then, that this Petition doth suppose a worm in our best fruit, drosse in our purest gold, and many spots in our choicest beauty. Neither may we dream of such an imputed righteousness, as shall take away the necessity of this praying; not that the godly are therefore to be denominated sinners, because we call them godly, though sinne be in them, because Godliness is the most noble quality in them, as we call that a field of corn, which yet hath many weeds in it.

A second thing implied, is feeling of sin a burden and weight upon us: For none can heartily and with feeling experience importune God for this pardon, but such who are sensible of a pressing load by sin. Hence the Hebrew word ἑαυτός (as you heard) the taking of a weight and burden. So the Greek word ἐλπίς is used of deliverance from bonds, Luke 4:18. where what was literally true of the Jews that were in Captivity and prifons, is applied to us spiritually, and the Gospel of Christ is said, To preach deliverance to the captives: so that hereby is declared, That as a captive Jew in Babylon was wearied with his estate, and did vehemently expect deliverance: no lesse doth a man burdened with sinne, desire a freedom and relaxation. Therefore the time of the Gospel is expressed allusively to the year of Jubile, v. 19. as that was proclaimed with the sound of a Trumpet, so this by the mouth of the Apostles. How many are there then who pray this prayer, but want much feeling and zeal within! Now sin hath a double weight, one of punishment, the other of offence and displeasure.
fure to God, and in this later we ought especially to groan under it. *Cam* felt a burden of his sins, and *David* also felt a pressure by them, but the tears of these two differed much. The one was meerly because of punishment; the other, because it was against God, *Against thee only have I sinned.* This inward disposition is that which puteth an excellent relish, and high prize upon Christ and his benefits. Hence the word to *trust,* signifieth also to roll and cast our burden upon the Lord: As a man who beareth an heavy weight upon his back, being ready to break under it, rolls it upon the next fall he meets with to ease himself, *Psal. 55. 22.* Consider therefore what thou feel-est within; what pressures upon thee while thou desir'est this forgivenesse: Art thou as the poor prisoner bound in his chains and irons, longing for a releasement? Art thou as one ashamed in the presence of so glorious a God? *Quidni totis artibus contremiscat ranunculæ que palude accedens ad thronum regis?* Why should not the frog coming out of the lake to the Kings throne altogether tremble?

3. *It implieth godly sorrow, and spiritual mourning of heart:* For we may not think this is appointed as a meer complement to use to God, but our hearts ought to be wounded and melted within us at that time. And indeed why is there a promise, *Zech. 12.* for the spirit of prayer and mourning together, if it were so easie and customary a work? Why (*Rom. 8*) are these groans unutterable-wrought by the Spirit of God in us at that time? Infomuch that a soul in prayer, is in spiritual travel and heavenly agonies: All which cannot be, unlesse the heart of a man be deeply humbled within for sinne: so that this Petition doth not only imply sin is in us, and that God seeth it, but also that all within us ought to be moved and troubled at it. Beg therefore for pardon with the same zeal and movings of bowels, as *David* did *Psal. 51.* who had his broken bones. A tear in our eye for sin, doth more adorn it, then a jewell doth the ear. Now the Antinomian Doctrine is like an Eastern or Northern winde, that drieth up, or bloweth away this spiritual rain. If God seeth no sinne in us, then he would see no humiliation nor debasement in us for sin: and so where-as heretofore repentance in believers hath been necessary,
Earnest Perseverance till we obtain.

now it shall be prejudicial to salvation, and all sorrow shall be ungodly. What direct Antipodes are these to Scripture-Directions? Hence they repent that ever they did so much repent and look upon their sorrow for sinne, as Christ upon his enemies, Lord, forgive me, for I did not know what I did. But we have not so learned the Gospel. The people of God, when sinning, are called upon to afflict themselves, and to mourn: and because the Corinthians did not so at first, though afterwards they did, therefore the Apostle threatens to come with a rod unto them. Take heed then of all Doctrines or practices that may obstruct the running streams of thy soul: Keep thy self always in this spiritual sweat. Take not the limb-beck from the fire, that so spiritual distillations may flow continually.

4. Earnest perseverance till we obtain.

4. It supposeth earnestness and importunity with perseverance till we do obtain. That which is requisite in every prayer, must not be excluded here. Prayer without fervency is like a messenger without legs, an arrow without feathers, an Advocate without a tongue. Hence are these phrases, Be instant in prayer: and Watch unto prayer: and Pray without ceasing. Till the heart be deaded to every creature, and minde this thing only, it will not pray aright. Seeing therefore our blessedness and happinesse is made to consist in this, that our sins are pardoned, how ought we to lay every thing aside, till this be vouchsafed unto us! Hierom complained of his distractions and dullness in prayer. SICCINE PUTAS ORASSE JONAM? Sic Danieleam inter leones? Sic latronem in cruce? Where is thy faith? Did Jonah pray thus in the whales belly? Did Daniel thus among the lions? Did the thief thus upon the cross? If spiritual things were as truly and really apprehended by us, as temporal are, how should we bid all comforts stand afar off, even refusing to be comforted, till Gods favour shine upon us! If the frowning of a King be like the roaring of a lion, how terrible then are the frowns of God for sin?

5. Constant renewed acts of faith.

Lastly, It supposeth in the subject, constant renewed acts of faith; For as there is constant pardon begged and offered, so there must be a continual lifting up, and stretching out the hand to receive. As the branch in the Olive doth constantly suck juice and
and nourishment, so ought we perpetually to be receiving from the fulness of Christ. This then is the only grace that hath the promise of pardon made to it: although where this is, there will also be the presence of all other graces. Neither may we with Spalato judge the distinction that is made between faith and other graces in this matter of Justification and remission of sins, a meer metaphysical subtily and formality, as is to be shewed. If therefore thy faith be asleep within, no marvel if such tempests and storms arise, that thou fear drowning. As a Tradesman will part with any thing rather then his tools, for they are instrumental to his whole livelihood; so above all, we ought to look to our faith.

3. In the object matter we suppose these things:

1. That forgiveness of sin may be had after Baptism. That although we sinne after that solemn stipulation, yet God will not divorce us, or cast us (as it were) out of the Ark into the deluge. There have been some of old, as the Novatians, and Anabaptists of late, who have maintained, There is no hope of pardon to those that after their Baptism do foully sinne, for there they suppose is given the plenary remission; but this is false and uncomfortable: for we have the incestuous person after his repentance received into favour again. How desperate had Peters condition been, if this had been true? And when our Saviour bids us forgive our brother seventy times seven, we may not think there is more love in the creature then in the Creatour, and Gods kindenesse beyond that of a mans is most emphatically described, Jer. 3. 1. Where God promiseth a reconciliation to his people, though they played the adulteresse with him.

2. That we may with hope and faith pray for the pardon of great sins as well as lesse. In Justification by Christ, greater sins are as easily forgiven as lesse. Though, as is to be shewed, the party offending doth not come by pardon so easily, and more is required of him; now this is a good cordial to the afflicted spirit, who is apt to limit God in his pardon. He may forgive such and such sins, but can these great mountains ever be removed out of his sight, sins of such a magnitude and aggravation? But our Saviour doth not determine us in our Petition, but

3. In the object matter prayed for are implied.

1. That forgiveness of sin may be had after Baptism.
whatsoever your sins are, pray for the pardon of them. Had it
not been a great dishonour to Christ, if any diseased man had
said, his malady was greater then Christ could cure; he might
heal others, but not him? no lefse injurious is thy doubting,
when the greatnesse of thy sin makes thee stagger. The obe-
dience of Christ is as much above thy greatest sin, as Christ's
person is above thy person.

3. It supposeth iteration of pardon, that God is not wearied
out, neither doth upbraid us. Who would not think that the
soul should be ashamed, and blush to go for the pardon of
the same sins committed over and over again? How easily
might we think, What hope is there to have me speed? Have
I not a thousand and thousand times intreated God to forgive
me such pride, such vain thoughts, such negligence in his
service, and must I still go to ask pardon? How shall I look
up into Heaven any more? And this temptation is more ter-
rible, as is to be shewed, if it be a sinne, or sins of a more
grievous nature, that the Petitioner hath been overtaken fre-
fently with; but as we are commanded to forgive to a bro-
ther offending in a day many times against us, so may we expect
greater things of God. Know then, as we sin daily, so there
are outgoings of pardon continually; and the goodness of
God, doth like the Sun, joyce to run his race without any
weariness.

Lastly, In the Person to whom we pray, there is sup-
posed,

1. That God only can forgive sins. This is an incommunicable
property of God, Isa.43.1. & Exod.34.7. it is there reckoned
as one of his Prerogatives: Hence Matth. 9. this is made an
Argument of Christ's Deity, that by his meer command he
forgave sin; for this power to forgive sin, is greater then to
create Heaven or Earth, or to work the greatest miracles;
Therefore a power to work miracles hath been vouchsafed to
the Apostles, but not of forgiving of sin, unleffe declarative-
ly only. When therefore our Saviour, Matth. 9. asketh
Which is easier, to forgive sinne, or to say, Take up thy bed and
walk, intending by this Miracle to prove, that he did also for-
give sinne; it is not spoken as if this later were greater then the
the former, but only the curing of the paralytical man, was a
more visible sign to confirm the other; for when they saw
that which he commanded accomplished upon the mans body,
they might well conclude the other fulfilled in his soul. Now
when we say, God only can forgive sinne, this is to be ex-
tended, both to the forgivenessee in Heaven, and to that in a
mans own conscience; for the former it is plain, because the
injury is done only against him, when we sinne; and for the
later, it is clear, because he is the Father of Spirits, and so can
command whatsoever peace and security he pleaseth in the
conscience. We see when Friends and Ministers do pour oyl
into a wounded soul, they feel no benefit or refreshment, till
God speak to the heart. This is notably asserted by Elihu,
Job 34.29. When he giveth quietness, who then can make trou-
ble? And when he hideth his face, who then can behold him?
Oh therefore with all humble thankfulness acknowledge this
great mercy of pardon, if thou art made partaker of it; If
the Lord should work Miracles for thee, he would not display
so much power and mercy, as he doth in this forgivenessee of
thy sins.

2. It supposeth God doth see, and taketh notice of sin in us, after
we have believed: For how can God be said to forgive that
which he taketh no notice of? If forgiving be covering of sin,
and a blotting it out, then it is seen and open to God, and
uncancelled till this be done. Suppose our Saviour had used
these words in this Petition, Cover our iniquities, as we cover
the sinnes of others; would not that expression have necessa-
riely implied, That God did see them, and look on them,
till he covered them? Certainly, Joseph did upon a good
ground abstain from sinne, when he said, How can I do this,
and sinne against God? that is, who seeth me, and beholdeth
me in secret, and will be angry with me? But if God take no
notice of my sinne; how can I truly awe my self from sinne,
saying, How can I do this evil in Gods eyes? How can I pro-
voke him to anger?

Let the Application then be, To importune for this mercy of Use.
forgivenessee, which makes all other things mercy. Health, rich-
es, learning, peace, are mercies, if with these there be a par-
T
don
Pardon of Sin the only Support in Misery.

don of all our sins, especially be pressed to seek for it from this motive, which I shall only mention at this time, viz. That pardon of sin is the only support and help in all miseries and calamities whatsoever. This only can sweeten thy pain, thy poverty, thy fears of death. When the Apostle Rom. 5.1 had spoken of Justification by faith, and the peace we have thereby with God, inferreth from thence, we glory in tribulation. Alas, there would be little glory, if at the same time man be against us, and God also. So Rom. 8.33, 34, 37. when the Apostle had gloriously triumphed in this privilege of Justification, and that none could lay any thing to our charge, then he concludes, we are more then Conquerors. Again, 1 Pet. 3.16, 17, 18. exhorting the people of God to be ready to suffer for well-doing, giveth this reason, For Christ once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, &c. So that no misery or calamity can be joyfully undergone, unless the Lord forgive our sins to us. In these times of war, while we have been under continual fears of an enemy, what could rightly support us, but remission of our sins. To have men accusing and condemning of us, but to have God clearing and absolving, this can make an Heaven in the midst of an hell.
Lect. XVI.

Setteth forth the nature of sinne in its several Names, Definition, Effects and Aggravations.

Matth. 6. 12.

Forgive us our debts.

Having explained this Petition positively and practically, we come to handle those Questions which may make to the clearing of that truth, which is contained in the Text. And I shall pitch upon those that are usefull and necessary, not on thorny and perplexed. God indeed once spake out of the thorny bush, but seldom doth truth discover herself in those thickets which the Schoolmen have made.

The first in order that should be discussed is, What remission of sinne is; Or, What is meant, when we say, God doth forgive sinne? But before we can come to that, another doubt must be rolled out of the way, and that is, What sinne is, and what are the proper effects of sinne? For a man can never understand, what it is to have sinne blotted out, or taken away, unless he be first informed what the nature of sinne is, and what effects it hath wrought upon the sinner. Of this therefore in the first place.

And first, I shall speak of sinne abstractedly in its own nature.

Secondly, Relatively to the person who sinneth.

Thirdly, The proper effects of it.

Fourth-
Fourthly, The weight or aggravation of every sinne.

Let us begin with the former. Sinne in the Scripture hath several names, which do in some measure describe the nature of it. The Hebrew מַטּ, מַטּ is used commonly for sinne, and it doth in a proper signification, wherein it is once used, denote an aberration from the mark we shot at, Judg. 20.16. Every one could sling stones at an haires breadth, and not miss; and from hence metaphorically is signified the nature of sinne, for every mans action is to have an end, which end is manifested by the Scripture; and when a man reacheth not to this, he is said to sinne; answerable unto this word in the Greek is ἁμαρτία, which comes from ἁμαρτάω, that is, to erre from the scope: And another word πρόφασις, which is going beyond the bounds and limits which are set us. Though a learned Critick, Dion, doth make πρόφασις not to signify beyond; but by, as if it did denote a negligent and careless passing by the commands of God. Another word is ἁμαρτία, which cometh of a word that properly signifieth crookedness and obliquity in the body, and so is applied to the soul, and doth denote perverseness in him that sinneth, and to this may answer ἁμαρτέω, where the particle α is not to be understood privatively only, but adverfatively: for a meer want of the Law may not be a sinne alwaies, but a repugnancy must necessarily be. And thus the word is used, 2 Thess. 2.8. 1 Tim. 4.9. The Hebrews also express sinne by יָד, יָד which is as much as a defection, or falling off from God; and answerable to this in the Greek is πρόφασία, which is a falling away from that integrity and purity we either once had, or ought still to have. As for the Latine word peccatum, some have derived it from pellicare, which is to commit adultery, as if a sinne were so called in the generall, from one kinde of it; and others from peccus, because a man in sinne wanders like a beast, or becomes like a beast; yet many conceive the word peccare to be a theme itself, and not derived from any other word.

As for the definition of sinne, What it is; though there have been many Disputes about it, and Chemnitus wished for one publike definition of it, to which all Churches should agree; yet certainly that of John is full and comprehensive enough, 1 John.
All Sin voluntary.

1 Joh. 3. 4. Sinne is the transgression of the Law: Answerable whereunto is that, 2 Sam. 15. 24. I have sinned, for I have transgressed the Commandment of the Lord: only you must remember not to limit tò áριστα, to a mere want of the Law, but as comprehending that which is against it. Now this definition agreement both to habituall and actual sinnes.

To habituall, whether it be that innate and imbred of originall sinne; or whether it be that habituall voluntarily contrasted, you have both the actual and habituall áριστα, excellently put together, Rom. 6. 19. As you have yielded your members servants to iniquity unto iniquity: where by the former iniquity is meant original and habituall sinne; by the later, actual sinne as the fruit of the former. It hath been doubted, how habituall, especially originall sinne can be called truly sinne, because it is not voluntary: for that voluntariness should be of the nature of sinne, is so universally acknowledged, that neither doctorum paucitas, nor indoctorum turba do dissentire: neither the few Learned men, or the many unlearned did ever gain-say, said Austin: And besides, All sinne must be forbidden by a Law, now how are we forbidden to be born without sinne? would not such a prohibition be ridiculous?

Again, The commands of God seem to be for good actions, not for the habits of good actions.

Now although it might fairly be maintained, that τι ζημιον, not το ἀπαρτητον, the transgression of a Law, and not voluntarines, is of the nature of a sinne; for the Apostle, Rom. 7. 25. faith, He doth that which he would not do; and there are many sinnes of ignorance, which must necessarily be without any express act of the will, yet we may with Austin call this sin voluntary, taking voluntary, as it comprehends the will of Adam, that universal person, and principle in whom we all willed. And by this means, though infants are not in themselves capable of any precept, much less before they were born, which they were to accomplish in their own person, yet they were bound up in a command even before they had an actual being in Adam, in whose will they were to fulfill that command, for that command was not given to Adam as a single person, but as an universal.

T 3 Hence
Man possibly may not intend Sin.

Hence it is that habituall sinne, whether remote, or proxime, is forbidden by the Law of God, which requireth not only good things to be done, but also that they flow from a clear and pure fountain within, even an entire perfection of the nature; so that although infused habits of grace come not under a precept, in respect of the infusing and ingenerating of them, for that is Gods act, and we are not bound to do that, yet they are commanded both before they are infused and after; Before, by the Law, which requireth of us, that inward rectitude, which is now lost; and after they are infused, to be diligent in those pious actions, whereby those habits may be preserved and retained. So that by this we may see a sinne to be, whatsoever doth transgress the Law of God, whether habitually or actually, whether internally or externally, whether by commission, or by omission; and from hence ariseth the curse which the Law pronounceth against sinners, because its broken by them.

In the next place, if we speak of sinne as it relates to the person sinning, so there is not required, first, That a man should not intend sinne, and will it as sinne, for that is impossible: even as the understanding cannot assent to any thing false as false, but as the object is either true really or apparently: So neither can the will desire any thing that is evil, as evil, but as it is apparently good. As the devil appeared in Samuels clothes, so doth sinne and evil alwaies under the notion of some good or other. Hence the Apostle faith, Luxis sana, i. do selemum, entice a man, as a Fisherman doth the silly fish by the bait upon the hook, which the Apostle elsewhere calls παρελογιμα, a deceiving or putting a false syllogism upon our selves. So that they do not sufficiently vindicate the pure providence of God from sin, who say, God doth will the act, but not the deformity, or the evil of it, for so neither doth man will expressly the evil of the act, although in willing that act to which sinne is necessarily annexed, it be interpretatively to will the sin.

Neither secondly is to sinne, to produce sinne, as the proper and immediate terminus of our action, for sinne being a privation, or at most a relation, it cannot be the immediate effect of any action. Sinne is not indeed a meer pure privation, such
as blindness is, but mixt and compounded, such as sickness is, which hath both the inordinacy, and want of a good temperament, and also the ill humours in it. So that a man sinneth by producing or doing that action, to which sinne is annexed. And herein neither do they sufficiently clear Gods concourse about sinne, in saying it goeth to the material act of sinne, but not to the immediate obliquity of it. For so neither doth man, and indeed sinne being a privation, or as some, a relation, it is impossible it should be produced any other way, but by that act unto which it is joyned to, as theft is committed by doing that material action, to which that deformity is inseparably adjoyned. Therefore to sinne, is to do a thing deficiently from the Law of God, so that God in all those severall acts of his about sinne, whether they be permisive or ordinative, is gloriously vindicated, because he doth nothing deficiently, as failing from that eternall and immutable Law of righteousness, whereas the Angels and man did, missing or coming short of the rule, by which they were to be guided: But because this Discourse is more remote to our present matter of pardon of sinne, we come to that which doth more nearly concern it.

Therefore in the third place, there is the proper effect, and consequent of sin, which is to make guilty, and oblige to eternall wrath. To omit the many things that are in sinne, Divines do acknowledge two things in every sinne, the macula, or filth, and the reatus, the guilt; which guilt some do again distinguish into the guilt of sin, which they call the inward dignity and desert of damnation, which they make inseparable from sinne, even as heat is from the fire; and the guilt of punishment which they make separable: For the present, let us examine, What is that effect of sinne, whereby a man when a sinne is committed is truly denominated a sinner, for seeing remission is a taking away of sinne in that respect, whereby we are adjudged and accounted of as sinners, it is necessary to know what that is, which doth so constitute a sinner: As for example, David after his adultery, Peter after his deniell, have contracted such a guilt upon them, whereby they are accounted as sinners, though the acts of their sins be gone and passed; and in.
in this condition they stand, till remission or forgiveness come, which takes away their sins. For the understanding of this, consider this foundation. That every sinne committed by a man, though the sinne be transient, and quickly passeth away, yet it doth still continue, and is as it were still in acting, till by remission it be removed. And this consideration is of great practical use. A man is apt to look upon his sins committed a long while ago, as those which are passed, and are no more to be thought upon; but you must know, that there is something which doth remain after a sinne is committed, which is somehow the same with the action of sinne: so that not figuratively, but properly the sinne itself is said to continue. Thus the Scripture calls something by the name of sinne, that doth continue, when yet the commission of the sinne is past. As David many moneths after he had sinned, praieth God, to blot out his sinne: why, where was his sinne? It was committed long before, and it was a transient act, but yet David by this doth acknowledge that there is something which doth continue that act of sinne, whereby David is as much bound up in his conscience, as if he had been in the very commission of it. Consider therefore that till there be a pardon of sin, though thy sins have been committed fourty or fifty years ago, yet they are continued still, and thou art truly a sinner, though so many years after, as thou wast at the first committing of them. Sinne is not taken away by length of time, but by some gracious act of God vouchsafed unto us: How justly may it be feared, that many a mans sins do still lie at his doors! thou art still in thy sins, and looked upon as so by God; though it may be thou hast left such sins many years ago. Thy youthfull sins it may be, thou hast left them a long while ago, yet thou art still in them, and they are continued upon thee, till by remission they are taken away. It is not thy other course of life and abstinence from sinne, that makes a sinne not to be, but there must be some gracious act on Gods part, removing of this. Consider therefore of it, that thy soul remaineth as polluted and guilty twenty years after a sinne, yea a thousand of years, if thou couldst live so long, as when it was in the very first act of sinne. Remember the action of sinne doth pass away, but not the sinne; you may therefore ask,
ask, Wherein doth the finne continue still? What is that which makes me still to be reputed of as if I were a sinner in the very act? It is commonly out of the Schoolmen determined, That after a finne is committed, there doth remain a macula, a blot in the soul, and that continuing, the sinner doth thereby remain obliged unto eternall wrath. That there is such a filth and blot remaining because of sinne, I see generally acknowledged by our Divines: only that Learned Wotton doth much oppose it, and faith, the Schoolmen have been five hundred years labouring to declare, what it is, and are not able to do it. Indeed he grants, That in Adams finne we may well conceive a blot remaining after the finne was committed, because he was indowfed with grace; but now in a man grown up that hath grace, no finne that he commits takes away his grace, and therefore he is not deprived of that beauty by the blot of sinne. And as for wicked men, they have no beauty at all in them; and therefore how can sinne make such a blot in them? There must be beauty in them by grace, which is nituor animi, the luftre of the soul, before there can be macula, which is the deformity of it. For the right conceiving of this, know; 1. That it is one thing to acknowledge such a defilement and impurity by sinne absolutely; and another to acknowledge it so, That justifying grace or remission of sinne must take that blot away. Herein the Papists erre, That they hold finne leaveth such a stain, which remission of sinne taketh away; whereas indeed there is such a filth by sinne, but that is taken away by sanctifying grace, not justifying; so that it is a dangerous error to speake of such a defilement by sinne, and then to say, God by pardoning takes it away; This were to confound justification and Sanctification.

But in the second place, we may according to Scripture, say, not only in Adams finne, but in every finne we commit there is a blot and stain made upon the soul, Mat. 15:20. These things that come from the heart defile a man, Ephes. 5:27. Sin is compared to a spot and wrinkle. So Rom. 3:12. All by nature are laid to become unprofitable. The Hebrew word in the Psalm, out of which this is taken, signifieth corruption or putrefaction.
for such sinne is to the soul, not that you may conceive that the
esseence of the soul is naturally corrupted by sinne, as rust doth
the iron, and moths the garment; but in a morall sense, by sin
the soul in its faculties is disenabled from doing its duty. Thus
the Apostle calls sinnes dead works, Heb. 9. 14. not in that sense
as if they did bring death to a man, for that the Apostle expres-
seth otherwise, killing us, when he speaks of the Law; but he
calls them dead works, because they defile man, as dead car-
kases in the Old Testament: For the Apostle, vers. 1. spake of
cleansing by the bloud of an heifer, which was to be used when
a man had toucht any dead thing, which made him legally un-
clean. Thus (faith he) Christ's bloud will cleanse from sinne
that contaminateth a man. Neither is it necessary that grace
must-really have been in the soul before, and then sinne by de-
priving the soul of it, so to stain it: for its enough that the soul
ought to have grace in it, though it were not present before:
as when a man doth not believe God's Word, though this un-
belief do not deprive him of the beauty and grace of faith
which he had, yet it doth of that beauty of faith which he
ought to have. And thus as particular actual sinnes are mul-
tiplied; so are particular stains and defilements also encrea-
sed: we therefore must grant a stain by sinne, though this be
not that which is removed by remission. Therefore that which
continueth a man a sinner in God's account, and is to be remo-
ved by remission, is that obligation to eternall wrath appoint-
ted by God; for as soon as a man hath sinned, there doth
accrué to God a morall right (as we may speak with revere-
ence) and power, being a Judge, as thereby he may in-
flict vengeance upon a sinner; and in this respect sinne is
called an offence, because it doth provoke him, who is a just
Judge, unto anger and vengeance. This then is that, which
makes a sinne to continue still as if it were in act, because upon
the sinne committed there is an obligation by God's appoint-
ment to everlasting punishment, and when this is taken off,
then is God said to forgive; and till it be, sinne is alive, cry-
ing for vengeance, as fiercely, as if it were newly committed.
So that the act once committed, that causeth the obligation to
punishment; and this obligation continuing, God doth not
forgive.
forgive. When a sinne is committed it may remain in God's minde, and in our minde. In our minde by way of guilt and trouble; as David said, His sinne was alwaies before him, or else in Gods minde, so that he doth will the punishment of such. Now when God doth forgive, he blots sinnes out of his minde, and remembers them no more. He doth not will the obligation of them to punishment, being satisfied thorow Christ, and the party believing in him. By all this you may see, That after a sinne is committed there remaineth obligation in the will and minde of God to eternall punishment, and God when he doth forgive, cancelleth this debt or obligation. This being cleared, we may the easlier judge with what act God doth forgive sinne; but of that hereafter.

Let us consider the aggravation of sin, as it is an offence to God, which may the more instigate us to pardon. In sinne we may consider two things: First, The deprivation of that rectitude which ought to be in every thing we do; in which sense, sinne is a morall monster, as there are natural monsters; for the soul in sin doth not bring forth fruit answerable unto reason, and the Law of God; this consideration may much humble us; but there is another thing in sin which doth more aggravate it, and that is as it is a dishonour and an offence to God, and by this means it becometh above our power ever to satisfie God for it. Therefore in every sin besides the particular considerations, look upon that generall one, which is in all, viz. That peculiar deformity it hath, as it is an offence against God. Its disputed, Whether sin have an infinite evil and deformity in it? To answer this, If a sin be considered in its kinde, so its not infinite, because one sin is so determined to its kinde, that it is not another sin, as theft is not murder.

Neither secondily can sin be said to be infinite evil, in respect of the being of it, for it cometh from finite creatures, who are not able to do any thing infinite; and therefore sin is not infinite, as Christ's merits are infinite, which are so, because of the dignity and worth of the person, though the actions themselves had a finite being. Besides, if sins were infinite in such a sense, then no sin could be greater then another, because that which is truly infinite cannot be made more or less.
Therefore thirdly, Sins are said to have infinite evil in them, in respect of the object or person against whom they are committed, viz. God, who is an infinite object. For seeing the aggravation of a sinne ariseth from the worth of the person against whom it is committed, if the person offended be of infinite honour and dignity, then the offence done against such an one, hath an infinite evil and wickedness in it. So that the infinitenes of sin ariseth wholly from the external consideration of God against whom it is. But of this more when we speak of the necessity of Chris's satisfaction to God's justice by his death.

Let the Use be to inform thee, That every sinne committed, continueth as fresh to cry vengeance many years after, as if it were but lately done, till remitted by God. Think not therefore that time will wear it out, though they may wear out of thy conscience, yet they cannot out of God's minde. Consider that of Job 14.17. Thou sealest up my transgression as in a bag, and thou seest up mine iniquity. So that what the Apostle speaks of some, 2 Pet. 2. is true of all impenitent sinners, Their damnation slumbereth not, nor doth it linger. Therefore till the mercy of God hath taken off this guilt, thou art to be in as much fear and trembling, as if the very sinnes were still committed by thee.
LECT. XVII.

An Enquiry into the Nature of Forgiveness of Sinne. Divers Greek words that express this Mercy. And the Necessity of Faith and Repentance, in order to Pardon.

MAT. 6. 12.

And forgive us our Debts.

The next Question to be handled is, What Remission of sins is, and how God doth forgive them. And although the discussing of the former Question, viz. What maketh a man a sinner, doth make an easy and quick way of dispatching this, because Justification doth take off that consideration and respect of a sinner from a man; yet that the whole nature of it may be better understood, I shall lay down several Propositions, all which will tend to give us much light in this great and glorious benefit of the Gospel.

And in the first place, as we formerly considered some choice Hebrew words that set forth the pardon of sin, so now let us take notice of some Greek words in the New Testament, that express this gracious act of God: for the holy Ghost knoweth best in what words to represent this glorious mercy to us.
The word that is most frequently used by the Evangelists and Apostles, is δείνυ, which in the general is as much as to dismiss, or send away, to let alone, to leave, to permit or suffer; in which sense the Scripture often useth it: and certainly, God in this sense doth pardon sin, because he lets it alone, he leaves it, he meddles no more with it, but handleth the person forgiven, as if he never had been a sinner. But commonly this word is used of absolving those who are accused as guilty, which appeareth in that famous sentence of Agesilus, who writing to have one Nicias sent to him that was accused, useth this expression, Νικίας εἴπε τῷ νικία εἰς δοκει αὐτός, εἰ δὲ δοκεῖι, εἰμι δίκαιος, δικαιούμεν ὁ δείνυ, Nicias, if he have done no wrong, absolve him; if he have, absolve him for my sake; but howsoever absolve him, or let him free. And in this sense forgivenes of sins may well be called δείνυ, but in the Scripture it seemeth rather to be an expression from those that are loosened out of their bonds for their debts; and therefore frequently is applied to the forgiving of debts, Matth. 18. 25, 27, 32. and this is more notably set down, Luk. 4. 18. to preach to captives or prisoners, δείνυ, freedom, or forgivenes of sin, and so δείνυ shall be as much as δείνυ, to loosen bonds, as the word is used Luk. 16. 26. Act. 27. 40. Therefore howsoever Grotius thinks the word to remit to be a Metaphor from those who part with, or leave a thing that they might retain, yet it seemeth rather to be taken from releasing of debts, and loosening of bonds, in which the conscience of a sinner was tied, being bound to answer it at the tribunal of God. Hence the Scripture useth several names to express pardon of sin, according to the several titles that sin hath in the Scripture. As sins are debita, debts, so God doth forgive; as they are sordes, a filth and loath-someness, so God doth cover them; as they are vincula, bonds, so he doth remit them. As they are debts written down in a book, so he blots them out: As they make us miserable and wretched, so he is mercifull and propitious in removing of them.

A second word is ἁφελλομεν, Col. 2. 13. Having forgiven you all trespasses, Col. 3. 13. Even as Christ forgave us. Now this word doth excellently signifie the fountain, and the effect of pardon. The fountain, that it cometh from the meer grace and favour of God.
God. There is nothing in us to merit or satisfy God with. Therefore howsoever there be a necessity of faith and repentance, yea and God will not forgive sinne in persons grown up, but where these are, yet these are no meritorious causes, nor can they satisfy God for all that offences and dishonour which our sins have cast upon him. And this may encourage the broken heart, who feeleth a load of sin upon it self, and hath nothing to bring unto God: Remember the root and fountain of all forgivenesse is Grace, which is so far from supposing any worth of condignity in thee for pardon, that it rather implieth the contrary. And as it doth imply grace thus in the fountain, so also acceptablenesse and joy too in the party, to whom sinne is forgiven. So that there can be nothing in the world more welcome, or a greater matter of joy, then to bring this glad tidings; and indeed therefore is the Gospel called εὐαγγέλιον, because it preacheth the glad tidings of Gods love and reconciliation through Christ with a sinner.

A third word is ἵνα, thus the Publican prayed, Luk. 18.3. Some derive ἵνα from ἵνας λάβην, because we desire to look on those to whom we are propitious. But this word doth more immediately relate to the bloud of Christ, as the way by which God becomes thus pacified. So that as the other words set up the grace of God in pardoning, so this the merits and satisfactions of Christ, 1 Joh. 2.2. 1 Joh. 4.10. Rom. 3.25. Heb. 2.17. In which places the appeasement of God towards us, is attributed to the bloud of Christ. Therefore if we put the former words and these together, we may see an admirable temperament and mixture of grace and justice in forgiving of sins. The former places exclude Popish Doctrins; The latter, Socinian blasphemies.

A fourth word may be ἐπιθυμεῖν, to obtain mercy. For although the Scripture apply this to all the benefits and mercies of God, yet Paul applieth it more particularly to pardon of sin, 1 Tim. 1.13. and when Dives prayed, Luke 16.24. Father Abraham, οἴνημεν με, have mercy on me, and so by consequent to be removed from that place of torment. Hence in that form of prayer which Paul used by way of Salutation, there are these three words, γὰερ, ἐκεῖ and εἰπίμα. But this word is more expressly used for this end in the grand Covenant and Promise for pardon.
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Don of sin, Heb.8.12. For I will be mercifull to their iniquities, &c. This is so comprehensive a Petition, that it seemeth to be a generally received form of Prayer in the Church, where εἰλησθη ἀπαντά, yea the wiser among the Heathens used this prayer, as appeareth by Arricinus epist. diffl. lib. 2. ch. 7. Τὸν Τιν ἐπιθυμησον, ἀφεθαι ωτί τινες εἰλησθην; Now this word supposeth, 1. The party praying for pardon to look upon himself, as in a most miserable and undone estate, that no outward calamity or evil lieth so heavily upon him, as his sins do. And then secondly, on Gods part, it supposeth that he doth not only pardon, but that even his bowels yearn within him, when he doth forgive. Hence Luk.1.78. they are called σωλαγχιαζείς, the bowels of mercy. This goodness of God is excellently represented in the father of the Prodigal, Luk.15.20. Therefore how great a sinne is unbelief, and refusing to have good thoughts of God, when God hath manifested himself thus gracious!

The last word I shall mention (though there be others that are used) is by way of negation, μὴ διώκετε, Rom.4.8. 2 Cor. 5.9. And this is a Metaphor from those that cast up their accounts, and account so much upon such an one for debt. Now by this word is shewn the terrible nature of sinne, as also that howsoever for a while, we may live jollily, care for nothing, and be in security, yet God will one day cast up his accounts, and charge such and such debts upon us; but if so be the Lord will not impute them to us, and account them upon our score, this will be our blessedness. And thus you have heard the most choice and principal words the holy Ghost expresseth our forgivenesse by. We proceed,

Propos. 1. Lay this down as a foundation, That when God doth pardon sin, he takes it away so, as that the party acquitted is no more looked upon as a sinner.

All the expressions about pardon amount to thus much; even as when one accused of theft and murder in the Commonwealth, and is legally acquitted by the Judge, he is no more reputed a thief or murderer. Therefore it is a calumny of the Papists, as if we held, That a man is a sinner after God hath pardoned him. It is true, we say, That sin doth remain in a man, though he be
be justified, and that sin hath a desert of condemnation with it, but where God hath pardoned, there he doth not look upon that man as a sinner, but as a just man. Therefore in different respects we may say, That pardon of sin is an utter abolition of it, and it is not an utter abolition it. It is an utter abolition of it, as it doth reflect upon the person making him guilty, and obliging him actually to condemnation; in this respect a man is as free as if he had never sinned; but if you speak of the inherency of sin, and the effects of original corruption that do abide in all, which are also truly and properly sins; so pardon of sin is not an utter abolition; and although Christ wrought no semiplenam curationem, as is observed, no half-cures upon any diseased persons, but whom he healed, he healed perfectly; yet he works by degrees in the grace of sanctification, as he did perfect the world by several degrees successively, and not (as Augstin thought) all at once. So that this particular, viz. That forgivenesse is a perfect abolition of sin in the former consideration, is of transcendent comfort to the believers: and indeed it is impossible that sin should be forgiven divisibly, and by parts: so a man should be at the same time under the favour of God, and under his hatred, which is impossible.

Thou therefore who art a believer haft cause to rejoice, for this perfect work of remission of thy sins past, wherein nothing more is, or can be done for thy good and consolation. Do not think it is with God as with men, who say indeed, they forgive with all their heart, yet retain their secret, inward hatred, as much as before. Indeed the pain of sin may roll and tumble in thy conscience a long while after, though it be forgiven (we see so in David) as the sea, which hath been enraged by tempests and winds, though they be quiet, yet the sea will roar, and make a noise a long time after. The heart of a man awakened and pierced with the guilt of sin, doth not quickly and easily compose itself again.

Propos. 2. It is one thing for God to forgive, and another thing not to exact and demand punishments.

As we see among men, a Judge many times through fear or otherwise, when Justice is obstructed, doth not call such a malefactor to an account, but deferreth it; yet for all that, the man
is not acquitted; so it is often to be seen in God's providence. There are multitudes of sinners, who after their transgressions committed, are not only without punishment, but enjoy great prosperity, and much outward success, yet these men are not pardoned, they have no acquaintance from God. This hath been such a temptation to David, Jeremiah, and others of God's people, that they have many times staggered through unbelief. But men may have their punishments deferred, their damnation may sleep or linger, but it is not taken off.

Let not men therefore delude themselves with vain hopes, as if their sins were forgiven, because not yet punished: No, there must be some positive gracious act of God to acquit thee, else thy sins are alive to condemn thee. Examine thy self therefore whether thy peace, comfort, plenty be a fruit of God's forbearance meerly, or of his acquittance. This later is always an act of his gracious mercy: but the other may be a terrible fruit of his hatred against thee, insomuch that thou hadst better wander up and down like Cain, fearing every thing will kill thee or damn thee, then be in such security.

Prop. 3. A godly man may account not only himself bound to thank God for the pardon of those sins he hath committed, but he is to acknowledge so many pardons, as by the grace of God he hath been preserved from sin.

And if a believer enter into this consideration, how will it overwhelm him! So often as God hath preserved thee from such and such sins, which thy own heart, or temptations would have engrained thee to, God hath virtually given thee so many pardons. That God preserved David from killing Nabal and his family, here was interpretatively as great mercy, as in the express forgiving of the murder of Uriah. It is a rule of Divines, Plures sunt gratiae privative, quam positive. There are more preventing graces then positive. The keeping of evils from us, is more then the good he bestoweth on us. Therefore Austin observed well, that as Paul said, By the grace of God I am what I am: So he might also have said, By the grace of God I am not what I am not. Though therefore we are not so sensible of preventing mercies, as of positive, yet a due and right consideration of God's love in this matter might much inflame our
our hearts: Say therefore, O Lord, I bless thee, not only for the pardon of those sins I have committed, but also for thy goodness in preserving me from those many thousands I was prone to fall into, which is in effect the pardon of so many.

Propos. 4. Remission of sin is not to be considered merely as removing of evil, but also as bestowing of good.

It is not only ablative mali, but collative boni; it is not a mere negation of punishment due to us, but a plentiful vouchsafing of many gracious favours to us, such as a Sonship, and a right to eternal life, as also peace with God, and communion with him. God also never pardons any sin, but where he sanctifieth the nature of such an one. Indeed it will be worth the inquiry, whether this connexion of pardon of sin with inherent holiness, ariseth from a natural necessity, so that one cannot be without the other: or whether it be by the meer positive will, and appointment of God. For the present this is enough, God hath revealed he will never dishonour these.

Propos. 5. In every sin there are (as to the purpose of justification, these two things considerable) the offence that is done to God, whereby he is displeased: and the obligation of the man so offending him, to eternal condemnation.

Now remission of sin doth wholly lie in removing of these two: so that when God doth will neither to punish or to offend with the person, then he is said to forgive. We must not therefore speak of two kinds of remissions, one remission of the punishment, another of the offence and fault; For this is one remission, and God never doth the one without the other. It is true, there remain paternal and medicinal chastisements after sin is forgiven, but no offence or punishment strictly so taken. What kinde of act this remission is, whether immanent or transient, is to be shewed in the next Question.

Propos. 6. From the former Proposition this followeth, That sinne in the guilt of is not remitted by any act that we do, but it is a meer act of God. So that neither the grace of repentance, or love of God is that which removeth guilt out of the soul, but it is something in God only. It is the opinion of many Papists, That God in pardoning doth onely enable to repent
Remission of Sin explained.

for sin, and then the guilt of sin doth naturally and necessarily go away, so that there needeth no acceptation from God, or act of remission, but only an infusion of grace to repent. But this in the next Sermon shall mainly be insisted upon, and it is of great practical use, to take us off from having confidence, and trust in our sorrow for sin. For as when a Creditour doth forgive his debtour, it is the sole act of the Creditour, not any thing of the debtour; So in pardoning, it is not any thing that we do, though with never so much love and brokenness of heart, that doth release and unity the bond of sin, but it is an act of God only.

If you say, Why then is repentance and faith pressed so necessarily, that God doth not forgive without it? for if it be only an act of God, then it may be done without any work of the sinner intervening; but of this in the next place, only for the present take notice, That it is not any sorrow or retraction of ours, that makes a sin either remissible or actually remitted, but a meer act of God; and if all the men of the world were askt this Question, What they mean, when they pray God to forgive their sins? The sense of all would be, not that they should do something which would remit them, but that God by his gracious favour would release them. So then, if all these particulars be cast up together, you may clearly conceive, how God doth forgive sin, not by infusing or putting grace into us, which may expell sin, as light doth darkness; but by his outward grace and favour accepting of us: and therefore we are not to rely upon any thing we do, not to presume, no not of our godly sorrow for sin, but to look up to heaven, desiring God would speak the word, that he would pronounce the sentence of absolution.

Let the Use be, To look upon our selves as bound in chains and fetters by our sins, as made very miserable by them, that so we may the more earnestly desire pardon, and put an high prize upon it. Though Gods forgiving be not the putting off godly sorrow, and the working of a broken heart within us, yet we can never obtain the one without the other. The grace and mercy of a pardon is no more esteemed by us, because we look not upon our selves as so many guilty persons adjudged to eternal death.
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Leath. Thus the Publican cried out, *Have mercy upon me a sinner.* What Plutarch said of the Husbandman, *That it was a pleasant sight to him to see the ears of corn bending to the earth,* because that was an argument of fruit within; No lesse joyfull is it to spiritual Husbandmen to see their people walk with humble, debased, broken hearts, through sense of sin, and not to walk confidently and delicately, like Agag, saying, *The worst is past.* God said of Ahab, though humbled for external motives only, *Seest thou how Ahab humbleth himself?* How much more will God take notice of those who humble themselves upon spiritual grounds, desiring ease from Christ! As therefore Bernard writing to one, *Epist. 180,* whom he thought was not solicitous enough about the judgements of God, in head of wishing him, according to the ordinary custome of salutation, *Salutem plurimum,* much health, said, *Timorem plurimum,* much fear: So may the Ministers of God, We wish you not much joy, but much holy fear. Alas thou fearest pain, poverty, death, but the guilt of sinne is chiefly to be feared, but we like children are afraid of a vizard, and do not fear the fire, which is a real danger.
LECT. XVIII.

The necessity of Repentance in order to Forgiveness: And how it consists with Gods Free-grace in remitting.

MATTH. 6.12.

And forgive us our debts.

You have heard, Pardon of sin is Gods work only, as also his manner of doing it, is not by infusing grace into us, which takes away the guilt of sin, but besides grace sanctifying, there is also an act of Gods part repealing the sentence of condemnation against us. Now because this may seem to overthrow the duty of repentance: and because this is the rock many have been split upon, not being able to reconcile our duty of repentance, with Gods gracious favour of pardoning; I shall speak, though not all, yet as much as relateth to my purpose in hand, concerning the duty and necessity of repentance, although there be no causality or merit in it to take away sin and this may rightly inform us about the true efficacy of our sorrow for sin.

To open this Truth, consider these Propositions:

First, That God doth never remit or forgive sinne, but when also he giveth a mollified and softened heart to repent.

The Scripture doth abundantly confirm this by precepts and examples. It is indeed disputed by the Schoolmen (as you hav heard) whether God by his absolute power might not forgiv sin without sanctification of our natures, and the grace of repentance
pentance; for seeing they are two distinct mercies, why may not God separate the one from the other? But it is a vain thing to dispute what God might do, when he hath revealed what he will do. And although we cannot say, That there is a natural necessity between Justification and Sanctification, such as is between the light and heat in the fire; yet this conjoyning of them together by God's will and appointment, ariseth from a condecenty and fitness both to God himself, who is an holy God, and to the nature of the mercy, which is the taking and removing of sin away.

2. Although the Scripture attribute pardon of sin to many qualifications in a man, yet repentance is the most express and proper duty.

The Scripture sometimes makes forgiving of others a necessary disposition, sometimes confessing and forsaking of them, sometimes believing (though that hath a peculiar nature in receiving of pardon, which other graces have not; and therefore faith obtaineth pardon by way of an instrument applying, which other graces do not) But if we speak of the express formal qualification, it is repentance of our sins, not repentance as it is a meer bare terror upon thy heart, but as it is sweetened with Evangelical considerations. Luther said, There was no word so terrible unto him, and which his soul did more hate then that (repent.) - But it was because he understood not Gospel grounds. We read then of some places of Scripture, which make God to be the only Author of blotting out and pardoning sinne. And again we read of other places, where God doth this for none, but the broken and contrite heart. Now both these places must not be opposed to each other: neither may we so dwell upon the one, as to neglect the other; so to look upon it as God's act, as if there were nothing required in us: and again so to look upon that which we do, as if God were not to be acknowledged.

3. None may believe or conclude that their sins are pardoned before they have repented.

To this I shall speak more particularly, when I handle the doctrine of Justification before faith. As for the assertion it self, it is plain by all those places of Scripture which make repentance requisite
requisite to pardon, **Ezek. 14.6. Ezek. 18.30. Mat. 3.2. Luke 13.3.** The Learned Doctor Twisse, *Vindic. Grat.* pg. 18, confesseth that there are arguments on both sides in the Scripture: Sometimes he faith, Pardon of sinne is subjoined to confession and repentance, of which sort he confesseth there are more frequent and express places; but yet sometimes, remission of sinne already obtained, is made an argument to move to repentance, and he instanceth in *David* and *Mary Magdalen*, who did abundantly and plentifully break out into tears, upon the sense of pardon. But these instances are not to the purpose, for *David* repented of his wickedness, before *Nathan* told him that his sinne was taken away; and his penitential *Psalm* was not made so much for the first pardon of his sinne, as the confirming and affuring of him in his pardon. Thus it was also with *Mary Magdalen*. But more of this in time.

**Prop. 4.**

There is a necessity of repentance if we would have pardon, both by a necessity of *precept or command*; as also by a necessity of *means and a way*.

Whatsoever is necessary, *necessitate medii*, by a necessity of means or a way, is also necessary by a necessity of command, though not *contra*. That repentance is necessary by way of a command, is plain by the places fore-quoted, and in innumerable other places. I do not handle the case, Whether an *actual* or *explicit* repentance be necessary to salvation of every sinner; but I speak in the generall. It is disputed, Whether it be a *natural* precept, or a meer *positive* command; and if it be a natural or moral command, to which command it is reduced? Those that would have it under the command of *Thou shalt not kill*, as if there were commanded a care of our souls, that they should not be damned, are ignorant of the true limits and bounds of the severall Commandments. It’s disputed also, When this time of repentance doth binde? It is a wonder that some should limit it only to times of danger and fear of death. Certainly this command bindes as soon as ever a man hath sinned, *Veniata indicias non patiuntur*, A man that hath swallow’d down poysen, is not to linger, but presently to expell it. And one that is wounded, who lieth bleeding, doth presently dispatch with all readiness for Physitians, to have his bloud stopt:
...with God's Remission.

...and thus ought men to take the first opportunity. Hence in that famous miracle wrought at the pool of Bethesda, not the second or third, but he that stepped first into it was the only man that was healed. As repentance is thus necessary by way of command, so also by way of means: for the Spirit of God worketh this in a man, to qualify him for this pardon; So that although there be no causality, condignity or merit in our repentance, yet it is of that nature, that God doth ordain and appoint it a way for pardon: So that the command for repentance is not like those positive commands of the Sacraments, wherein the will of the Law-giver is meerly the ground of the duty; but there is also a fitness in the thing it should be so; even as among men, nature teacheth, That the injurious person should be sorry, and ask forgiveness before he be pardoned.

5. Concerning this duty of repentance, there are two extreme practical mistakes; the one is of the profligate, secure man, who makes every empty and heartless invocation of mercy, to be the repentance spoken of in the Scripture, whereas repentance is a duty compounded of many ingredients, and so many things go to the very essence, yea the lowest degree of godly sorrow, that by Scripture rules we may say, Repentance is rarely to be seen any where; for if you do regard the nature if it, it is a broken and a contrite heart. Now how little of the heart is in most mens humiliations? men being humiliati magis quam humiles, as Bernard said; humbled and brought low by the hand of God, rather then humble and lowly in their own souls. Again if you consider the efficient cause, it is from the Spirit of God, the spring of sorrow must arise from this hill, Zecb.12. Rom.8. Further, if you consider the motive, it must be because God is displeased and offended, because sin is against an holy Law, and so of a staining and a polluting nature.

Lastly, if you consider the effect and fruit of repentance, it is an advised forsaking and utter abandoning of all those lusts and iniquities, in whose fetters they were before chained: so that a man repenting and turned unto God, differs as much from himself once a sinner, as a Lazarus raised up and walking, differs from himself dead and putrifying in the grave. Do not thou...
The second of
the godly.

Mans Repentance consistente

then whose heart is not contrite, who doest continually lick up
the vomit of thy sin, promise to thy self repentance: No, thou
art far from this duty as yet.

On the other side, there is a contrary mistake, and that is
sometimes by the godly soul, and such as truly fear God,
They think not repentance enough, unless it be enlarged to such
a measure and quantity of sorrow: as also extended to such a
space of time; and by this means, because they cannot tell
when they have sorrowed enough, or when their hearts are
broken as they should be, they are kept in perpetuall labyrinths,
and often through impatience do with Luther in such a tempta-
tion, wish they never had been made men, but any creatures rather,
because of the doubts, yea the hell they feel within themselves.
Now although it be most profitable bitterly to bewail our sins,
and to limit no time, yet a Christian is not to think pardon
doeth not belong to him, because his sorrow is not so great and
sensible for sin as he desireth it. David indeed doeth not only in
his soul, but even bodily express many tears, yea rivers, because
of his sin, and other mens sins; yet it is a good rule, That the
people of God, if they have sorrow in the chiefeft manner ap-
preativě, though not intensive, by way of judgement and
esteem, so that they had rather any affliction should befall
them, then to sin against God; if this be in them, though they have
not such sensible intense affections, they may be comforted.
When the Apostle John makes this argument, He that loveth
not his brother whom he hath seen, how shall he love God whom he
hath not seen? it implieth, that things of sense do more move us,
then matter of faith. David made a bitter out-cry upon the
death of Absalom, with sad expressions, Would to God I had died
for thee, O Absalom, my son, my son &c. But when Nathan told
him of his adultery and murder, though he confessed his sin, yet
we read not that he made such sensible lamentation. Thus
Hieron writeth of a godly woman Paula, that at the death of
her children, would be so dejected, that she did hardly escape
death; yet it is not reported that she found such grief for her
sins. So that as in corporall things, a man would choose the
tooth-ach, rather then a pestilent feaver, yet a man is more af-
flicted and pained at the tooth-ach, or burning of his finger,
then at a fever: So it may be here, a godly man would rather choose the loss of his children, or dearest relations, then lose the favour of God by his sinne; yet it may be have more painfull grief in the one then the other. Again, it is to be observed, that the Scripture requiring sorrow or repentance for sin, doth not limit such a degree, or such a length of time, which if necessary, would certainly have been prescribed.

6. It cannot be denied, but that the ancient Fathers have spoken hyperbolically of tears and repentance; which phrases were the occasion of that corrupt doctrine in Popery. Chrysostom compareth repentance to the fire, which taketh away all rust of sinne in us. Basil calls it the medicine of the soul, yea those things which God properly doth, are attributed to tears and sorrow; as if the water of the eyes, were as satisfactory as the bloud of Christ; his bloud is clean enough to purge us, but our very tears need washing. It is true indeed, we read of a promise made to those, who turn from their evil ways, Ezek. 18. 27. he shall save his soul alive; but this is not the fruit of his repentance, but the gift of God, by promise: If qualifying the subject, it hath no influence upon the priviledge: Even as a man doth by the power of nature dispose and prepare the body to receive the soul, but it is the work of God, immediatly to infuse it.

7. Though therefore repentance be necessary to qualify the sub-ject, yet we run into falsehood, when we make it a cause of pardon of sin. And thus ignorant and erroneous people do: Ask why they hope to be faved or justified, why they hope to have their sins pardoned; they return this answer, because they have repented, and because they lead a godly life: thus they put their trust and confidence in what they have done. But the Scripture, though it doth indispensible command repentance in every one, yet the efficient cause of pardon is God's grace, and the meritorious is Christ's bloud: And if repentance come under the name of a cause, it can be only of the materiall, which doth qualify the subject, but hath no influence into the mercy it self. We read Luke 7. that Mary Magdalen had many sinnes pardoned her, because she loved much: But the Parable of a Creditour which forgave debts, that is brought by our Saviour to
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aggravate her kindness, doth plainly shew, that he speaks not of a love that was the cause of pardon of her sin, but which was the effect of it, God's love melting her heart, even as the Sun doth snow. The highest expressions that we meet with in Scripture, where pardon of sin seemeth to be ascribed to godliness, as a cause, is Dan 4:27. Break off thy iniquity by shewing mercy to the poor. Here we would think, that if a man would on purpose hold, that doing of a good work, would be a proper cause to remove sin, he would use no other expression. But first it appeareth by the context that Daniel giveth not this counsel in reference to Justification, and the pardon of his sin, so as to be accepted with God; but to prolong and keep off that temporall judgement, which was revealed in the vision, as appeareth by those words (if there may be a lengthening of thy tranquility.) And we have the like instance in Ahab, who prorogued his calamity by an external humiliation. Again, although the vulgar translate it, Redeem thy sins; yet the Hebrew word doth properly signifie, to break a thing, as we translate it; and although by a metaphor it be applied to redeem and deliver, yet that is always of men and persons, not things, especially it would be ridiculous to say, Redeem thy sinnes: so that the meaning is, that whereas before, Nebuchadnezzar had by injustice and oppression done much rapine and violence, now Daniel counselleth him to break off such wicked waies, by the contrary expressions of love and charity: so that this place giveth not any spiritual mercy to repentance, as the proper cause thereof.

8. As repentance is thus necessary, but not as a cause of pardon: so neither is it required, as that whereby we appease and satisfy God; and this all Popery goeth upon, yea and all Pharisaicall spirits, in their humiliation, that by those afflictions and debalements of their souls, they shall satisfy God, and make him amends. But this is so gross, that the more learned of the Papists are fain to mitigate the matter, and say, That satisfaction cannot be properly made to God by any thing we do, because all we have and do is from God, and therefore there must be an acceptation or Covenant by way of gift interposed, whereby we may be able to satisfy. And then further they say,
There cannot be satisfaction made to gain the friendship of God, which sin hath violated, but to take away something of temporal punishment that belongs to sin.

So that by all this which hath been delivered, we may give repentance those just and true bounds, which God's Word doth assign to it, and yet not give more then God's Word doth. Neither may we think it a nicety or subtilty to make a difference between a qualification, and a cause; for if we do not, we take off the due glory that belongs to Christ and his merits, and give it to the works we do, and we do make Christ and his sufferings imperfect and insufficient; and by this we may see, in what sense grace inherent, or sanctification doth expell sin; for if we speak of the filth and pollution of sin, so sanctifying grace expels it, as light doth darkness, heat doth cold, by a real mutation and change: So that God in sanctifying doth no more to expell the sin in the filth of it, afterwards; even as the Physitian needs to do no more to the removing of the leprosie, then by producing a sound health in the body. But when we speak of the guilt of sin, it is not grace sanctifying within us that doth remove the guilt, but grace justifying without us. Inasmuch that although a man after sin committed were perfectly sanctified, yet that would not take off the guilt his sin had brought upon him: so that although that man needed in such a case no further grace of sanctification to make him holy, yet he needed the grace of remission to take away this guilt. So that the guilt of sin doth not cease by a natural necessity, upon the removing of the nature of the sin, but upon a distinct and new act of God's favour in forgiving; for if this were so, then God's mercy in giving a repenting heart, and his mercy in pardoning should not be two distinct mercies, (which yet are evidently distinguished by the Scripture) but the same entire mercy. Now although this be true, yet how few do reform their judgements in this point? and thereupon they come to put that upon their grace within them, which belongs to grace without them.

Use of Instrucition, That there may be an happy reconciliation and accord between God's grace in forgiving, and man's duty in repenting, one need not be preached to jumble out the other. All error is an extremity of some truth, and therefore it is hard.
hard to discover truth, because it is difficult to finde out where the bounds are that truth parts from error. Let not therefore a Christian so rely upon his repentance, as if there were no Covenant of grace, no blood of Christ to procure an atonement: so neither let him extoll these causes to the extinguishing of his duties.

To stir up to this duty of repentance, as that without which pardon of sin cannot be obtained. There is no such free-grace nor Gospel-mercy that doth supersede a broken and contrite heart. Christ was broken for thy sins, yet that will not excuse thee from a broken heart for them also. Christ was wounded, and a man of sorrow for thy sins, yet that will not take off thy wounds and sorrow also. Indeed if these were able to satisfy God's wrath, or to make an atonement, then Christ was wounded, and became a man of sorrows in vain, for God doth not require a two-fold satisfaction: but we are wounded for sin upon other grounds then Christ was: we mourn for other causes then he did: and consider, thou that art afraid to grieve here for sin, how little is that which thou shalt be forced to grieve for it hereafter! Thou art unwilling to be burdened here; but oh how easie is that to the load thou must stand under hereafter! This Bernard urged, When, faith he, we urge men to repent, they say, This is a hard speech, who can bear it? but you are deceived; when God shall say, Depart ye cursed into everlasting fire, This is indeed an hard speech. And account that repentance is as much as the bringing of a man to his wits and minde again. All the while thy sins are not a burden to thee, thou art in blindness: even as the childe, as long as it is in the dark womb, weeps not, but as soon as ever it cometh into the light, then it crieth. As long as thou liest in the womb of darknes and ignorance, thou mournest not; but when God shall open thy eyes to see thy estate, and the aggravation of thy sins, then thou wilt burst out into sorrow.
Lect. XIX.

Repentance no cause of Pardon, and yet its Usefulness and Necessity as to Pardon. Why Repentance is not sufficient to remove the Guilt of Sinne; And why it bears not the proportion in Satisfaction that Sinne doth in the offence.

Matth. 6. 12.

And forgive us our Debts.

It hath been shewed, That there is an happy accord between Gods grace in pardoning, and our duty in repenting. In bounding of which you have heard the Scripture excludes all merit and causality from our repentance, and gives the glory of all to Gods grace, and Christ's blood.

Before I leave this point, it will be necessary to answer some practical Objections, for there is a great miscarriage in many about this very duty of repentance. If they be asked, How they hope to be saved, they will reply, by their repentance. Thus they make that their ark, and city of refuge; they look upon that as the
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the brazen Serpent, and not Jesus Christ. And it is no wonder if this be so among ignorant people, when the most learned amongst the Papists, do give such power and merit unto repentance. Insomuch that Vasques saith, He wonders at those Catho-

lics who have such low and despicable thoughts of the righteous-

ness of us, as that it should not exclude sin, without any new favour or pardon of God: as if the enabling of us to repent, did expell the guilt of sin, as fire doth water, by a natural necessity.

The first Objection therefore may be, To what purpose doth God require repentance seeing it is no cause of pardon? Why may not God forgive sin, as well without this sorrow of ours? for if it have no efficacy of itself, to deliver from the guilt of sin, then sin might be pardoned as well without it as with it; for if the Spirit of God prepareth us for pardon, by exciting and stirring up repentance, this repentance must have some respect of causality to pardon, or else to what purpose doth it? For it is hard therefore to see the necessity of repentance, unless it have such effects. In this sorte, repentent pænitentiae, inhære tanquam naufragus tabulae, said Ambrose; and this efficacy all are prone to give to repentance.

Answ. I.

Now to answer this, lay first this foundation, That God doth indispensably require repentance of all, Acts 17.30. Where not only the command of repentance is made known, but the goodness of God in pressing this duty: for whereas God hath neglected and passed over the former times of ignorance, by not revealing any such command unto them, now by the general spreading of the Gospel he doth. For howsoever we translate it (winked at) as also Beza doth, yet Dein upon the place sheweth more probably, that it signifies God's anger, and indignation to them, and therefore hid the means of salvation from them. This grace is also required of the godly sinning, 2 Cor. 7.9,10. Rev. 2.16. Tertullian subtilly, but not solidly faith, God first dedicated repentance in his own self; for before God said, It repenteth me that I have made man, the name of re-

pentance was not heard. But we know that God cannot in a proper sense be said to repent, because there is no ignorance in his understanding, or mutability in his will. But to answer, Why God doth require it; this in the first place might be e-

ough, Because it is his will and command, Bonum est pænitere,
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Anon. *quid revolvis? Deus precipit*, said Tertullian, Is it good to repent, or not? Why doubt'st thou? Hath not God commanded it? It is God's will to joyn pardon and repentance together. Though there were no more connexion between these two, then by that meer appointment of God, we were bound up to do it. As we see in the Sacraments, God hath promis'd such spiritual grace in the holy use and application of such outward signs, where there is no natural connexion at all between the grace and the sign; but the union comes by the meer institution and command of God. Although the conjoyning of pardon with repentance, be more then from a meer positive command, there is an aptness and fitness in the thing itself. Now God in commanding of this, doth not because he needed it, or as if he could not do otherwise; for if a man may forgive another that hath injured him, although he do not grieve or be troubled for such an offence, why may not God, if we speak of absolute power? Thy tears therefore and thy repentance, they make not God more happy; neither are they required for God's good, but for thy own good. Neither doth God require them, as if they should make up any defect or insufficiency in Chrisf's blood; for alas, if Chrisf's blood be not able to cleanse away thy sinne, how shall thy tears do it? Hence its no lesse then blasphemy, which Rivet reporteth of Panigirolla the Papift, who calls it foolishness, and a grievous sin to put confidence wholly in Chrisf's blood. Although therefore God puts up thy tears in his bottle, yet if he do not also take notice of the blood of Chrisf, thy soul must still remain filthy. Do not therefore magnifie thy tears, and undervalue Chrisf's blood. The blood of the Sacrifice, which represented Chrisf's blood, was to be sprinkled upon the posts of the door, but not on the threshold, it was not to be trampled upon or despised: no more is Chrisf's blood.

In the second place, There are many reasons of congruity and fitness, why a man should repent, though it procure not pardon as a cause. Though God cause the Sun to shine, and the rain to fall upon the wicked as well as the righteous, yet pardon and reconciliation is not vouchsafed to the impenitent, as well as the penitent.

**Answ. 2.**

Six Reasons of Congruity betwixt repentance and remission.
The first reason of congruity is, because hereby a man shall experimentally know the bitterness of sin, as well as the sweetness of it: For as God, through Christ, hath fully satisfied his justice, to take away all punishment, doth yet heavily afflict his own people for sin, that so they may in their own sense apprehend what wormwood and gall is in sin; so the Lord, though pardon come wholly by Christ, yet will give it to none, but to those that repent, that so according to their delight in sin, may also be their bitterness for it, Jer. 2. 19. Aristotle said, Homo est magis sensus quam intellectus, much more is he sensus then fides, more sense than faith; and what he experimentally doth most feel, in that he is most affected.

2. Another congruity is this, hereby we shall come to prize pardon the more, and to esteem the grace of God in forgiving. The sick esteem the Physician. The broken bones make a man cry out for ease. The famished Prodigal would be glad of crumbs. It is therefore fit that a man's sins should be a burden, and an heavy trouble to him, that so pardon may be the sweeter, and God's love the more welcome. When Joseph's brethren were put in fear, and dealt with roughly as spies: after this to know that Joseph was their reconciled brother, did work the greater joy. Again, we shall hereby judge the better of Christ's love to us, his sufferings in his soul were more exquisite then those in his body, when he cried My God, why hast thou forsaken me? in this was the height of his agony. Now thou that in thy repentance feelest God's displeasure, art ready to cry out, why dost thou forsake me? by these throbs and agonies in thy own soul, thou mayest have some scantling of what Christ had in his soul: and certainly to think that Christ was thus tempted, thus under God's displeasure for thee, will more endear Christ to thee, then that he was made poor, a worm and no man, yea crucified for thee.

3. Hereby we shall give God the glory of his justice, that he might damn us, if he did enter into strict judgement with us. In repentance we judge our selves, 1 Cor. 11. that is, we condemn our selves, acknowledge such sins to be committed by us, for which God might shew no mercy, for which he might say, Depart ye cursed into everlasting fire; and by this means, God is highly honoured, and we debased. See this notably in David, Psal.
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Psalm 51:4. Against thee have I sinned, that thou mightest be justified, when thou speakest, and clear when judgest. By this expression, David doth acknowledge, That all the afflictions laid upon him for sin were just, and therefore God was to be cleared bowsoever. Thus in repentance a man comes to know himself, how low and vile he is, and that if he be saved from wrath and hell, it is meerly from God's good pleasure; and therefore repentance is a kind of a revenge upon a man's self. 2 Cor. 7:10. The Lord is set up in his greatness and sovereignty, we are made wholly prostrate.

4. As there is a Congruity, so repentance floweth by natural consequence from a regenerated and sanctified heart: For seeing regeneration is taking away the heart of stone, and giving an heart of flesh, thereby also is given a flexibility, and tenderness, and aptness to relent, because God is dishonoured. As there is in children a natural impression to mourn and relent, when a father is displeased, so that this godly sorrow floweth from a gracious heart, as a stream from the fountain, as fruit from the tree. From this inward principle David doth so heartily mourn and pray; from this Peter goeth out, and weeps bitterly. It is therefore a vain Question to ask, Why a godly man is humbled for sin? It is as if you should ask, Why a child mourneth for the death of his father? That love of God within him, which doth abundantly prevail, and reign there, is like fire that doth melt and soften. So that as natural forms are the principles of actions, which flow from them; Thus is a supernatural principle of grace within, the ground of all spiritual actions that issue thencefrom; but although it flow as a fruit, yet many times this stream is obstructed or dried up.

5. There is in godly sorrow an aptness or fitness to be made the means or way wherein pardon may be obtained. And this is the highest our godly sorrow can attain unto, in reference to pardon of sin, viz. an ordinability of it to be such a way, wherein we may finde mercy. And thus we cannot say of impenitency, or any other sin: That God may forgive a man living in his impieties and wicked ways, for they have no aptitude or condescency in their natures, to be referred to such an end. We grant therefore that when the Spirit of God doth humble and soften a man's
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In the heart of man, it works that in a man which hath a fitness to be used, as the means whereby mercy is obtained; yet that hath no merit or condignity in it to purchase salvation. Hence it is that we may not say, It is all one whether a man doth repent or not; or that repentance is in a man, as a sign only that God hath pardoned; but we must go further and say, It is the means and way which God hath appointed antecedently to pardon; so that where this goeth before, the other cometh after.

6. There is a Congruency in repentance for sin, though it be not expiatory or satisfactory; if we do regard the justice of God, or the mercy and grace of God. The justice of God: For if he should pardon sinfull, impenitent men, though they wallow in all mire and filth that despise his grace and mercy, how could his justice bear it? Though therefore repentance doth not satisifie his justice, yet sins unrepent of cannot be pardoned without injustice; and therefore Christ did not undertake to satisifie the wrath of God in an absolute illimited manner, but in an ordered way, viz. in the way of faith and repentance.

Again, It is not becomming the grace of God, to give pardon without repentance, for hereby a flood-gate would be opened to all prophaneness and impiety; and then what sense or taste could men have of the grace of God, if it were thus exposed to all impenitent, as well as repenting, who would magnifie grace? who would desire it? So that you see, it is neither agreeing with the mercy or the justice of God, to forgive sin before, or without repentance.

A second Objection may be, Why repentance wrought by the Spirit of God, is not enough to remove sin in the guilt of it? What necessity is there, that besides this there should be a special and gracious act of God to pardon?

1. The Answer is from many grounds: First, The Scripture makes these two distinct mercies, and therefore ought not to be confounded. God promises to turn the heart unto him, and he will turn to it, in the way of pardon. So that a man absolved at the throne of grace, hath two distinct benefits, for which he is to give God thanks; the one is, That he makes him to see his sins, and be humb'led for them; the other,
other, That being thus humbled, God giveth him pardon; for although God hath ordered it so, that where the one goeth before, the other shall infallibly follow, yet all this is of God's goodnesse. He might have commanded repentance in a deep and broken manner, and when we had done all, yet might have had no pardon, and therefore its no thanks to thy repentance, but to God's grace, that thou dost meet with forgive-

2. Our repentance is infirm and weak needing another repentance. 

Lava Domine, lachrymas meas, faith he, O Lord, was my tears. That is only true of Christ's blood, which Ambrose spake in commenda-
tions of water, Que lavas omnia, nec lavaris, which washes all things, and art not washed thy self. So that repentance cannot be the remedy to lean upon, for alas, that needeth another remedy, which is the blood of Christ. If therefore when asked, How dost thou hope to have thy sins pardoned? thou answer, Because thou repentest and humblest thy self for thy sins It will be further demanded, But how dost thou hope to have thy sins of thy repentance taken away? Here all must necessarily be resolved into the blood of Christ. Take heed then after sin of trusting in thy own sorrow. It is a most subtil sin, unless a man be much acquainted with the Gospel-way, and his own self-emptiness, its impossible but that he should look upon his repentance, as that which maketh God amends.

3. If it were possible that our repentance were perfect and without spot, yet that could not take away the guilt of sin committed, because sinne is an infinite offence and dishonour to God, and therefore can never be made up by any man, though he should be made as holy as Angels. For if man had committed one sin only, if the same man should presently be made perfectly holy; or if he had the holinesse of Angels and Saints communicated to him, all this could not take off the guilt of sin, neither would all that holiness have as much satisfied God, as sinne displeased and dishonoured him. Hence God sent Christ into the world to make a reparation, and to bring a greater good, then sin could evil. Oh therefore how low must this lay thee in the dust, after sin committed! O Lord, could I repent to the highest degree, Could I bring the holiness of men

and
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and Angels, it could not make up the breach sin hath made upon me, What then shall I think of my self, whose graces may be much perfected and bettered then they are?

But you may say, Why should not repentance be as great a good, and as much honour God, as sin is an evil? For when you say, sin hath an infinite evil in it; it is meant only objective, because God against whom it is committed, is an infinite God; Now then if sin be called infinite, because it turneth from an infinite God, why should not repentance be said to be infinite, because it turneth to an infinite God? This hath much puzzled some, and hath made them hold, That repentance hath as much infinite worth in it, because of God, to whom a man is turned by it, as sin hath infinite evil in it. But there is a vast difference, because it is enough for sin to have an infinite evil in it, because the offence is done against an infinite God, and so the nature of an offence is according to the object against whom it is. As an offence against a King or Emperour is more then against a private man; so that still offences are more or lesse as the persons against whom they are, be of greater or lesse dignity; but now it is otherwise in good things that are done by way of Satisfaction, that ariseth from the subject, not the object: as now repentance, though it be a turning to God, who is infinite, yet that cannot have infinite Satisfaction, because the Subject which doth repent is finite: Therefore this cleareth the difficulty; offences arise according to the object, but Satisfaction encreaseth according to the Subject. Hence it is, that Christ only could satisfie, because he only was an infinite person. Otherwise if grace or holiness could have done it, Angels might have wrought our redemption. Besides, our repentance and turning to God, cannot be as meritorious of good, as sin is of punishment, because of that true rule, Malum meum, & purè malum est, & meum est: bonum meum, neque purè bonum est, neque meum est. Our sins are altogether, and only sins, and they are truly ours; but our good things are neither purely good things, nor yet ours, but the gifts of God.

Object 3. What harm to God in sin.

The last Objection is, Why should there be such pressing of mourning and repenting for sin, and that because it is such an offence to God? For seeing God is All-sufficient and happy enough in himself,
himself, our sins do not hurt him or make him miserable, no more
then our graces adde to his happinesse, but as he is above our graces,
so he is also above our sins: seeing therefore God is incapable of any
injury from man, why should sin be such an offence?

The Answer is easie, If you consider the internal Attributes
of God, as Justice, Wisdom, Glory and happinesse: so God can
have no lesse or injury, for he is alwayes the same happy and
immutable glorious God: but if you do consider the external
good things that are due to him from men, as honour, praise,
reverence, &c. These may be taken away from God by the per-
verse wils and lives of men, and so God have lesse of this exter-
nal honour and glory then he hath. And although this external
honour and reverence do not make to the internal happinesse
of God, yet he is pleased with this, and commands it of men,
and threatens to punish where it is denied him; and certainly
we may not think the Scripture doth aggravate sin under this
title, as an injury to him, as that which offends him, and is diso-
bedience unto him, if so be there were not some reality. Besides,
the necessity of Christ's death by way of Satisfaction, doth ne-
cessarily argue, That sin is a real offence and dishonour to him.
And lastly, a sinner as much as lieth in him, depriveth God of
all his inward happinesse and glory; in somuch that if it were
possible God would be made lesse happy by our sins. It is no
thanks to a sinner that he is not, but it ariseth from his infinite
perfection that he cannot.

Let the first Use be, To commend repentance as the necessity of it, if ever we would have pardon. God hath appointed no other
way for thy healing. Never perswade thy self of the pardon of
sin, where sin it self hath not been bitter to thee. Besides where
godly sorrow is, there will be earnest prayer and heavenly a-
sension of the soul unto God for his pardon. Hence Zech. 12.
the spirit of prayer and mourning is put together, and Rom 8:
Prayer and groans unutterable. As the fowls of the heaven were
at first created out of the water; so do thy heavenly breathings
after God, arise from thy humbled and broken soul. It is pre-
sumption to expect pardon for that sin, which hath not either
actually or habitually been humbled for by thee. If a man
should expect health and life, yet never eat or drink, would
you
you not say, he tempted God, and was a murderer of himself? So if a man hope for pardon, and yet never debase or loath himself repenting of his sins, will you not say, he is a murderer of his soul? And be encouraged to it, because God hath annexed such a gracious promise to it. He might have filled thee with sorrow here and hereafter. It might be with thee, as the damned angels, who have neither the grace of repentance, nor the mercy of pardon.

2. Not to trust in repentance, but after all thy humiliations still to depend only upon Christ. Though Christ died, and was crucified, yet he did not lose his strength and efficacy. This was represented in that passage of God's providence, *That a bone of his was not broken*; rely therefore upon Christ wounded for sin, not upon thy own heart that is wounded; use this, but trust only in Christ. Dependance upon Evangelical graces doth evacuate Christ, as well as confidence in the Law. A man may not only preach the Law, and the duties thereof, to the prejudice of Christ's glory; but also the duties and graces of the Gospel. If a man relieth upon his repentance and believing, he maketh Justification and Salvation to be of works, though it be of faith; for he makes his faith a work, and gives that glory which belongs to Christ to his own repentance.
Lect. XX.

Whether Pardon of Sinne be an Immanent or Transient act of God; And whether it be antecedent to our Faith and Repentance. The contrary proved, viz. That God doth not Justifie or Pardon us before we Believe and Repent.

Matth. 6. 12.
And forgive us our debts.

It hath already been demonstrated at large, how God doth remit or forgive sins. We come now to shew, What kinde of act forgiveness of sin is, and whether it be antecedent to our faith and repentance. Both these Questions have a dependency one upon another; and therefore must be handled together.

The first doubt is, What kinde of act in God forgiveness of sin is? Whether it be an Immanent act, indwelling and abiding in God; or Transient, working some real effect and change upon the creature. Now in handling of this, I shall not trouble you with that perplex Question so much vexed by the Schoolmen, Whether a transient act be in the agent, or in the patient, but lay down some differences between an immanent action,
action, and a transient action; only you must take notice, that we are in deep darkness, and not able to comprehend how God is said to act or work. For on the one side, we must not hold that there are any accidents in God; or that he can be a subject recipient of such, because of his most pure and simple essence; so that whatsoever is in God is God. And yet on the other side, the Scripture doth represent God doing and working such mercies and judgements as seemeth good to him. Only this some conclude of, wherein others with some probability dissent, that God's knowledge and will is the cause of all things that are done; so that there is not an executive power besides them, whereby he doth this or that; As we see there is in man, though an Artificer will such a thing to be done, yet that is not existent till he hath wrought it, but now God worketh all things by a more command of his will, as appeareth Gen. 1: God said, Let there be light, and there was light; here was God's will to have it so, no executing power distinct from that will. Therefore it is a sure truth, De Deo etiam vera dicere periculum est. It is dangerous to asserter things, though true, of God; and Tune dignè Deum est imamus cum inestimabilem dicimus, then do we rightly esteem of him, when we judge him above our thoughts or esteem. We must not therefore apprehend of God, as having a new will to do a thing in time, which he had not from eternity (as Vorstius and others blaspheme) but his will was from all eternity, that such a thing be in time accomplished by his wisdom. As for example, in Creation, God did not then begin to have a will to create: but he had a will from all eternity, that the world should exist in time; and thus it is in justification and sanctification; not that these effects are from eternity, but God's will is: And if you ask, Why, seeing God will to create or justify is from eternity, Creation and justification are not also from eternity? The answer is, because God is a free agent, and so his will is not a necessary cause of the thing, for then it would be immediately, as the Sun beams are necessarily as soon as the Sun is, but it is a voluntary principle, and so maketh the effect to be at the time he prescribeth. As if there were an Artificer or Carpenter, that could by his meer will cause an house to be reared up; he might will this to be done in
in such and such a year long after his will of it to be: So God when the world is made, when a sinner is justified, willed these things from all eternity, and when they come to have a being, these effects cause an extrinsec call denomination to be attributed to God, which was not before, as now he is a Creator, and was not before, now he justifieth, and did not before. There is no change made in God, but the alteration is in the creature. But of this more in its time. Let us come to give the differences between an immanent action, and a transient, and then we may easily see, which of these two Justification or Remission of sin is.

The first and proper difference is this, An immanent action is that which abides in God, so that it works no real effect without: As when God doth meekly know or understand a thing; but a transient action is when a positive change is made thereby in a creature, as in Creation, &c. So that we may conclude of all Gods actions which do relate to believers, only predestination is an immanent act of God, and all the rest, Justification, Reformation, Glorification, are transient acts; for predestination though it be an act of God choosing such an one to happiness, yet it doth not work any real change or positive effect in a man, unless we understand it virtually, for it is the cause of all those transient actions that are wrought in time. Howsoever, therefore Justification be called by some an immanent action, and so made to go before faith and repentance *, as if faith were only a declaration and signe of pardon of sinne from all eternity, yet that cannot be made good, as is to be shewed.

A second difference floweth from the other, An immanent action is from eternity, and the same with Gods essence, but a transient action is the same with the effect produced. Hence the Orthodox maintain, That Gods decrees are the same with his nature. Hence when we speak of Gods willing such a thing, it is no more then his divine essence, with an habitude and respect to such objects; Gods decrees are no more then God decreeing, Gods will no more then God willing: otherwise the simplicity of Gods nature will be overthrown, and those volitions of God, will be created entities, and so must be created by other

* Extra controversiam est, remissionem pecatorum, prout actus est in Deo immanens, antecedere nostram fidem & reflexicientiam. "Twill vind. gr. pag. 18.

2. An immanent action in God is from eternity.
What kinde of act Remission of Sin is.

new volitions, and so in infinitum, as Spanheimius well argueth, only the later part seemeth not to be strong or sufficient, because when man willeth, he doth not will that by a new volition, and so in infinitum; and why then would such a thing follow in God? Besides, its no such absurdity in the actings of the soul, to hold a progress in infinitum, thus farre, that it doth not determinately pitch or end at such an act. It is one thing to have things distinguished in God, and another thing for us to conceive distinctly of them. The former is false, the later is true and necessary. But with transient actions it is otherwise, they being the same with the effects produced, are in time; and this is a perpetuall mistake in the Antinomian, to confound God's decree and purpose to justify, with justification; Gods immanent action from all eternity, with that transient, which is done in time. Whereas if they should do thus in matters of sanctification and glorification, it would be absurd to every mans experience, whereas indeed a man may as truly say, That his body is glorified from all eternity, as that his sins are forgiven from all eternity. And certainly, Scripture speaks for one as well as the other, when it faith, Whom he hath justified, them he hath glorified.

By these two differences, you may see, That pardon of sin is a transient action, and so Justification also, partly, because it leaveth a positive, real effect upon a man justified; he that was in the state of hatred, is hereby in a state of love and friendship, he hath peace with God now, that once was at variance with him. Now when we say, There is a change made in a man by Justification, it is not meant of an inward, absolute and physical one, such as is in sanctification, when of unholy we are made holy; but moral and relative, as when one is made a Magistrate, or husband and wife: partly, because this is done to us in time, whereas immanent actions were from all eternity, and therefore it would be absurd to pray for them, as it is ridiculous for a man to pray he may be predestinated or elected. Some indeed have spoken of predestination, as actus continuus, a continued act, and so with them it is good Divinity, Si non sis predestinatus, ora ut predestineris. If thou beeest not predestinated, pray that thou maieft be; but this is corrupt doctrine, and much opposeth
Faith and Repentance antecedents of Justification.

opposeth the Scripture, which doth frequently commend election from the eternity of it, that it was before the foundations of the world were laid; whereas now for pardon of sinne, it is our duty to pray that God would do it for us. This being thus cleared, we come to answer the next Question depending upon this, viz. Whether God doth justify or forgive our sins before we believe and repent? and our answer is negative, That God doth not: Although there are many who are pertinacious, that he doth; and so they make faith not an instrumentall cause to apply pardon, but only a persuasion that sin is pardoned; and thus repentance shall not be a condition to qualify the subject to obtain forgiveness, but a sign to manifest that sin is forgiven. This Question is of great practical concernment; and therefore to establish you in the truth, consider these Arguments.

1. The Scripture speaks of a state of wrath and condemnation, that all are in before they be justified or pardoned. Therefore the believers sins were not from all eternity forgiven; for if there were a time, viz. before his regeneration and conversion, that he was a child of wrath, under the guilt and punishment of sinne, then he could not be at the same time in the favour of God, and peace with him. Now the Scripture doth plentifully shew, That even believers before their regeneration are detained in such bonds and chains of guilt and Gods displeasure, Eph.2.1,2,3. There the Apostle speaking to the converted Ephesians, telleth them of the wretched and cursed condition they were once in, and he reckons himself amongst them, saying, They were children of wrath, and that even as others were: So that there is no difference between a godly man unconverted, and a wicked man, for that present state; for both are under the power of Satan, both walk in disobedience, both are workers of iniquity, and so both are children of wrath. It is true, the godly man is predestinated, and so shall be brought out of this state, and the other left in it. But predestination (as is more largely to be shewed) being an immanent act in God, doth denote no positive effect for the present of love upon the person; and therefore he being not justified, hath his sins imputed to him, lying upon him, and therefore by the Psalmists...
argument, not a blessed man. This also, 1 Cor. 6.9,10,11. The Apostle faith of some Corinthians, that they were such as abiding in that state could not inherit the Kingdom of God, and such were some of you, but ye are washed, but ye are justified. Therefore there was a time when these Corinthians were not justified, but had their sins abiding on them. Likewise all the places of Scripture, which speak of God's wrath upon wicked men, and that they have no peace with God, must needs be true of all godly men while unconverted. He that believeth not, hath not life, and the wrath of God abideth on him; and without faith it is impossible to please God. Now who can deny but that this is true of Paul, while no believer, but an opposer of godliness? The Psalmist also faith, God is angry with the wicked every day: Was not this true of Manasses before his conversion? It must therefore be a very poisonous doctrine, to say, That God is as well pleased with a man before his conversion, as after.

Argum. 2.

2. If the Scriptures limit this privilege of justification and pardon only to those subjects that are so and so qualified, then till they be thus furnished, they cannot enjoy those privileges. The places are many which testify this, Acts 3.19. Repent, that your sins may be blotted out. Therefore their sins flood uncancelled, as so many debts in God's register book, till they did repent, Acts 26.18. To turn them from darkness to light, from the power of Satan to God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins. Therefore they had it not, while under the power of darkness, 1 John 1.9. If we confess our sins, he is faithfull and just to forgive us our sins, which supposeth, That God doth forgive our sins only, when we confess and forfake them, Matt. 6.15. If ye forgive not, neither will my heavenly Father forgive you. It is in vain to number up more places, for these do necessarily prove sin is not forgiven, till faith and repentance. They do not indeed argue a causality or merit, yet they inferre a necessary presence in those that obtain pardon, and do hold by the same proportion, as those places which require sanctification before glorification.

Arg. 3.

3. Where the Scripture requireth many things to the obtaining of any special benefit, there that benefit cannot be said to be enjoyed, till all those things be brought about. Now the Word of God speaks
speaks of severall things required to pardon of sin. There is the grace and mercy of God, as the efficient cause, Psal. 51.1. Isa. 43.25. Rom.3.25. 2. There is requisite the blood of Christ, as the meritorious cause; for there can be no remission of sins without effusion of blood, Rom. 3.25. 1 Cor.15.3. Heb.1.3. 1 Job.4.10. 3. There is faith required as an instrumentall cause, Acts.26.18. Rom.3.25. Now although an instrumentall cause have not that worth or excellency as the efficient and meritorious have, yet it is as necessary in the way of an instrument, as the others are in their respective causalities: so that as a man may not from those places which speak of Gods grace, inferre, Therefore remission of sins is before Christ's death: So neither may a man argue, because Christ died to take away our sins, Therefore these are taken away before we believe. So that this argument may fully establish us. We see the Scripture speaking of three causes cooperant to pardon of sin, therefore I may not conclude the effect is wrought till all those causes be. And as the Scripture speaks of these causes, so, as you heard, of many qualifications in the subject. Infomuch that it is so farre from being a duty to believe our sins were pardoned from all eternity antecedently to faith and repentance, that we are undoubtedly to believe they were not. If the King proclaim a pardon to every one that shall humble himself and seek it out, If the Physitian prepare a potion for the patient to receive it, shall any man say, because of those causal preparations, that either the one is pardoned, or the other healed before their particular application of those things?

4. If our sins be pardoned antecedently to our faith and repentance, then all those effects which are inseparable in the least moment of time from justification, are also antecedent to our faith and repentance: But it is evident by experience that is not so. It is a clear truth, That sanctification of our natures is individually conjoined one with the other. So that although there be a priority of nature, yet they are together in time. God pardons no mans sins whom he doth not heal, Rom.8.1. 1 Job.1.9. Psal. 32.2. A man may be justified, and not glorified, but not justified and unregenerated. Then if so, a man shall be at the same time, unconverted and converted; at the same time a member of
of Christ, and a member of the devil; and so as they say, we are justified only declaratively in our own consciences, so we shall be regenerated and converted only declaratively. Again where sins are pardoned, there is blessedness, as the Psalmist speaks, then I may call Paul a blessed persecutor; Manasses a blessed murderer, for they had no sin imputed to them at that time. Besides, those whose sins are pardoned, may boldly go to the throne of grace, and call God Father; all which are contrary to the whole tenour of Scripture, which expostulates with men, for taking his name or words into their mouth, and hate to be reformed: yet a Doctor of this Antinomian fower leaven, affirmeth boldly, That God doth love us as well before conversion, as after, That God did love Paul with as great a love when he persecuted the Church, as when he preached the Gospel: How must this devour up all godliness, when I may have the same faith and confidence in God for pardon in the acting of flagitious crimes, as well as out of them, in prayer and humiliation? and if he may have the same faith, why not then the same consolations, and joy in conscience?

Arg.5.

5. If justification do antecede our faith, so that faith doth only declare our pardon of sin, then any other grace may be said to justify as well as faith. For take any other grace, repentance, humility, joy, these are all the fruits of God's Spirit; and so demonstrate his election of us, his Justification of us. But how answerably do the Orthodox prove, a peculiar instrumental virtue in faith for pardon, which others have not? The Apostle expresseth it, and this, through faith in his blood, not love of his blood: and indeed the Apostle maintaineth that Gospel position against false teachers, viz. That we are justified by faith, not by works. The Question was not, Whether the works of the Law did justify us declaratively only, but causally. So then by this Doctrine, faith must no more be called the hand, or the eating and drinking of Christ's body and blood, but only made a sign of such mercies.

Arg.6.

6. If pardon of sin be from all eternity, going before our faith and repentance, because of God's election, then it must also be antecedent to the death and obedience of Christ. So that not only our tears, but Christ's blood shall be excluded from this great favour. The reason
reason is plain. Because Gods predestination and election is antecedent to Christ, yea Christ is a fruit of our election: so that the Orthodox maintain against Arminians, Though we be chosen in Christ, yet not for Christ. Christ is the meritorious cause of Justification and Glorification, but not of predestination, that is meerly from his own self; so that if Gods act of predestinating us be enough to institute us into all this favour and love, what need is there of an atonement by Christ's blood? and thus we may urge a Doctors Argument upon himself. All the elect of God are justified, but all the elect of God are elected antecedently to Christ's merits, Therefore they are justified before Christ's merits.

7. If (because its said, Ephel. 2. That while we were dead, Christ gave himself for us, and Rom. 5. That he died for the ungodly,) it followeth our sins are pardoned before we believe, then it will also follow, that all men's sins are pardoned. For the Texts that speak thus of his dying for the ungodly, and for enemies, make no distinction of one from another: And thus a Judas as well as a Peter is bound to believe his sins are pardoned.

Those that argue against all qualifications, and say, God requireth nothing of thee, though lying in thy blood, must needs hold an universal promiscuous pardon of all, and that such a sin as presumption is not possible. For if I believe that Christ died to take away my sins, though I walk in all disobedience, yet that is not presumption, but a duty. It is true, the Orthodox call upon those who lie groveling in their swinish lufts to come unto Christ, and to believe in him; but what is that faith? Not a faith that sins are already pardoned, but a faith relying on him for pardon, which faith also at the same time cleanseth and purifieth the heart. Therefore let us take those general Texts, which speak of Christ's dying to take away the sins of enemies; and let any Antinomian give a true reason, why one man's sin is pardoned rather than anothers: And although to evade this, they fall into another error, holding Christ died for all; yet that will not serve the turn, unless they hold, That all men shall actually be saved and none damned; for those Texts speak of a benefit that is actually obtained for those, in whose behalf he
he died. And thus I have produced seven Arguments for
the antecedency of our faith and repentance to our Justi-
Fication, as many in number, as the forequoted Author
brings against it. Other grounds may be pleaded to this pur-
pose, when we shall demonstrate, that all sins are not pardon-
ed together.

Use of Exhortation, to avoid all presumption, whether it
be wrought in thee by thy own carnall heart, or corrupt
teachers, and that is, when thou believest pardon any other
way than in Scripture bounds; there is a Pharisaical presum-
tion or Popish; and there is an Antinomian or Publican pre-
sumption. The former is, when we hope for pardon, partly
by Christ, and partly by our own works and merits. The
other is, when we expect it, though living and walking in sin.
Now it is hard to say, whether of these is more derogatory to
Christ. The one sinnes in the excess, the other in the defect.
Be not therefore a Pharisee, excluding Christ either in whole
or in part from the cause of pardon, Tutius vivimus, quando
totum Deo damus; we live more safely, when we give all
unto God, and take nothing unto our selves. In the next
place be not a Publican: Think not to have Christ and Bel-
al together; expect not pardon for sinne without repen-
tance of it. The world is filled with these two kinde of pre-
sumers: some limit Gods grace, and assoicate their perform-
ances with it. Others extend it too farre, and conjoyn their
lufts with it. But as the Apostle faith, If of works, and of the
Law, then there is no grace: so we may, If of lufts, and prophan
impieties, then there is also no grace. We are therefore both to
avoid sins, and carnall confidence in our own righteousness,
if we would have Christ all in all. In vain did Peter and
Mary Magdalene pour out their soules with so much bitter-
nesse, if pardon of sinne may be had without this. It is
Hierons observation, That in all Pauls salutation, grace go-
eth before peace, for till Gods grace hath pardoned our
sins, we can have no peace, and God doth not pardon but
where he gives repentance. Labour therefore for that which
is indeed the good of thy soule, viz. pardon of sinne. When
the rich man in the Parable, speaking of the corn in his barns,
Whether Justification precede Faith and Repentance.

Said, Soul, take thine ease; thou hast much good laid up for thee. He spake as if he had porcinam animam, the soul or life of an hog; for what good is corn and wine to a mans soul? Forgivenesse of sin and reconciliation with God; that is, the connatural and sutable good and happinesse for the soul.

Lect. XXI.

The Antinomian Arguments for Justification before Faith, answered.

Matth. 6. 12.

And forgive us our Debts.

That hath been proved, That God doth not justifie or pardon a man till he doth believe; and that the wrath of God abideth upon such an one. It is necessary in the next place to answer those Objections which are propounded by the Adversaries, because some of them carry a specious pretence with them. And indeed the Antinomian with those Arguments he fetcheth from some places of Scripture, is like David in Sauls armour, not able to improve them, the weapons being too big for him. But before I enter into the conflict, its worth the enquiry, what the judgement of the Orthodox is in this point.

The Remonstrants (Acta Synod p.293.) bring several places out of our Authors, Lubertus, Smantius, Piscator, and others, wherein they expressly say, That God doth blot out our sins before we either believe or amend our lives, and that this pardon doth anteced our knowledge of God faith, conversion or regeneration of the heart.
Whether J ustification precede

heart. Thus also Dr Twis, in the place before quoted. Pemble
also to this purpose (pag. 24) The Elect (faith he) while un-
converted, they are then actually justified, and freed from all sin by
the death of Christ; and so God esteems of them as free, and having
accepted of that Satisfaction, is actually reconciled to them. But
the falsehood of this will appear in answer to the sixth Argu-
ment. When Grotius had distinguished of a twofold remission,
a full remission, and a lesse full remission, holding this later
kinde of remission to be given to impenitent sinners, abusing
two places of Scripture for this purpose, Rom. 5.10.2 Cor. 5.19.
Rivet confuteth him, making it a sure truth, That sins are not
actually remitted, but to those that repent, and faith, Quinam
sunt ii, qui volunt actu remissa peccata cuiquam ante conversionem?
certi nobis sunt ignoti. Who are they that say, Sins are actually
pardon'd before Conversion? Certainly they are unknown to us.
Although we acknowledge the price of Reconciliation and Redem-
pion to have been prepared for the Elect from all eternity, or in
God's purpose and intention remission of sins to have been ordained
for them, even as Conversion, which in his time, by God's grace
are to be effect'd. Thus Kivet. Vindic. Apol p.127. If therefore
any of our orthodox Authors have acknowledged a remission
of sins before faith, it hath been in a particular sense to oppose
the Arminians, who maintain a reconciliableness, and not a re-
conciliableness by Christ's death, and not in an Antinomian sense,
as is more largely to be shewed in answering of their Objection
brought from Christ's death for enemies and sinners. Indeed
some learned and worthy men speak of a Justification before
faith in Christ our head, as we are accounted sinners in the first
Adam or common person. Thus Alstedius in his supplement
to Chamier, pag.204. When Bellarmine arguing against the
holiness of the Protestants Doctrine, and bringing this for a
paradox above all paradoxes, That I must be justified by faith,
and yet justifying faith be a believing that I am just and righteous;
which is, faith Bellarmine besides and against all reason. He an-
swereth among other things, That Christ and the Elect are as
one person, and therefore an elect man is justified before faith
in Christ, as the principle of righteousness before God; and
then he is justified by faith as an instrument, perceiving his
Justification
Justification in that righteousness of Christ. So that faith as it goeth to the act of Justification, is considered in respect of that passive application, whereby a man applieth the righteousness of Christ to himself, not of that active application whereby God applieth to man the righteousness of Christ: For this application is in the mind of God.

To this purpose the learned Zancty in his Explication of the second Chapter of the Epistle to the Ephesians, upon those words, ver. 5. [And you being dead in sin, he hath quickened together with Christ] doth in the first place distinguish of a twofold quickning, one whereby we are freed from the guilt of sin, and invested with a title or right to eternal life; The other from the power of sin, whereby we are made spiritually alive to God. The former is Justification, the later Sanctification.

Now, faith he, this twofold blessing is to be considered in Christ, and in our own persons. In the first respect, God did quicken us in Christ, when by his death (sin being expiated) he freed from guilt all the elect that have been and shall be, considering them as members in Christ their head. In the later respect God doth it, when having given us faith, he gives us also remission of sins, and imputeth Christ's righteousness to us. And afterwards the fore-quoted Author, making this Objection to himself, How Christ could be said to be freed from the guilt of sin, who had no sin? He answereth, The person of Christ is considered two ways; first in itself, as God-man, and so Christ was not bound by any guilt. Secondly, as appointed head, and so representing our persons. In this respect, as God laid our iniquities upon him, Isa. 55. So when they were expiated by his blood, then was he released from the guilt of those sins.

We might instance in other Authors, but these may suffice to cerifie, that some orthodox and learned Divines do hold a Justification of the Elect in Christ their head, before they do believe; yet so, as they acknowledge also a necessity of a personal Justification by faith, applying this righteousness to the person justified. Therefore although this Doctrine passe for true, yet it will not strengthen the Antinomists. Although even the truth of this opinion may modestly be questioned, unless by being justified in Christ our head, we mean no more.
then that Christ purchased by way of Satisfaction our Justification for us, and so virtually we were justified in Christ's death and Resurrection. But the learned men of that opinion, speak as if God then passed a formal Justification upon all (though afterwards to be applied) that are elected; even as in Adam sinning all his posterity were formally to be accounted sinners.

Now this may justly admit a debate, and there seem to be many Arguments against it.

First, If there were such a formal Justification, then all the elect were made blessed and happy, their sins were not imputed to them: for so in Adam when accounted sinners, they are wretched and miserable, because sin is laid to their charge. And if the elect before they believe or repent were thus happy, how then at the same time could they be children of wrath? and so God imputing their sins to them, Can God impute their sins to them, and not impute them to them at the same time? It is true, if we say, That Christ by his sufferings obtained at God's hand, that in time the elect should believe and be justified, this is easily to be conceived; but it is very difficult to understand, how that all our sins should be at the same time done away in Christ (who is considered as one person with us) and yet imputed to us.

Secondly, I do not see how this Doctrine doth make our Justification by faith to be any more then declarative, or a Justification in our conscience only, and not before God, and so by believing our sins should be blotted out in our sense only, when they were blotted out before God by Christ's death already. And so our Justification by faith, shall be but a copy fetched out of the Court- roll, where the sentence of Justification was passed already, whereas the Scripture speaks to this purpose, That even before God, and in his account, till we do believe and repent, our sins are charged upon us, and they are not cancelled or blotted out, till God work those graces in us. Therefore this opinion may symbolize too much with the Adversary; and indeed none of the nearest Antinomians * speaks of an original reconciliation which was wrought by Christ on the Cross, without any previous conditions in us, and urge that parallel of the first Adam, in whom we all sinned before we had any actual being; as also that Text Col. 3. 1, where we are said to be risen with Christ.
Thirdly, it is difficult to conceive, how Christ should represent any to his Father, thereby to partake of the heavenly blessings which come by him, till they do actually believe, and are incorporated in him, for they are not his members till they do believe: and till they are his members, he cannot as an head represent them. It is true, God knoweth whom he hath elected, and to whom in time he will give faith, whereby they may be united to Christ, and so its in God's purpose and intention to give Justification and Sanctification to all his elect: But these being mercies vouchsafed in time, and limited to such qualifications in the subject, I see not how they can be said to be justified in Christ (before they do believe) otherwise than virtually and meritoriously. It is true, we are all condemned in Adam, because that was a Covenant made with him and his posterity, so that the issues thereof fell upon them by a natural and necessary way: But it is not so in the second Adam. Neither do those places Ephes. 2.5,6. Col. 2.13,14. prove any more, then that in and through him, we do obtain such mercies there spoken of: and although we are said to sit in heavenly places already, yet that is because of the certain right we have thereunto; in which sense also, He that believeth is said to have eternal life; and Christ being the first fruits doth sanctifie the whole lump.

As for that place, 1 Tim. 3, where Christ is said to be justified in the spirit, that makes nothing at all to this Justification we speak of. For the meaning is, that Christ was declared just, and absolved from all the reproaches cast upon him, by the Spirit of God, which was done several ways, as by the witness exhibited from heaven unto him, by the innumerable miracles he wrought. In which sense, Mat. 11. Wisdom is said to be justified of her children. So that Acts 2.22, seemeth to be a full Commentary on this place; Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by signs and wonders, which God did by him in the midst of you: And this is that Justification of himself, which Christ speaks of Isa. 50.8. It is true, the Apostle doth apply that spoken of Christ to every believer, Rom. 8. by way of allusion; and the rather, because Christ being the head of the elect, it will be made good of them in time, when they do believe; otherwise.
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Whether election is not enough to free from present accusation or condemnation, unless by faith they be actually in Christ, as is to be shewed more at large.

But this is a digression. It is the constant opinion of the Orthodox, That a man is not justified, or hath his sins pardoned, till he doth believe. I have brought Arguments to prove the point, and now address my self to remove their Objections.

The first is brought from Infants, who are justified, and yet do not believe, therefore before faith some are justified.

First, The case of Infants is of peculiar consideration, and therefore not to be attended unto in most Questions: yea the Scripture pressng the things requisite to salvation, as repentance, obedience, &c. cannot be understood of Infants. And Suarez argueth against Justification by faith in the general upon this ground, Because Infants are justified without it. So that the Argument (if it proveth any thing) would prove a Justification without faith, rather then before faith. Suppose a man should argue about Glorification, as the Adversary doth about Justification. Infants are glorified without fruits meet for repentance: Therefore men grown up also may be, How absurd would that be? Therefore if the conclusion of the Argument were granted, viz. Some that do not believe are justified, restraining it to Infants, the main Question would have no detriment. The Opponent layeth down this conclusion [Reconc. of man with God, p. 5.] That man's actual reconciliation to God, requireth previous conditions to be wrought in him by God's Spirit before he can be reconciled actually to God; among which he reckoneth believing as the chief. Now I may retort on him thus, Infants are actually reconciled to God: But Infants do not believe: Therefore some are actually reconciled to God that do not believe.

Secondly, The Opponent cannot but know that there are learned men, who hold Infants have actual faith, and do believe. Therefore to them his Argument is of no force. It may very well be thought, that they have actual sins, not such as are in men grown up, accompanied with reason and will; but those immediate motions of original corruption in them. For although original sin be not peccatum actual, yet it is peccatum actualum,
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actuosum, if it be not an actual sin, yet it is an active sin, and therefore may not be thought idle in an Infant. Austin, lib. 1, conf. c. 2. Vid. eco Zelantem parvulum, &c. I have observed envy in an Infant, when another little child hath sucked his breast, and so they have sinfull anger, which made the same Father say, Imbecillitas membrorum infantilium innocens est, non animus infantum. There is more innocency in their bodies, than in their souls. Now if there be actual motions of sin before the use of reason, why not actual motions of God’s Spirit? That it is possible, John Baptist makes it without question: all the doubt is, Whether God doth ordinarily so to Infants. Arctius is alleged by some to hold, That even repentance may be attributed to Infants, out of Joel 2. 16. but the command there is, That parents should bring their children into the publick humiliation, that by the sight of them they may be the more fervently stirred up to pour out their prayers before God.

Thirdly, That which the most solid Divines pitch upon, is, That Infants have (I speak not generally, but indefinitely) a seed of faith, because they have the Spirit of God and regeneration, otherways they could not be saved; and by this seed of faith, they become members of Christ, and that relation which is in their faith to Christ’s merits, is the instrument by which they obtain remission of sinne. As for that place, Faith cometh by hearing, it is to be applied to the ordinary means of faith, and that in persons grown up. Neither can I lay, that an Infant is bound to have actual faith; for happily in the state of Integrity, Infants then, though they had the Image of God, yet could not have put forth the actual exercise of graces, and if they could not do it in that state, it is not to be expected they do so now.

Fourthly, It is not enough for him to prove they are justified before they believe, but also before they be any way united to Christ, let that union be conceived how it can by us. For if a man be justified, because he is elected, as his third Argument would prove; then he is to shew, that Infants not only before they believe, but before they have any union with Christ are justified, for the election of Infants must needs go before their union with Christ. And howsoever the opponent quoteth Austin, saying,

Neither may this seem such a wonder, seeing that the orthodox hold even in men grown up, the first grace is wrought in us as meer patients, our understandings and wills no ways antecedently concurring to it; so that the grace of God is then wrought in us, without us.
faying, That which was wrought in John Baptift, to be a singular mercy, yet (Serm. 14. de verbis Apostoli) on those words, He that believeth not shall be dammed, makes this Question, Ubi ponis parvulos baptizatos? Where put you little children baptized? Profello in numero credentium, Truly in the number of believers.

Argum. 2. His second Argument is to this effect, He that is in Christ is justified. Now a man is in Christ before he doth believe, because the tree must be good before the fruit can be. Therefore a man must be justified before he do believe.

In answering this Argument many things are considerable,

First, It must be acknowledged a very hard task to set down the true order of the benefits bestowed upon us by God. The assigning of the priority and posteriority of them is very various, according to the several judgements of men interested in that controversy.

The Opponent (it may be knoweth) that there are some, who say, Christ or the Spirit of Christ is first in us by way of a moving or preparing principle, and afterwards as a principle inhabiting and dwelling in us; That as some say, Anima fabri- cat sibi domicilium, The soul makes its body to lodge in; it works first efficiently, that afterwards it may formally, so they say, Christ doth in us. As the silkworm prepareth those silken lodgings for her self to rest in. So that according to the judgement of these men, Christ, or his Spirit, doth efficiently work in us the act of believing, by which act Christ is received to dwell in us. And in this way, Christ hath no union with us, till we do believe. He worketh indeed in us before, but not as united to us. Now according to this opinion, the answer were easie, That we are not in Christ till we do believe; Though Christ be in us, as working in us, and upon us. Yea faith would first be wrought, and then Christ with his benefits of Justification, &c. would be vouchsafed to us; but there are reasons why it is not safe to go this way. And indeed that Charta magna, or grand promise for regeneration, doth evidently argue the habits or internal principles of grace, are before the actions of grace, Ezek. 36.26. God takes away the heart of stone, and giveth a
new heart, an heart of flesh, which is the principle of grace, and afterwards causeth them to walk in his Commandments, which is the effect of grace.

But secondly (which doth fully answer the Objection) It is true, our being ingrafted into Christ, is the root and fountain of faith, and of Justification too; but yet so, that these being correlates (Faith and Justification) they both flow from the root together, though with this order, that faith is to be conceived in order of nature before Justification, that being the instrument to receive it, though both be together in time. Therefore the major Proposition should be thus regulated, He that is in Christ doth believe, and is justified, or believing is justified; for Justification as our Glorification, though it flow from Christ, yet it is in that order and time which God hath appointed. Neither is it any new thing in Philosophy, to say, Those causes which produce an effect, though they be in time together, yet are mutually before one another in order of nature in divers respects to their several causalities.

Christ is in us, and we in Christ. Christ is in us, deumau, by way of gift, and actual working, and we are in Christ, xelauos, by way of receiving; and both these are necessary, as appeareth John 15:5. and both are together in time, yet so that in order of nature, Christ's being in us is before our being in him, and the ground of all our comfort and fruit, is not because we are in him, but he in us (even as the branch beareth fruit, not because it is in the Vine, but because the Vine is in it, communicating efficacy to it). Thus also Faith and Justification are together, yet so as one is produced by the other; we are not justified, and therefore believe, but we believe and are therefore justified.

Lastly, This may be retorted upon the Opponent, who (as was alleged before) denieth any actual reconciliation, till we do believe. But may not we strike the adversary with his own reason in this manner? He that is in Christ is actually reconciled. But we must be in Christ before we do believe. Therefore we must be actually reconciled, before we do believe.
I pass over the third, and reserve the fourth and sixth Argument (being all one) for the next Lecture, because in them is matter worthy of a large consideration.

I come therefore to the fifth Argument, which is taken from the collation between the first Adam and second, out of Rom 5:18,19. From whence is argued, *As in the first Adam we are accounted sinners before any thing done on our part; so in the second Adam, we are to be justified before any thing wrought in us.* This the Opponent doth much triumph in, but without cause, as the answer will manifest.

And in the first place we cannot but reject those Expositors of that Text fore-quoted, who understand us to be sinners in Adam, only by imitation, or by propagation meerly, as from a corrupted fountain; but we suppose it to be by imputation: Adam (by God's Covenant) being an universal person, and so as Austin said, *Omnes ille annus homo fuerunt,* All were that one man. And therefore these do not rise up to the full scope of the Text, who parallel Christ and Adam only as two roots, Origenes, or Fountains; for there must be a further consideration of them, as two common persons, for our immediate fathers are a corrupted root, and we are corrupted by them, yet their sins are not made ours, as Adams was. Hence the Apostle layeth the whole transgression upon one, *As by one mans disobedience,* &c. Those that deny imputation of Adams sinne (as the Pelagians of old, and Erasimus with others of late) do not relish that Translation of those words, *καθὼς πάντες ένμετρον,* in whom all have sinned, but preferre the other, *Forasmuch as all have sinned in him,* but both come to the same sense: and howsoever Erasimus lay, that *ἐν* with a Dative case must be understood causally, yet that is not universally true; for *Mark 2:4. There is mention made of the Bed,* *τοίος* in which the Paralytique lay, it would be ridiculous to translate that, *Inasmuch.* So *Acts 2. Be baptized,* *ἐν ονόματι* in the Name, Heb. 9. Those Ordinances consisted *ἐν βεβαίωσιν* in meats. We therefore grant, That Adams sinne was ours by imputation, before we had any actual consent to it. In which sense Bernard called it, *Alienum & nostrum,* anothers sinne and ours: yea, it is so farre from being ours by consent, that if a man on
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purpose should now will that Adams sinne should be his, this would not make Adams sinne imputed to him, it would be a new actual sinne in the man, it would not be Adams sin imputed to him. Now although all this be concluded upon, yet it followeth not, that therefore we are justified in Christ before we beleive. I acknowledge, some eminent Divines have pressed this comparison; but there is a vast difference in this very act of Imputation, and the ground of it; for supposing the Covenant at first made with Adam, all his posterity by a natural way are involved in his guilt, and so whether they will or no, antecedently to their own acts they are obnoxious to this guilt. Hence all men (none excepted) that are propagated in a natural way are thus corrupted, but in Christ we are by a supernatural way, and none are made his, but such as beleive in him; and he doth not represent any to God as his members, till they be incorporatted into him by faith, which faith although it be a gift of God, yet by it we are enabled voluntarily to choose and embrace Christ. Many other differences there are, but I pitch on this only, as being fully to my purpose in hand. If therefore we were in Christ by a natural way, as we are in Adam, then antecedently to any thing wrought in us, we might be partakers of privileges by one, as we are of curses by another.
Arguments to prove Justification before Faith, Answered.

WE proceed to the remaining Arguments, which would maintain a Justification before faith.

The next is from God's election, thus, All the elect of God are justified before God. But some of the elect do not believe. And the major is proved from Rom. 8. 33. Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth.

In the first place this Argument might easily be laid aside, for the Apostle doth not speak here of election antecedently, antecedently to his other graces, which flow from that in time, but executively, as it is executed and compleated in those that are elected. Therefore by the elect he meaneth those elect that believe, that are holy, that are conformable to the image of God, that do love him, as the context sheweth; for otherwise we know Paul himself laid much to the charge of the Ephesians, though elect, when before their conversion, he said they were children of wrath as well as others; and therefore by that adamantine chain, Whom he hath predestinated he hath called, whom he hath called he hath justified, whom he hath justified he hath glorified, it is plain, he takes election terminative (as they lay) in the effects of it, even till it hath obtained the utmost terminus, which is everlasting glory.

2. From
2. From this chain also is an infallible Argument against the Opponent, thus,

Those only are justified that are called. But none are called or converted from all eternity. Therefore none are justified from all eternity.

The major is grounded upon the method and order which the Apostle observeth, beginning with the highest round in that chain, which is predestination, and ending in the lowest, which is glorification: so that it cannot rationally be thought that the Apostle did not intend an exact order and method in those expressions.

3. If so be a man (because he is elected) be justified from all eternity, then it will also follow he is glorified from all eternity. And so Hymeneus and Philetus may be excused in this sense, if they say, The resurrection is past already. It is true, the Apostle u- seth words signify ing time past, Whom he hath predestinated, he hath called, &c. but that is either to shew the certainty and infallible connexion of these benefits together; or else, because predestination being necessarily for the time past, he would not alter the current of his expression for the following mercies.

4. The Apostle might well say, *Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect?* and not of believers, because election is the material mercy, it is the fountain and head from which all other flow. Hence the Apostle doth in the same Chapter limit mercies to those that are called according to God's purpose, implying hereby, that this is the ground and root of all.

But fifthly, To discover the fundamental weakness of this Argument. We are to take notice, That predestination is an immanent act of God, and works no positive real effect upon the party elected, till in time: for howsoever it be an act of love, yet of love only by way of purpose and decreeing, and so doth not denote a change in the creature, but when that purpose or counsel of God (which is altogether free) hath determined it. Hence we are to conceive a love of God electing us from all eternity, which both produce another love of God (not immanent in him, or so nothing is new in God, but transient in us) and that is justification; from this love floweth another effect of love, which,
which is glorification. Some have doubted, Whether election be an act of love, and therefore have distinguished between diletion and election, as if diletion did go before, and election follow. But certainly the same act of God, as it doth will good to the creature, is diletion; as it willeth it to this rather then another, is election. We grant therefore that Election is an act of great love, but its a love of purpose or intention, not execution, it is amor ordinatum, not collatissus; its a love ordaining and preparing of mercies, but not bestowing them pre
dently. Thus Austin defined Predestination, to be Preparatio beneficiorum quibus liberantur, a preparing or ordaining of those
mercies and priviledges, which the elect shall have in time. And among men we see the purpose of giving such a gift is accounted love, as well as the gift itself. Now while a man is only un
der the love of election, and no more, there is no actual
remission of sin, no acceptance or complacency in his person or
duties. There is a purpose in God to do all these in time, but the merces are not from eternity exhibited. So that in some
respect there is a great difference between an elect person un
converted, and a reprobate: And again, in some respects there is none at all. As for example, there is this grand difference,
That although both be equally in sin, and under wrath, yet God
hath a purpose to bring the elect person infallibly out of that
misery; and in this respect God may be said never to hate him
that is elect, (In which sense God is said to love Jacob and hate
Esau) but the reprobate shall perish eternally in his sin. The
Apostle faith, Rom.11. Election hath obtained, because that
will most certainly bring about both the means and the
end. So that for all the elect, The foundation of God stand
eth sure, having this seal, The Lord knoweth who are his,
2 Tim. 2.19.

2. There is no difference in this, in that for the present both are children of wrath, both aliens from the promise of grace, no promise of any gracious priviledge either for pardon of sin, or eternall glory belongs unto them, only Gods purpose will in
time make an actual difference between them. Neither is this to make any contradictory will in God, for both these may well stand together, viz. Gods will for the future to give pardon and
and glory, and yet to will neither of them to be for the present. All this is done with the same act of God's will. If therefore hatred be taken as opposite to that love of election which God had from all eternity, so an elect man, though unregenerate, is never hated; but if it be taken largely for that displeasure or wrath of God, which is contrary to the grace of Justification exhibited in time, so he may be said to be hated before his conversion: neither is it any wonder, if this be called hatred, seeing in the Scripture, less loving, is called hating sometimes, as the Learned observe. Neither doth this make any change in God, it only denoteth a change in the creature, as hereafter is to be shewed. So that the gross mistake, as if election were all love, actually and expressly, and the confounding of the love of God, as an immanent act in him, with the effects of this love, hath made several persons split upon rocks of errors. But how love and anger are in God, is more exactly to be examined, when we speak of the meritorious cause of Justification, which is Christ's merits: for indeed this Argument from election, will as well put in for a Justification before any consideration of Christ, as well as of faith, if everything be duly weighed, as in that part (God willing) is to be shewed, where also the distinctions about God's love are to be considered of. Some making a general love, and a special love; others a first love and a second, or one flowing from the first, others a love of benevolence or beneficence, and of complacency: but of these in their proper place.

We proceed, and in the next place we will put his fourth and sixth Argument together, being both grounded upon this, That Christ by his death gave a full satisfaction to God, and God accepted of it, whereby Christ is said so often to take away our sins, and we to be cleansed by his blood. This Argument made the Learned Pembel, pag. 25. to hold out Justification in God's sight long before we were born, as being then purchased by Christ's death, otherwise he thinks we must with the Arminians say, Christ by his death made God placabiliem, reconcilable, not placatum, reconciled. No (faith he) it is otherwise, the ransom demanded is paid and accepted, full satisfaction to the Divine justice is given and taken, all the sins of
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the elect, *actually* pardoned. This is a great oversight.

Ans. 1.

For first, Though Christ did lay down a price, and the Father accept of it, yet both agreed in a way and order when this benefit should become theirs, who are partakers of it, and that is, when they believe and repent. Now *bonum est ex integris causis*, if God the Fathers Covenant be to give pardon for Christs sake to those that do believe (which faith also is the fruit of Christs death) then may we not separate Christ from faith, no more then faith from Christ, or God the Fathers love from both. If Christ had died for such a man to have his sinnes pardoned, whether he had faith in him or no, then this Argument would have stood firm: God then did accept of Christs death, and becomes reconciled, but in that order and way which he hath appointed.

Ans. 2.

2. This Argument doth interfere with that of election; for there pardon of sinne doth take its rise from election, but here from the time God laid our sins upon Christ. And indeed the Antinomians are at a variance amongst themselves, some fetching the originall of pardon from one way, and some from another.

Ans. 3.

3. We do not say, That faith is the condition of Christs acquiring pardon, but of the application of pardon. Faith doth not make Christs merits to be merits, or his satisfaction to be satisfaction. This ariseth from the dignity and worth of Christ. It would be an absurd thing to say, That faith is the cause why God doth accept of Christs merits, and receiveth a satisfaction by him. This were to make the instrumental cause, a meritoriuous cause. The Arminians they make Christ to have purchased pardon upon condition of believing, which believing they do not make a benefit by Christs death; yea they say, *Nihil ineptius nihil vanius*, nothing is more foolish and vain then to do so. Now this indeed is an execrable error, to hold Christ died only to make a way for reconciliation, which reconciliation is wholly suspended upon a mans faith, and that faith comes partly from a mans will, and partly from grace, not being the fruit of Christs death, as well as reannission of sins it self. But we say a farre different thing, Christ satisfied Gods wrath, so that God becomes reconciled, and gives pardon, but in the method
method and way he hath appointed, which is faith, and this faith God will certainly work in his due time, that so there may be an instrument to receive this pardon.

For the opening of this, when it is said, Christ satisfied God's wrath, this may have a different meaning, either that Christ absolutely purchased reconciliation with the Father, whether they believe or no, without any condition at all, as Job obtained Absolom's reconciliation with David, or Esther the Jews deliverance of Abasheroth, or with a condition. In the former sense it cannot be said, because the fruits of Christ's death are limited only to believers. If with a condition, then either antecedent, which is to be wrought by us, that so we may be partakers of his death, and that cannot be, because it is said, He died for us while sinners and enemies. And this is Arminianism, for by this means only a gate is set open for salvation, but it may happen that no man may enter in, or else this condition is concomitant or consequent, viz. A qualification wrought by the Spirit of Christ, whereby we are enabled to receive of those benefits, which come by his death: And in this sense it is a truth; and by this the foundation of the Opponent is totally razed. For Christ took away the sins of those for whom he died, and reconciled them to God, and this absolutely, if by it we understand any condition antecedent to be done by us, but not absolutely, if it exclude a condition that is consequentially wrought by the Spirit of God, to apply the fruits of Christ's death: so that the actual taking away of sins is not accomplished, till the person for whom he died be united to him by faith. Hence the Scripture speaks differently about Christ's death; sometimes it faith, He died for us sinners and enemies; and in other places, Job. 15. 13. He laieth down his life for his friends, and his sheep, Joh. 17. 19. He saith, he praieith and sanctifieth himself for those that shall believe in him, viz. in a consequent sense, for those who by faith shall lay hold on his death. So that faith hath a two-fold condition, the first of the time when sins are taken away by Christ's death, and that is when they believe. Secondly, Of whom these priviledges are true, and that is, of such who do believe. Now all this may be the further cleared, if we consider, what kind of cause Christ's death is to take away our sins. It is a meritorious cause;
cause, which is in the rank of moral causes; of which the rule is not true, Positâ causa, sequitur effectus, the cause being, the effect presently followeth. This holdeth in natural causes, which necessarily produce their effects, but moral causes work according to the agreement and liberty of the persons that are moved thereby. As for example, God the Father is moved through the death of Christ to pardon the sins of such persons, for whom he dieth. This agreement is to be made good, in that time they shall pitch upon in their transaction. Now it pleased the Father, that the benefits and fruits of Christ's death should be applied unto the believer, and not till he did believe, though this faith be at the same time also a gift of God through Christ. It is good therefore, when we either call election absolute, or say, Christ died absolutely, to consider that absolute may be taken as opposite to a prerequisite condition which is to be fulfilled by us, so that upon this, election, and the fruits of Christ's death shall depend: or else absolute, may be taken, as it opposeth any means or order which God hath appointed, as the way to obtain the end; and in this later sense, it would be a grand absurdity to say, Election is absolute, or Christ died absolutely; for if this were so, the prophanate argument about election, would have truth in it; If I be elected, let me live never so wickedly, I shall be saved. And the Arminian Argument, That every one were bound to believe that Christ died for him, though wicked and abiding so, would not well be avoided.

Arg. ult. His last Argument is from the unchangeableness of God's love, if we are not justified in his sight before we believe, then God did once hate us, and afterwards love us. And if this be so, why should Arminians be blamed, for saying, We may be the children of God to day, and the children of the devil to morrow? Hence he concludes it, as undoubted, that God loved us first, before we believe, even when we were in our blood.

In answering of this Argument, several things are considerable.

Answ. First, It must be readily granted, That God is unchangeable, Jam. 1:17. God is there compared to the Sun, and is therefore
fore called the Father of lights, but yet is preferred before it, because that hath clouds sometimes cast over it, and sometimes is in eclipse, but there is no change or shadow of change with him. The Heathens have confessed this, and so argued, If God should change, it would be either for better or worse; for worse, how could it be imagined? for better, Then God were not absolutely perfect. Most accursed therefore must Vorstius his blasphemy be, who purposely pleads for mutability in God.

But secondly, As this is easily to be confessed, so the difficulty of those Arguments, brought from the things which God doth in time, and not from all eternity, have been very weighty upon some mens shoulders; insomuch that they thought this the only way to salve all, by saying, That all things were from eternity. And certainly by the Antinomian Arguments we may as well plead for the creation of all things from all eternity, as that we are justified from all eternity, for all are equally built upon this sandy foundation. That because the things are done in time, therefore there must be some new act of will or love in God, which would imply God is mutable, not loving to day, and loving to morrow; Therefore to avoid this, they say, All is from eternity. Origen who was called by an ancient Writer Centaurus, because of his monstrous opinions, argued thus, lib. 1. de æt. cap. 2. As there cannot be a Father without a sonne, or a Matter and Lord without a possession, so neither an omnipotent, unless there be those things about which this power may be exercised. Now although it be true, That de Deo etiam vera dicere periculum est, because of the weakneffe of our understandings to perceive his infinite luster,

Yet thirdly, It is well cleared by the Schoolmen, That those relations which are attributed to God in time, as a Creator, Father or Lord, are not because of any new thing in God, but in respect of the creatures; so that when the world is created, when a man is justified, we say, God who was not a Creator before, is a Creator, who was not a Father by grace, is now by grace; not because any new accident is in him, but because there is a new effect in the creatures. Thus, if a man once the child
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child of wrath, be now a son of God's love, the change is not in God, but in the creature.

For the better clearing of this, we are to take notice in the fourth place, That it is one thing, as Aquinas observeth, *Mutare voluntatem*, to change the will; and another thing, *Velle mutationem*, to will a change. By the same unchangeable will we may will severall changes in an object. As the Physitian, without any change of his will, may will his patient to take one kinde of physick one day, and another the third: here he wils a change, but doth not change his will. Thus God with the same will, decreed to permit in time such an elect man to be in a state of sin, under the power of Satan, and afterwards to call him out of this condition, to justifie his person; here indeed is a great change made in the man, but none at all in God. There is no new act in God, which was not from all eternity, though every effect of this love of God was not from eternity, but in time. Hence when our Divines argue against Arminians, That if the Saints should apostatize, God's love would be changeable, it is meant of Gods love of Election, which is an absolute purpose and efficacious will to bring such a man to glory: now although such a decree was free, and so might not have been, yet *ex hypothesi*, supposing God hath made this decree, it doth very truly follow, That if that Saint should not be brought to glory, God would be changeable. And besides this immutability, which may be called an immutability of his nature, there is another of his Word and Promise, whereby he hath graciously covenanted to *put his fear in their heart, that they shall never depart from him*: now if any of the Saints should totally or finally apostatize, Gods mutability would be seen in both those respects of his nature or will, and of his truth and fidelity. But the case is not the like, when a man at his first conversion is made of a childe of wrath, a childe of grace; partly because there was no such absolute decree of God from eternity, that he should be for no space a childe of wrath, but the clean contrary; and partly because there is no such word or promise unto any unconverted person, that he shall be in the favour of God; but the Scripture declareth the clean contrary. This duly considered, will give a clear reason, why it is no good argum
gument to say, such a man in his sins to day, is a childe of wrath, and converted to morrow, is a son of grace: Therefore God is changeable. But on the other side, if a man should argue, An elect man received into the state of grace, may fall totally and finally, Therefore God is changed, would be a strong and undeniable inference. And indeed for this particular may the Arminians be challenged, as holding Gods mutability, because they hold, That notwithstanding Gods decree and purpose to save such a man, yet a man by his own corruption and default, shall frustrate God of this his intention. Otherwise all know, Adam was created in a state of Gods favour, and quickly Apostatized into the contrary: so that we may truly say, Adam was one day, (yea hour, as some) a childe of Gods favour, and in another of his wrath; yet the change was in Adam, not in God, both because God had not made an absolute decree from all eternity for his standing, as also because he had made to promise to preserve him in that happy condition. In this sense, 1 Pet. 2. 10. it is said, Which in time past were not a people, but now are the people of God; which had not obtained mercy, but now have obtained mercy. And whereas the Opponent faith, God loved us before we did believe; it is true, with a love of purpose; but many effects of his love are not exhibited till we do believe. He loveth us, and so worketh one effect of love upon us, that that effect may be a qualification for a new and further effect of love. He loveth us, to make us his friends, and then he hath done that, he loveth us with a love of friendship. God loved us before he gave Christ, for out of that love he gave us Christ, that so when Christ is given us, he may bestow another love upon us. Now because it is ordinary with us to call the effects of Gods anger, his anger, Paena patientis esse creditur decernentis, the punishment on the offender is judged the anger of the inflicter: and by this means we say sometimes God is angry, and afterwards he ceaseth to be angry, when he removeth these effects of his anger: so a man is said
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LECT. XXIII.

Whether we pray here for Pardon, or for Assurance of Pardon only. Why God sometimes pardons a Sinner, and doth not acquaint him with it; With Directions to doubting, tempted People, concerning their sinnes.

MAT. 6. 12.

And forgive us our Debts.

The next Question to be considered is, Whether in this prayer we pray only for the assurance of pardon, not pardon itself? For thus the Antinomians answer to the Objection fetched from this place, That the whole sense of this Petition is, That we may feel in ourselves, and assuredly perceive, what pardon God had given us before [Honey-comb, p. 155. So Den. Reconcil. of God to man, p. 44.] making this Argument of the Text against himself. If we pray
pray for forgivenes of sins, then sins are not forgiven before, anwreth, The Protestants (faith he) with one consent hold, that they do beg at the hands of God greater certainty and assurance of pardon, and he instanceth in a condemned person that is upon the ladder, who having received the pardon of his Prince, may when called into the Kings presence, fall down and say, Pardon me my Lord and King; But this is to abuse Protestant Authors: For although many of them may make this part of the meaning, yet none make it the only meaning. Gomarus in his explanation of this Petition, doth excellently confute Piscator, for explicating pardon of sin by a metonymy of the subject, viz The sense and feeling of this in our hearts, and faith, That such a signification cannot be proved out of any place of Scripture, nor out of the language of any good Authors; and one of his reasons is this: Prayer for pardon of sinne would be imprudently taken out of the Lords prayer; for he who prayeth for the sense and feeling of a thing, supposeth it already done. Now (faith he) every wise Petition hath for its object a thing to come, and not a thing past.

This also Bellarmine objecting against special faith, as if it were a confidence that my sins are forgiven already, he makes it as absurd upon this ground to beg for pardon, as it would be to pray, that Christ may be incarnated, or made flesh. Cricius in his answer to this, Disput.de fidei justificamis objeeto, p.131. faith, as you heard before. That those things indeed use not to be prayed for, which are so done, that they are never done more; but those things which are so done, as that they may be often done again, may be prayed for. The Incarnation of Christ was once done, and can be no more, but remission of sins is so done, that it continueth further to be done, and its last effect is reserved for the future. For as often as we sin, so often there is need of repentance. So that by his judgment remission of sin is not like creation, which once was, and is not reiterated, but conservation. More might be said out of Authors; but I come to answer the Question.

First, We grant it a duty for that believer, who knoweth his sins are pardoned, to pray for further faith and assurance of the pardon. For seeing our faith admits of degrees, and is sometimes staggering, ready to sink, no marvel if it needs supports. Thus David, although he heard his pardon proclaimed, yet makes
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that penitential Psalm, Psal. 51, for mercy to do away his sins, which was by appeasing his conscience, and satisfying his soul with the goodness of God: For as a godly man, though he have truly repented of his sins, yet upon any sad occasion doth reiterate his pardon, as Paul many times hath his heart ache for his former blasphemies and persecutions; so it is necessary to have the sense and apprehension of his pardon reiterated to his own comfort and consolation. There is no man's assurance about pardon so high and unmovable, but it many times meeteth with violent assaults, and therefore needeth oil to be frequently poured into his wounds,Comfort, comfort ye my people (faith the Prophet). There must be an ingemination of the duty, else the soul at first will not hearken.

In the second place, We may conceive of four sorts of persons praying for this pardon of sin.

The first is an unconverted and unregenerated man. For although he cannot call God Father, and so not pray in faith, yet he is bound to pray. The Socinians interpreter that compellation, Our Father, not actually, but dispositively; as if the meaning were, who art ready and willing to be a Father. But that is not the full meaning of that place. There lieth an obligation upon unregenerate men to perform holy duties, though they cannot do them acceptably. Their impotency to do them doth not disoblige from the command to do them. Now its plain, that such a person praying for forgivenesse, doth not pray for the assurance of that which is already past (for so no sinne is forgiven to him) but for initial pardon, which he never yet hath enjoyed.

The second sort of persons praying this prayer, are those that at the first conversion humble themselves, and seek unto God for his face and reconciliation with him. Now those that are thus in their beginnings, and new birth, they can pray in no other sense, but for initial and first pardon; for as that is the first time they begin to have sorrow and brokenesse of heart: so that is the first time they begin to partake of pardon; pardon of sinne and faith they are correlates, and so are together.

A third rank is of Believers in their progress of holiness and sancti-
sanctification, walking without any scandal or offence in the ways of God. They, in this Petition, have a twofold sense, the one an assurance of the pardon of sins that are already forgiven them; and the other is a renewed pardon for the renewed infirmities they continually are plunged into.

Lastly, There are lapsed believers, who have fallen into some grievous sins, and thereby have made desperate wounds upon their own souls, and these have agonies and pangs of heart, much like their first conversion. Therefore its called so, When thou art converted strengthen thy brother, faith Christ to Peter. This recovery out of the sin they were plunged into, was like a new conversion. By such a commotion as this made in the soul, there is nothing but darkness and confusion, and they pray for pardon, as if this were the first time. They fear all their former ways to have been hypocrites. Thus David, Psal. 51. prayeth for the restoring of joy to him, that his broken bones may be healed; as also for truth in the inward parts. Now although such a man's former sins were indeed forgiven him, yet it is to his sense and feeling as if it were not so, but rather the contrary is feared by him, that God's wrath doth still abide on him. Hence he prayeth for pardon in his own judgement, as one who yet never hath been acquitted by God. So that according to the several conditions of the persons praying, we may suppose several senses in the Petition:

But in the third place, to answer the Question, we say, That assurance of pardon is not the only thing prayed for. And that for these Reasons,

First, We are never to depart from the literal sense of the words, Without an evident necessity, but the plain undoubted sense is, That God would forgive our sins; For our Saviour minding brevity in this Prayer, no doubt would speak his sense in the most perspicuous and clear manner that can be. As therefore if Christ had said, Make us to be assured of the pardon of sin, The Antinomian would not have gone from the letter, but pressed us to that: So on the other side, when Christ faith, Forgive us, and not Give us the sense of forgivenes, we have caule to cleave fully to that: and this may be illustrated by two further considerations: the former, of those places where God is said not to forgive,
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forgive, the later of those where forgivenesſe is applied of one man unto another. When the Prophet Isaiah speaking of the Israelites, how their Land was full of idols, and both great and mean men did humble themselves before them, Isa. 2. 9. prayeth that therefore God would not forgive them, Can any one make the meaning to be, that God would not give them the assurance of their forgivenesſe?

Mat. 12. 32. The Evangelist faith, All other sins may be forgivner, but that against the holy Ghost shall never: Now in that sense, other sins are said to be forgiven, in which sense that is denied to be forgiven: and that is denied to be forgiven, not in respect of assurance and declaration to a mans conscience only, but really and indeed. Therefore the sins forgiven are in the like manner forgiven.

Reaf. 2. Again, It is plain, That by pardon is not meant assurance of pardon only, because when applied to men it cannot admit of such a sense. Now the Petition runs thus, That God would forgive us, as we forgive others; and there is no man will explain the later forgivenesſe of assurance; and why then the former?

Reaf. 3. Besides, The equivalent phrase of forgivenesſe doth evince more then an assurance of forgivenesſe: For when the Scripture calls it blotting out of sin, its an expression from debts, which are, as it were written in Gods book, and therefore till he cancelleth them, they do remain in their guilt.

Reaf. 4. Furthermore, If a sin be not really pardoned, till a man do repent and believe, then he beggeth for more then assurance; But we have fully proved, That there is no remission of sin, till confession and forfaking of it.

As for the above-named Authors instance of a malefaftour who hath received pardon, may yet upon his coming into the Kings presence, desire pardon, it no wayes advantageth him: For suppose a malefaftour might the first time do so, yet experience doth demonstrate it would argue folly and madnesſe in a malefaftour, to do so frequently: whereas it is our duty daily to beg the pardon of our sins at the throne of grace. To conclude this point ( because we have elsewhere spoken to it) This Exposition doth overthrow the continual use of the Word, the equipollent phraſes, the proper object of prayer; and departs from
from the letter of the Text, without any just ground at all. Which is against the rules of explication of the Scripture.

The next Question is of great practical concernment, viz. Why God doth sometimes pardon a sin, and yet not manifest it to the sinner's heart? It appeareth by David, Psal. 5 1. that when a sin is forgiven in heaven, it is not also remitted, and blotted out in a man's conscience; yet God can as easily work the one as the other. If he say, Let there be light in such a dark heart; of an hell, it presently becomes an heaven. We would judge that by this divine dispensation, as the godly man losteth much of his comfort, so God of his glory and honour.

But divers Reasons may be produced for this. As

First, It may be God will teach us hereby, That pardon of sin is not a necessary effect of repentance, but a gracious gift bestowed, though not without it, yet not for it. Though therefore thy soul hath been deeply humbled, and is greatly reformed, yet God suspends the light of his favour upon thy soul, that thou mayst acknowledge it his grace, not the merit of thy sorrow; where causes do naturally produce an effect, there it is a miracle, if the one followeth not the other. If the fire do not burn, if the Sun stand still; if Peter walking on the water sink not. But it is no wonder, to see a true contrite heart without assurance and consolation. These may be separated, that so thou mayest be as humble with thy graces, as if they were not at all. Yea God hath delighted sometimes in natural causes to work the effects without them, lest the glory should be given to the instruments. Hence he caused light to be before the Sun, and the earth is commanded to bring forth herbs before any rain, that so God may be acknowledged all in all. If God do this in the order of natural things, how much more of supernatural? Yet this is not so to be prest, as if therefore God would forgive sin without repentance. No, God hath ordered a way inviolably and indispensably, wherein he will vouchsafe his pardon, and no otherways. But although God out of his meer good will hath inseparably conjoin'd repentance and remission together, yet the discovery or promulgation of this unto the broken and contrite heart, is altogether arbitrary: And in this, as well as in other things, that speech is true, The winde bloweth where it listeth.
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4. Know therefore by these divine dispensations, That though thou dost repent, Gods forgivenesse is a meer gift of liberality, and no natural, necessary fruit of thy sorrow. Inso-much that setting Gods gracious promise aside, whereby he is a debtor unto his own faithfulnesse, after thy purest and most perfect humiliation for sin, God might refuse to take thy guilt away.

Reaf. 2. A second Reafon, Why God though he pardon, may yet deny the manifestation of it, is, Because hereby God would make us feel the bitternesse and gall of it in our own hearts. A pardon easilly obtained takes off the burden of the fault. Thus God dealt with David, the light of Gods favour doth not presently break thorrow the cloud, that so David may feel how bitter a thing it is to sinne against God. As God suffered Isaac to be bound, to have wood laid on him, the knife to be lifted up to strike him, in all which space, Isaac’s fear could not but heighten. Thus God also will kill and wound those, whom he intends to make alive: he willbruife them, and break them, that so they may judge the seeming good in sin, to be nothing to the real evil that followeth it.

Reaf. 3. And from this second issueth a third Reafon, viz. To make us more watchfull and diligent against the time to come: Peters bitternesse of soule, was a special preservative against the like temptations; as bitter potions kill the worms in childrens stomacks. It muft needs argue much guilt in Gods people, if after the particular gall and wormwood they have found in sin, they shall be ready to drink the like bitter potion, when sin presents it self. Certainly, the heart-aches that Paul found afterwards, though pardoned for his former persecutions, were like a flaming sword to keep him off from such attempts again; He might more truly say then that Heathen did, He would not buy repentance so dear.

Reaf. 4. By reafon of the difficulty, and supernatural way of believing, it is, that pardon may be in heaven, when we cannot apply it in our consciences. Hence though the promises be never so much for our ease, and thereupon infinitely to be desired, yet the way of believing this, is so far above natural conscience, which expects Justification by works, that the heart of a man hath much
much ado to close with it. Therefore faith is not like other graces or duties (viz. love of God, humility, &c.) which have some obscure footsteps in the natural dictates of conscience, but it is wholly supernatural; yea Adam in the state of integrity knew not this kind of believing in the righteousness of a Mediatour. For as the object of Faith, viz. Christ, is only by revelation, no counsel of men or Angels could have excogitated such a truth; so Faith, as it is the hand or organ applying Christ's righteousness, is a duty not manifested by humane light, but wholly from above. And as flesh and blood doth not reveal to us, That Christ is the Son of the living God, so neither that we are to have remission of sins only by faith in his blood. Hence the Scripture makes faith the gift of God, which coming from the Spirit into our hearts, meeteth with much contrariety and opposition of doubts and unbelief. No wonder therefore if after the heart of a man hath been awakened for sinne, there remain some commotions a long while after: even as the sea after tempests and windes, though they be allayed, yet for some space after roareth and rageth, not leaving its troubles present-ly, as you heard before. Though therefore as God pardoneth in heaven, he offereth it also unto our consciences, yet we refuse and put it off, we will not be comforted, because it is not a comfort flowing in the way we look for, viz. by working. And for this reason, though David heard Nathan pronounce his pardon, yet he doth vehemently importune for it afterwards in Psal. 51. as if he had not the least notice of any such mercy to him.

Lastly, God defers the notice of pardon unto thee, that so thou mayest be the more able to sympathize with those that are in the like tempted condition. For as one end of Christ's suffering in his soul, lying in agonies under God's displeasure, was because he might know how to have compassion upon his children in such temptations: So the Lord doth exercise his people to the same purpose; and certainly Christ accounted this, the tongue of the learned, to speak a seasonable word to a wounded heart. Besides, hereby shall we speak the more wonderfully of God's grace, and his goodness, after our deliverance out of those storms. Those that have been in these deep waters, see the wonderfull works
Another Question may be, What Directions are to be given unto a soul tempted about the pardon of sin? for many such there are, who like Pauls fellow-passengers in the ship, have been so many days, months, yea it may be years, and have seen no Sun, enjoyed no comfort at all.

Let the persons thus affected use these remedies:

First, Acknowledge God, and clear him howsover. Thus David, Psal. 51. That thou mayest be clear, when thou art judged. If the devils and the damned in hell have no cause to complain of God as unjust, or too severe, then much lesse mayest thou who art kept in darkness for a season only, that afterwards thou mayest enjoy the more light. Let not God be the worse God, his goodness the lesse unto thee, because thou art not yet set free out of the bonds of sin. By being thus humble thou takest the way to be filled, whereas impatience and discontent causeth God the more to hide his face.

Secondly, Examine thy repentance, whether that hath been so sound, so pure, so deep, so universal, as it should have been. All sorrow and humiliation for sin, is not godly repentance. Ahabs tears and Peters differ as much as the water of the sea, which is brinish and salt, and the water of the clouds, which is sweet. David, Psal. 32. acknowledgeth the pain and gripes he had within, because of sin: and no wonder he did not confesse it and bewail it before God. If therefore God keeps thy heart in many doubts and fears, giving thee no rest; consider whether thou hast cast all that leven out of thy house, whether every Achan within thee be stoned or no. It is in vain to cure the wound, as long as any splint of the poisoned arrow lieth within it, or if thou finde no sin unrepented of; search whether thy formal lazy duties be not the cause of all the blacknes that is in thy heart. We reade in the Canticles, that the Churches laziness, and her not opening the doors to Christ when he knockt, was the cause of that spiritual desertion she was plunged into, seeking up and down for her beloved, but not finding of him. The standing pool begets the croaking frogs, not the running stream: and it is the dull, negligent Christian, whose heart is filled with sad fears.
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fears and doubts, whereas the hidden manna and white stone is promised to him that overcometh.

Thirdly, *Though thy soul walk thus in darkness, yet exercise acts of dependency and recumbency upon Christ howsoever.* As David many times calls upon his soul to trust in God, and not to be sinfully dejected. How is that woman of Canaan commended for her faith? Who, though our Saviour called her dog, and did in effect tell her, she was excluded from pardon, did yet earnestly pursue him, and gave him no rest, till he gave her rest. And certainly, this is the noblest act of faith, this is indeed to give glory to God, when in the midst of all thy fears and guilt, thou canst rely upon him for pardon; as in wicked men who are filled with Satan, as Ananias was, there is a desperate boldness, whereby they dare venture upon sin: So in the godly there should be a confidence of faith, whereby maugre the devil and our consciences, we dare throw our selves into the arms of a promise. Thus by frequent putting forth of strong, fiducial, applicative acts of faith, we shall at last enjoy obsignative. Howsoever, hereby thou wilt shew thy heavenly courage in enduring a kinde of spiritual martyrdom. As that love is the highest love, which is carried out to enemies, so those are the strongest acts of faith, which make us depend on God, though he seem to kill us, yea to damn us.
LECT. XXIV.

Whether in Repentance the difference between great Sinnes and less is to be respected.

MAT. 6. 12.

And forgive us our debts.

A nother Question, which is also of great use, we are to dispatch at this time, viz. Whether a believer repenting and suing for pardon, is to make any difference between a great sin and a less? For if a man should be persuaded of the negative, then would gross and notorious sins, which Tertullian calls, devoratoria salvatis, whirlpools and gulfs, wherein the party offended is plunged, be no more then those sinns which Austin calls, Quotidian & levis, daily infirmities, which continually flow from the most sacrified person. Again, on the other side, A Christian falling into such a gross sin, may so far be swallowed up with sorrow, as that he shall think the whole bond of friendship is dissolved between him and God, that he is cast out of that spiritual Paradise he was in, and that God is no more his Father, nor he his childe. It is therefore necessary to have a pillar of fire to guide us in this wilderness. And that the whole truth of this matter may be understood, observe these Propositions.

First, Every sinne even the least sinne doth deserve eternall death: As appeareth by those generall places, Cursed is every
great Sins and less is to be respected.

one that abideth not in all things the Law commands, Gal.3.10.

Now every sin is a transgression of the Law. This the Apostle speaks universally of all sin, without any exception, Rom.6.23. The wages of sinne is death. And indeed this must needs be so, if you consider the least sinne is an offence against an infinite God: and in this respect, because God is not a little, but a great God, so every sinne is not little, but a great sinne. Again, if you consider the necessity of Christ's blood to expiate this, no sin can be thought little: for if a man had no sin in the world, but one of these little ones, he could not escape eternall wrath, without Christ's mediation.

Therefore we cannot say any sin is veniall, either from its kinde and nature (as Papists distinguish) such they make to be officious, or jesting lies; or from the imperfection of the act, such they make those that are committed indeliberately, or out of ignorance, without full consent or knowledge. Or from the smallness of the matter, as to steal a farthing, or the like. None of these sinnes are so small, but that they deserve hell, because they are the transgression of the Law of an holy and great God; and our Saviour confirmeth this, when he faith, Of every idle word a man shall give an account, Matth.12.36. and that phrase of giving an account, is not a diminutive, but aggravative expression: Our Saviour doth there argue from the less to the greater, thus, If a man must give an account for every idle word, much more for blasphemy against the holy Ghost.

Take we heed therefore, how we bring down the weight and guilt of the sin; here also we may see, why Paul found such a mountain upon him, by sinfull motions only arising in his heart.

There are two places that seem to import such a difference between sinnes, as if some only deserved hell, and others not. The first is, Mat.5.22. where our Saviour speaking of three degrees of sinne, doth proportionably assign three degrees of punishment, and the last only is guilty of hell fire.

But the clear answer is, That our Saviour speaks allusively to those three Courts of Judicature among the Jews, the leaft punishment whereof was death; so that the first Court punished...
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with death, the second, death with a more grievous torment, the third with a most grievous. For that our Saviour doth only allude to these Courts, and not speak of what faults the Courts punished, is plain; for none can think that the Court put any to death for calling his brother fool. It was murder and such sins that they punished with capital punishments. The other place is, 1 Joh. 5. 15, 17. where the Apostle makes a difference between a sin unto death, and a sin not unto death, but that is clearly to be understood either of the sin against the holy Ghost (which in those times, when the spirit of discerning was frequent, might easily be known) or of such sin that did plainly discover obstinacy and impenitency accompanying of it, otherwise no man might pray for another man that hath committed a mortall sin, if by a sin unto death, the Papist will mean every mortall sin.

Lay therefore this foundation, That every sinne is mortall, in respect of its desert and guilt, howsoever to the godly believing and repenting, no sin is mortall, but all veniall, Rom 8. 2. There is no condemnation to those that are in Christ Jesus. Therefore Musculus observes well, That in this case, the persons offending are to be considered (whether they be believers) more then the sins themselves.

A second Proposition.

Howsoever every sin, even the least, doth thus deserve eternall damnation, yet there is a great difference between some sins and others. And therefore sin is not a meer negation, but a privation, as diseases are, and so as one disease may be more desperate then another, so may one sin be more hainous then another. The Stoicks thought all sins alike. And Cyprian among the Ancients, is reported by the Learned to have been of that minde. But Scripture doth evidently confute this, He that delivered me unto thee hath the greater sinne, Joh. 16. 11. So you have the phrase to be worse then an infidell, 1 Tim. 5. 8. Thus Ezek. 16. 47. Israel is said to be more corrupted, and to do more abomination then So. om. For although to sin be to misse the mark, yet some may shoot farre wider from it then others, one sin therefore may be more hainous then another divers waies, as Divines shew. As
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First, From the person offending, if he know the will of God, or if he be in publike place and office.

Secondly, From the object; If it be sin against God immedi-
diately, or man only, as Eli said, 1 Sam.2:25. If one man sin
against another, the Judge shall judge him, but if a man sin against
the Lord, who shall intreat for him?

Thirdly, From the matter about which, if it be in the life of
a man, and not in his goods, that thou wronged him. Some
also may be aggravated from the disposition of the man, the
means he enjoys to overcome sinne from the frequency of it,
or defending of it, and the like. Hence some sins are compared
to Camels, others to Gnats, some to Beams, others to Moats,
some to talents, others to farthings. This then being clear, let
us consider, what difference a true believer should make be-
tween these in matter of pardon, and what difference he should
not make.

And in the first place, he is to make a vast difference about
them, when he such out for pardon. As

1. He is to believe Gods wrath is more kindled against him;
and that his indignation burneth more hotly, when such an in-
quity is committed, then in our daily infirmities. Thus when
Aaron had made the Idolatrous Calf, how angry was God both
with Aaron and the people? How angry also was God with
David after his murder and adultery? David had continuall
infirmities, but God did not break his bones for them, he made
not such a breach upon his peace and conscience, as he did in
these sins: Therefore it must argue high prophanem[se] of spirit,
if a man after the committing of groffe and loathlom sins be
no more troubled, then for the continuall motions and incur-
sions which sinne necessarily makes upon us. No, as sins have a
greater guilt in them, so Gods wrath is stirred up in a more ve-
hement manner against such.

2. There is a great difference to be made in respect of humi-
liation, and the measure of godly sorrow for it. For as the sin may
exceed another, as much as the Camel doth a Gnat, so ought
the sorrow, as much as an ocean doth a drop. Thus Peter goeth
out, and weeps bitterly, he did not so for every defect, and
spirituall imperfection in him, as for this abominable apostasie.
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We reade also of the incestuous person, as he committed sin, that was not so much as named among the Gentiles, so he manifested such sorrow as was scarce heard among Christians; in-,

somuch that the Apostle was afraid of him, lest he should be overwhelmed with too much sorrow. Now if for every sin of infirmity there should be as much sorrow and humiliation, as for these crimson and scarlet sins, how would the whole life of man be but a continuall trouble of soul? and in what darkness would he live alwaies? Although all thy continuall failings ought to be matter of humiliation unto thee, yet when such as these shall break out, thy soul ought to set open the flood-gates of thy soul. Neither may this be thought a low mercenary way, as if the party so humbled did intend a compensation unto God. But all places of Scripture must be regarded, as those which speak of Christ's glorious grace; so also those which speak of our duties.

3. The Spirit of God doth not only in his Word reveal a greater wrath against such sins, but he doth also withdraw all those consolations and comforts which were in the heart before. So that a man thus offending, doth, as it were, bolt himself in a dark dungeon, and shut out all the beams of the Sun against him. In-

somuch that although assurance, and the consolations of the holy Ghost may conflict with the weaknesses and sinfull infirmities of God's people; yet they do not with the grosse impieties they plunge themselves into, as appeareth in David, Ps. 51. who prayeth for the restoring of that salvation he had lost by his sin.

The Spirit of God is a Dove, and that delighteth not in no-

some buildings. The Spirit of God may be grieved and quench-
ed in respect of the fruits thereof: So that a man thus wounded for sin, feels a very hell in his heart, admits of no comfort. Neither can it be otherwise, for when we refuse the Spirit of God sanctifying, we presently repel it comforting. If we have not the heat of this Sun, neither shall we have the light thereof.

4. In these grosse offences the Spirit of God doth not only forsake him in respect of consolation, but its a command laid upon the Church-officers to cast such an one out of their society, as 1 Cor. 6. neither may the people of God have any familiar communion or acquaintance with such: now what horror and trembling
Great sins and less is to be respected.

Trembling may justly arise in such a man's heart; who shall thus be cast out of all gracious privileges, and that by God's appointment? What darkness must this work in his heart, when he shall argue, thus with himself; Its God's command I should not be admitted to the seals of his love; he hath given his officers charge to pour no oil in my wounds; how can I plead for the grace signified, when he denieth me the seals thereof? God hath shut me out like the unclean leper, and whither shall I go? Now then, if the Church of God make such a vast difference between him and others, and that following the directions of Christ; Ought not the person offending also, to judge the same things about himself?

5. In some kindes of grosse sins, although there may be deep humiliation, yet there are many other conditions requisite, without which pardon of sin cannot be obtained, and that is in sins of injustice, violence and fraud of others. Thus Zachew, it is not enough for him to beleve Christ, the Messiah, and receive him into his house, but he makes satisfaction where he hath done wrong. Thus our Saviour also, Mat. 5. If thou remember any man have ought against thee, leave thy gift at the Altar, and go and be reconcil'd. It is a known saying of Austin, Non remittitur peccatum, nisi restituatur ablatum. The sin is not remitted, unless what thou hast unjustly taken be restored. And it is a most wretched perverting of the sense, which an Antinomian makes (Reconcil, with God, pag. 90) that this reconciliation is to be made of man to man, but not true in respect of God to man; and whereas the same Author speaks of Zachew, that he did believe first, and afterwards made restitution, which (pag. 91.) he calls an example beyond all exception; let him the second time consider Zachew's his explication, and he will see it nothing to his purpose. The words are in the present tense. Luke 10:8. Behold, Lord, the half of my goods I give to the poor, and if I have wrunged any man, I give him four-fold. Now either Zachew means this of his former life past, or else he declares his ready and prepared will for the time to come; and there are Interpreters of both sides, and which way soever you expound it, it overthroweth the adversaries tenent. For, if it be understood of his course of
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of life, formerly past, then it goeth clear against him. If of his readiness of mind for the future, it makes nothing for him. For although by this it will appear, That Zacheus did joyfully receive Christ before he made actual restitution, yet not before he had a preparedness, and resolution of heart to do it. And certainly Zacheus speaking thus to Christ, Behold I give, cannot but be understood, that this penitent frame of heart was upon him before he said so. If Zacheus speaks this of his former course of life, then he doth manifest this not in a way of pride or ostentation, but to see whether Christ would command him to do otherwise, so that he might be thought to say this, for instruction sake, to be directed for the future.

6. Grosse sins require a more intense act of faith to apply pardon.

6. As there must necessarily be more sorrow, and will be greater terrors from the Lord, so there is also required greater and stronger acts of faith, whereby pardon may be applied; For the agony and temptation being greater, the strength of faith also must proportionably be increased. Hence we see the inceftuous person was almost overwhelmed; so great a matter was it to exercise faith, when God was apprehended thus angry: and certainly, if faith be a grace so difficultly put forth even for the least sinne; What conflicts must there needs be, when nothing but mountains are in the way, and great guls apprehended between pardon and him? The mariner doth need more skill and strength in a tempest; then in a calm; and the solider must shew more courage in the midst of a furious battell, then when all things are quiet.

Thus you see wherein a great difference is to be made.

Now there are some particulars wherein a Believer repenting is to make no difference at all. And that is in these things.

First, There is no difference in respect of the efficient cause, Gods grace in pardoning. The godly man is not to think, that God can more easily pardon lesser sinnes then great sinnes: No, all these are equally pardoned by him. Even as in the earth, though there be great and high mountains in respect of other hils, yet both them and these are meerly as a punctum in respect of the heavens; So although
though some sins exceed others in guilt divers waies, yet all of them in respect of Gods grace are but as a drop before the Sunne, which is quickly dried up. Hence when God proclaimeth himself in all his goodnesse, he is descri-
bed to be a God pardoning iniquity, transgression and sinne; And thus Isa. I. he can make sinnes as red as scarlet, as white as snow: So that compared to Gods grace, there is no dif-
tinction at all.

Nor secondly, may any difference be made in respect of the meritorious cause, which is Chrift's obedience and sufferings; For that cleanseth away great sinnes, as well as small. And certainly, when we consider what infinite value and worth the sufferings of him, who is God as well as man, do amount to, he beleeving soule need not wonder, if Chrift do away one as well as the other. In the red sea, the stout-
eft and most valiant Champion was drowned, as well as the meaneft souldier. He is the Lamb that takes away the sinnes of the world; and his blood is said to cleanse us from all our iniquities. Here is no difference made, from one sinne as well as another. So that although thy great sinnes require greater humiliation, yet not a greater Mediator then Chrift is; Thou must pour out more tears, but Chrift needs not pour out more blood; so that in respect of Chrifts righteousness ap-
plied, the leaft and the greatest sinner are pardoned both alike; neither is it blasphemy (though the Papists judge it so) to say, Mary Magdalene, and the Virgin Mary are both justified alike.

3. Neither may we make any difference in the means of par-
don thus farre, as if our merit and satisfaction were to go to the pardon of one, and not of the other. We are to shew greater for-
row, more means are to be used, yet we are not to judge these actions of ours, as having any worth or dignity in them for re-
conciliation, so that after we have done all, we must confess its grace only that pardons. And this is the more to be obser-
ved, because it is hard not to do any thing extraordinarily in a way of pardon, and not presently to rest upon this, as if it had some worth in it. But certainly, if so be it be the goodness of God meerly to forgive us our farthings, it is much more his li-
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berality to pardon our bounds: and if by our strength we cannot remove a straw, how shall we a beam? But in the primitive times the Church being severe against grosse offenders, appointed more solemn and extraordinary duties of humiliation for satisfaction to the Church of God in point of scandal, and in process of time these were taught to be satisfactory even to God himself.

4. Neither may this difference be made, as if less sins might consist with the grace of justification, but such gross sins did wholly exclude out of that state. For there are some who plead for the distinction of mortal and venial sins; in this sense, venial are all those which may stand with the favour and grace of God to the person so failing: but mortal are such, which (though a man hath been justified) yet being committed, will cast him out of this Sonship. Such a distinction Musculus acknowledgeth, loc. com. de peccato, and others; but this supposeth a total apostasie from grace, which I have already disproved.

As the Ark was made of that wood which would not be corrupt or putrife, so is the Church of God in respect of the living members. Therefore although God's people in such grievous falls lose their assurance, feel wofull commotions of heart, yet they are not to conclude, That God hath utterly cast them off. They are not to look upon themselves as unsound, though they have been Prodigals.
Of the Pardon of Sin under the notion of covering it.

Ps. 32. 1, 2.

Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sinne is covered.

Blessed is the man to whom the LORD imputeth not iniquity.

David is styled by some Ancients, The divine Orpheus, by whose musick the wilde beasts, evil men, may be made tame: and certainly his material harp was not more efficacious to drive out Sauls evil spirit, then his Psalms are sanctified means to expell all corrupt affections in us. And although all Scripture be equally excellent in respect of the Author, yea and of the matter absolutely considered, yet in respect of us, our direction or consolation by reason of our present estate, one place of Scripture may be preferred before another: in which sense Junius interprets those Psalms that have their Inscription, A Psalm of Degrees, A Psalm of Excellencies, as the Hebrew word will bear it. Now this Psalm I am upon, may justly be so styled, because it hath a peculiar usefulness, to those who are exercised about the guilt of sin; for here we have David like an anatomy opened, that we may be instructed. Hence the title of the Psalm is Maschil, which is as much as giving instruction, and it is observed by Commentators, this is prefixed commonly to those Psalms that have some choice, eminent Doctrine, especially about...
about afflictions, as this hath about David's guilt and trouble under sin, and also his pardon of it.

The *Hebrews* call this Psalm 37 Cor. *The heart of David*, because he is so affected with God's displeasure for sin, and the excellency of the pardon. Therefore you must conceive the Text to be uttered by David, as one groaning and heavily pressed with the weight of his sin, and crying out, *Oh how blessed and happy are they, who have their sins forgiven them!*

In which words you have *Pardon of sin* described.

First, From several expressions to magnifie the mercy, *Sins forgiven, covered, not imputed.* It is much to consider how ancient Interpreters have made a difference between the sins enumerated; as if there were divers kindes, or at least degrees of sin enumerated; and hereupon also they make a difference between forgiving, covering and imputing, as if one were more then the other; but we are rather to take it according to the Scripture custome, which doth use for amplification sake, to say the same thing in divers words, and this is *autology*, but not *tautology*. The difference that is, from the several metaphors that are in the words. As the first word doth signify the taking away of sin, which is a burden, *Blessed is he that is exalted of such a weight.* The second, which is covering, doth signify the loathsome filthinesse of sin in the eyes of God, and therefore by grace it is taken out of his sight. The third, not imputing or reckoning, is a metaphor supposing sin a debt, and God in his account will not set it upon our score; so that the several expressions are wonderfully comfortable; if sin trouble thee as an heavy weight on thee, pardoning is the easing and taking off this burden; if sin make thee to judge thy self loathsome, thou canst not endure thy self, pardon of sin is covering of it; if sin put thee in such a debt to God, that thou knowest not how to satisfie, pardon is not imputing.

Secondly, This is described from the *adjunct*, adherent to remission of sin, viz. *Blessednesse.* The Apostle Rom.4 alledgest this place, to prove, That a man hath righteousness imputed to him without works. But the pertinency of the Apostles Argument is disputed of: For how doth it from this place follow, That a man hath righteousness imputed to him without works?
This is as if a man should argue, He is a rich man, because his debts are forgiven, which is a non sequitur, because they are two distinct things. This makes Piscator and Wotton, with others, to make justification to be nothing but remission of sins, and that imputation of righteousness, and remission of sins are the self same thing; a man being therefore accounted righteous, because his sins are not imputed unto him. Hence they deny, that the Scripture ever faith, Christ's righteousness is imputed unto us, although in some sense, they grant it may be said so, inasmuch as by his death for us, he purchased remission of sin, which is our righteousness. This is to be considered of, when we speak of the other part of justification, viz. imputation of Christ's righteousness. Although they that are for imputed righteousness, say, the argument is good, which Paul useth because imputing of righteousness is immediately contrary to the imputing of sin; and therefore Paul might argue righteousness imputed from sin remitted; even as we truly argue, the night is not, therefore the day is, because darknesse and light are immediate contraries, and the subject must necessarily have one of them.

Lastly, this forgivenesse of sin is described from the subject in whom it is, viz. in him in whose heart there is no guile; that is, who doth not cover his sins by not confessing, and not repenting of them, as David acknowledgeth he did for as while.

From the Text I shall raise such Observations as are to my particular scope. As

First, that forgivenesse of sin is a covering of sin.

This truth deserveth a diligent unfolding, because the mistake about it hath brought forth dangerous errors in two extremities, the one of the Papist; That because it is covered, therefore there is no sin at all in the godly, otherwise God could not but see it and hate it, as Pererius and others argue. The other of the Antinomian, who infer from thence, That therefore God seeth not sin, or taketh notice of it in justified persons, as Eaton.

To understand this aright, take notice, that to cover is a metaphorical expression, and we must not squeeze it too much,
left blood come out instead of milk; Some make the metaphor from filthy, loathsome objects, which are covered from our eyes, as dead carcasses are buried under the ground; some from garments that are put upon us to cover our nakedness, some from the Egyptians that were drowned in the red sea, and so covered with water; some from a great gulf in the earth, that is filled up and covered with earth injected into it. Lastly, some make it an allusive expression to the Mercy-seat, over which was a covering, which might signify God's grace through and in Christ, abolishing our sins. Hence the Apostle attributes *inaspect* and *inashew*, to Christ and his blood, which is given to the Mercy-seat; we may not strive for any of these metaphors, they all in the general tend to show this, That God when he pardoneth, doth not look upon us as sinners, but deals with us, as if we had never sinned at all: as it is here made blessedness to have sinner covered, so it is made a woe and misery, Neh. 45. not to have sinner covered, as Nehemiah prayeth against Sanballat and Tobiah. This expression is also used Psal. 85.2.

In the next place, we may consider in what sense God doth cover sin when he pardons, and in what he doth not.

1. God is said therefore to cover sin from his eyes, Because he will not take notice of it in justified persons to punish it with wrath and condemnation: although it be not so covered, as that God doth not see it to be angry with it, and chastise believers for it, yet it is so covered, as that he doth not see it to condemn believers for it. We do not therefore make God to cover sin (as an Antinomian faith we do) as if a man should cover a thing with a net, where the object is still seen, Honeycomb, p. 57. but as to God's hatred and revengeful condemnation, so it is wholly covered; and therefore those expressions of taking away, blotting out of sin, &c. do fully imply, that God giveth not an half pardon, but that he taketh away the offence, and whatsoever punishment (properly so called) belongs unto it.

2. It doth imply, That God when he hath thus forgiven, deals with a man as no more in that particular a sinner. Therefore David after his murder and adultery are washed away, he is as white as snow in respect of those actual sins; and every true believer repenting, is bound to believe, that God doth this graciously and glo-
Gods Mercy in pardoning Sin.

Gloriously to him, That he is no more in Gods account that loathsome leper and unclean person he was.

3. It doth imply, That God by degrees, and in his due time will cover the believers sins, as from his own eyes, so from the believers eyes. So that the guilt of conscience, those arrows of the Almighty, shall not alwayes stick in his heart. Thus as mans love to another, covers a multitude of sins, he will not mention, charge or upbraid the party with them, so doth Gods love cover the multitude of believers sins committed by them, dealing with them as reconciled persons, not upbraiding of them, but bestowing all encouraging mercies upon them; so that if we improve this phrase of covering sin no further, we shall split on no rock, and yet the soul have as much comfort as it can rationally desire.

In the next place, hear what it doth not reach to, and where in the phrase is abused: As

1. When we dream of such covering of sin, as that sin is wholly taken away; so that no relics of original corruption abide in us. Thus the Papists, We must not (say they) suppose such a covering, as if some were still there, only God will not impute it, but it is such a covering as is a blotting sin out. Now for actual sin, we grant covering to be a blotting it out, but for original sin, in the lufts thereof, We say, they are still in the godly, and properly sins, only covered, because not imputed to them: for the grace of regeneration, though it cut the hair of sin; as Dalilah did Samsons, yet it groweth again; as long as the root is there.

2. We may not conceive sin covered in this sense, as if we by our subsequent good actions did cover sin; So some have expounded holy works to be the garment that covers our nakedness, but this would be our covering, and not Gods covering, whereas the Psalmist attributes it to God, Psal. 85 2. Therefore that expostion will not hold, which some bring out of Austin, explaining this covering of sin, as Emplastrum tegit vulnus, the plaister covers the sore, by healing of it; for although healing grace accompany Justification, yet it is not Justification.

3. We may not conceive it said to be covered in this sense. As if God when he had pardoned, did not yet still retain anger against the
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the persons sinning, and so chastize them. Though this Doctrine be much pleaded for, yet Scripture is evident against it. David had sin covered, yet God would not let the sword depart from his house. Thus Job aweth himself against sin with this consideration, That God would see it in him, and take notice of it, Job 10. 14. If I sin thou markest me (God seeth sin in Job) and thou wilt not acquit me from mine iniquity; and Chap. 14. 16, 17. He faith, God doth watch over his sin, and seal it up in a bag. Let not then the people of God delude themselves into security, by any false doctrine; and what wofull conclusions there are of a godly mans peace, when he falls into a grosse sin. I shall handle in another Question.

Neither fourthly, may we conceive of sin covered in a carnal grosse manner, As if there were something interposed between Gods eyes and sin; as if a mans face were covered with an hat, or a candle put under a bushel. The Antinomians similitude is grosse and carnal, [Honey-comb, pag. 275.] As a man looking thorow a red glasse, seeth the water all red within it; so God looking upon us in Christ, seeth nothing but the righteousnesse of Christ, and no sin at all; for the reason why our senses judge water red thorow a red glasse, is, because it depends upon the fitnesse of a medium, and that being indisposed, the eye is deceived; but God in looking upon us, doth not depend upon any intervening thing; and indeed Gods seeing of sin in this point, is not so much an act of his understanding, as of his will, decreeing to punish sin, or not to punish it. So that this similitude doth no wayes hold, for God in this matter of forgiving or punishing sin, is not to be looked upon as a natural agent, but voluntarily. So that all these things rightly understood, we may take that which is good and comfortable, leaving that which is corrupt and false.

And if the Question be made, Whether the phrase of covering sin, make for that error, That God doth not see sin in believers offending?

I anwer, no by no means, for these Reasons:

First, Gods covering of sinne is to be limited onely to condemnation, as I have proved; Davids sinne was at the same time open to God, and covered; open to fatherly charifements,
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First, covered to revengeful condemnation. God did see it as a Father to be angry with him, not as a Judge to hate him.

Secondly, Because this covering is limited to those sins which are past, and repent of, not to new sins committed; they are not covered without a new gracious act of God's favour. David before this sinne committed that is spoken in the Psalm, he had his former sins covered, but this was not covered, till he did acknowledge it, and then faith he, Thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin. Though therefore God should not see the sins past, yet the new ones committed, they are taken notice of by him.

Thirdly, Because though God hath covered them, yet God may and doth sometimes afflict his people for their sins, so that they cannot be in every sense said to be covered. But I have spoken largely of this already.

Two material Objections are to be answered, and then I shall proceed.

The first is, If sin be in the regenerate, yet covered, and not imputed. How will this stand with the Omnisciency, Truth and Holiness of God? His Omnisciency, for he cannot but see sin if it be there: His Truth, for God must needs judge of things as they are; If therefore sin be there, he must judge it to be there, otherwise we make him like the wicked who covers sin, he will not acknowledge it to be there: Now what Truth is this, to say of a regenerate man, He is cleansed and washed from all his evil, and yet his evil is in him? This the learned among the Papists do much urge, Peregrinus, Tirinus, &c. At most (faith Suarez de Justific.) it makes remission of sin to be nothing but a remission of the punishment, not of the offence or fault. The very same is urged by Antinomists. Lastly, How doth it consist with God's holiness? for he must needs hate sin in whomsoever he finds it; and therefore for the Saints to have sin in them, and yet God not to impute it to them, seemeth a contradiction.

But to all this the answer is easy. As for God's Omnisciency, none say, but by that God beholds sinne where it is; and in that sense, sinne is not at all said to be covered; for he knoweth all in man. As for his Truth, God doth judge
judge as the thing is, for as he seeth sin, so he judgeth sin to be in them, and according to that eternal Rule laid down, 

*Psalm 89:32, 33.* He chastiseth them with the rod, though he take not his loving kindnesse from them: So that God doth not judge things otherwise then they are. And as for his holyenesse, he is not only angry with their sins, but also would proceed to their eternal condemnation, were it not for Christ their Surety, so that their sins are punished, though not in their own persons. Neither is this a taking away of sin only in respect of the punishment, but of the offence also, God being wholly reconciled with his people, though the corruption (which is removed by Sanctification, not Justification) is by degrees purged away.

**Object 2.**

**Answ.**

The second Objection is, *How can God see sin, seeing they have Christ's righteousness, and there being no sin in that, therefore God must look upon them as in Christ, which is without any sin at all?*

The Answer is, that when we say, Christ's righteousness is made theirs, it is not to be understood subjectively, as if it were a quality inherent in them (for then indeed God could not see sin in them) but relatively, he is their Mediator, and by his obedience they are acquitted, so that the righteousness is in Christ, but by faith it becomes theirs, not formally, but as the merit for which God doth justify them, and God doth account it to them as theirs; now this is no contradiction, to be sinfull in our selves, and yet at the same time acquitted by the righteousness of another. It is true, those expressions of making Christ's righteousness a formal righteousness; or as others, a material righteousness; and those Disputations, Whether Christ's active or passive Obedience, both or either of them be imputed to us, hath much darkned the Question, whereas if we consider of it, as a relative righteousness performed by our Surety in our stead, the matter will be made much clearer: yet I speak not this, as if Christ's active obedience were not made ours, as in time may be shewed.

I come to the second Observation out of the Text, which is, *That those only do esteem pardon of sin as a blessednesse, who feel inwardly the anger of God for sin.*

David
David here in this Psalm, being deeply wounded with the
guilt of his sin, judgeth not his kingdom, his wealth, his conquest
over enemies an happy thing, but pardon of sin.

Now the ground of this is, Because such is our custom (though
it be our weakness) to esteem of mercies more carendo quam ha-
bendo, by wanting of them, than having of them. The blinde man
earnestly desireth fight. The lame man prizeth sound limbs; a
people distressed with warre, and finding the bitterness of it,
commend peace. Thus it is here, a man afflicted and imbitter-
ed in his soul because of sin, he doth highly admire forgive-
ness, and accounts those happy, that walk in the sense of God's
favour. Though innocency or freedom from sin may be majus
beneficium, a greater mercy then pardon and reparation, yet
this is dulcis beneficium, a more sweet mercy to the sense and
feeling of him, who enjoyeth it. Hence that Christ and the Go-
spel might be exalted, God permitted sin to be, and the Law is
on purpose to discover sin, and aggravate it, that Christ and his
grace may be the more welcome.

The Uses of both points together, are

1. From the former, Doth God in pardoning cover sin? then with what boldnesse may true faith triumph? Why is
the godly penitent, as if his sins were always in bloudy cha-
acters before God? Why is he, as if there were no bloud of
Christ, wherein these Egyptians are drowned? If thou hadst
never been a sinner, thy heart would not have trembled. Is
not forgivenesse making of a finne not to be, as you have
heard? So that as Rachel is mourning for her children, because
they are not; so mayest thou be rejoicing, because thy sins
are not, and although they be not covered out of thy sight,
yet if covered out of God's sight, that is thy blessednesse; better
have them rise up always in thy conscience, then once before
God.

From the second we may be instructed, who are the best
Preachers of Christ, and the grace of the Gospel, who are
Gospel-preachers, even such who make deep incisions and
wounds first in mens consciences by the Law. The only way for
a Minister to make his auditors relish and favour of Christ and
grace indeed, is to keep them in a godly sense and apprehen-

Ule of the first
Observation.

Use 2.
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fion of their infirmities. We are not in our first conversion only to have throbs and pangs after Gods grace, but also this hunger and thirsting after Christ, is to be kept up in the progress of San@ification. And therefore as thofe Minifters are to be blamed (if any fuch) that do only preffe duty, discover fhe Sin, but never set forth the fulnefle of Christ: So they alfo are to be blamed, who only preffe fuch Texts as manifeft Gods grace, but never open that issue and fountain of all fhit that is within us. Both these tempered together are like Aaron's excellent compound.

The last Use of Exhortation, is, To be fo deeply humbled and tenderly affected within yourselves, that all within you may cry out, Blessed is the man to whom the Lord imputeth no Sinne. O that every Auditor which heareth me this day, could with the fame Spirit, affection, and turning of bowels within him, proclaim this truth, as David did. What is said of Paul's Epiftles, is also true of David's Psalms, Nnquam Davidis mentem intelliges, nisi prius Davidis spiritum imbiberis. You can never fully understand David's meaning, unleffe you be posfeffed with David's spirit. Now that you may be moved hereunto, consider the motive in the Text, and the means to get it. The motive is Blessedneffe; a man is never an happy man, till his fins be pardoned. What makes hell and damnation, but meerly not forgivenofe? Thy wealth, thy greatneffe, thy honours, cannot bring that happineffe to thee, which remifion of fins doth. Hence this is the caufe of all other blessedneffe. And observe, here is a great deal of difference between this place, Blessed is the man whose fins are pardoned, and thofe Texts, where he is faid to be blessed that feareth alwayes, or he is faid to be blessed that walketh not in the ways of the wicked, for in the Text is fhewed the caufe or fountain of blessednes, viz. remifion of Sin, but in other places there is only deciphered, who they are that are blessed. A man that feareth is blessed, but his fear is not the caufe of his blessedneffe. A man that liveth godly is blessed, but his godlines is not the caufe of his blessedneffe, but his pardon of Sin makes him blessed in all his graces; Thou art blessed, not because thou prayeft, heareth, liveft holily, but because God doth forgive all thy fins and imperfections in these duties. If therefore your
graces, your holy duties are not the cause of your blessedness, never think your outward mercies can be. The means to obtain it, is in the Text, *By having no guile in the heart*, that is, by not hiding our sins, but repenting of them, and confessing them to God: *For this (faith David) every one shall pray unto thee in an acceptable time*, for this, that is, for this remission, and because thou wast so ready to forgive, when I said, *I will confess my sin*, therefore shall every one seek to thee; where by the way, let none abuse that place, v.5. David said, *he would confess*, and God forgave it; David did but say it, and God pardoned it; so some have descanted upon it. But to say there, according to the use of the Hebrew word in some places, is firmly to purpose and decree so resolvedly, that he will be diligent in the practice of it. Do not therefore think that a meer lip-labour is that brokenness and contrition of spirit, which God requireth as the means to pardon.
Lect. XXVI.

Sheweth, That God takes notice of, and is Angry at the Sinnes of Believers. The Aggravations of Davids, and so of all Believers Sinnes. What Sinnes Believers may possibly fall into; And yet wherein they differ from the sinnes of other men.

Psalm 51. 9.

Hide thy face from my sinnes, and blot out all mine iniquities.

You have heard of the peculiar usefulness of the Psalms in respect of our conditions or temptations. What some Authors (I know not upon what ground) have said of the Manna, that it had the taste of all delicate meats in it, and gave a respective relish to what every palate desired; this may be truly affirmed of the Psalms, they have a respective Direction, or comfort to every ones affliction or temptation. Hence they have been called by some The little Bible, or The Bible of the Bible: For although the Stars be of a quintessential
The first Petition is, 

*Be merciful unto me, Jehovah.*

This Petition is directed to God in a twofold manner: first, Get thee hence from mine eyes; and secondly, Let me alone; for after the manner of men, they are not able to bear with any correction, wherein the goodness of God is known. And they expose themselves to God, as to a just Judge, declaring their unfitness, and nothing but forgiveness can remove their guilt. And as the knowledge of God is in them, so they are willing to come near to God, even to receive the good of his goodness. And this Petition is enforced from the consideration of the goodness of God, as being a foundation of the knowledge of him, and the just deserts of his goodness. And this Petition is also employed as a proof of the means, by which the knowledge of God is known through his goodness. And the first Petition is supported by the consideration of the goodness of God, in his goodness, which is the means of the knowledge of God. And the second Petition is supported by the consideration of the goodness of God, in his goodness, which is the means of the knowledge of God. And this Petition is supported by the consideration of the goodness of God, in his goodness, which is the means of the knowledge of God. And the second Petition is supported by the consideration of the goodness of God, in his goodness, which is the means of the knowledge of God. And this Petition is supported by the consideration of the goodness of God, in his goodness, which is the means of the knowledge of God. And the second Petition is supported by the consideration of the goodness of God, in his goodness, which is the means of the knowledge of God. And this Petition is supported by the consideration of the goodness of God, in his goodness, which is the means of the knowledge of God. And the second Petition is supported by the consideration of the goodness of God, in his goodness, which is the means of the knowledge of God. And this Petition is supported by the consideration of the goodness of God, in his goodness, which is the means of the knowledge of God. And the second Petition is supported by the consideration of the goodness of God, in his goodness, which is the means of the knowledge of God.
And there is the face of his anger, and his indignation. This David perceiveth upon him, and against him, wherefore he desireth God would hide it from him: So that it is an expression from a guilty person, who cannot endure the just Judge should look upon him; or rather from a child offending, who cannot bear the frowns of his father, casting his eyes upon him. David hath that filth and guilt now upon him, which he knoweth God cannot behold but with much wrath and indignation, therefore he prayeth God would not look on him. You see here David acknowledging, That God doth see and take notice of the sins of justified persons in a most provoked manner.

This prayer is expressed to the same sense in the next Petition, Blot out all mine iniquities; wherein consider the mercy prayed for, Blot out, a metaphor (as you have heard) from Merchants that cancel their debts, or as the Sun doth dissipate and cause the cloud to vanish.

2. The extent of the Object [All my iniquities.] Whether this extend to future sins, so that all sins, past, present and future are pardoned together, shall be considered in the second place.

From the first Petition, observe, That God seeth and taketh notice of, in a most angry and provoked manner, the hainous and grosse sins, which a believer hath plunged himself into.

For this reason, David prayeth God would turn away his eyes, and face from him, even as the forse eyes desire to have the light removed, as being unable to bear it. And this aggravation of Gods seeing it, he mentioneth also, ver. 4. Against thee onely have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight. That God did see it, and was offended, did more trouble him, then the eyes of all the world upon him: So 2 Sam. 11. 27. where this History is related, there is this peculiar brand upon Davids sinne, that what he had done was evil in the eyes of the Lord. Therefore God did see it, and take notice of it, so as to be displeased with it. This Doctrine is worthy of all diligent examination, both because it will be a strong Antidote to keep Gods people from scandalous grosse sins, as also to enform how farre in such sins the people of God make a breach
Davids Sin and Repentance.

breach upon their peace with God, and claim to the Covenant of grace. And although this Question hath been vexed in some respects with the scratching claws of the Schoolmen, yet I shall endeavour not to be so ill a feedman, as to toowe among thorns: Nor as one of the Ancients alludes, Plantare nemus Aristotelicum juxta altare Dei, Plant Aristotles dark grove near Gods altar.

And for the clearer proceeding in this great point, I shall consider the Doctrine briefly in the hypothesis, as it was Davids case, and then in these, as it may be any believers condition:

For David, take notice of two things,

First, The aggravation of his sin.

Secondly, Of the evil befalling him, because of it. Davids sin is at large mentioned, 2 Sam.ii. where you have severall aggravations of this ungodly act.

1. He was a King, and so his wickednesse was the greater, by how much his person was greater. Men in place being like the Sun, which if in an eclipse, causeth much destructive alteration to inferiors.

2. A man advanced by God to special mercies, both temporall and spirituall, and for him to sinne thus, we may cry out, What ailest thou, O Jordan, to runne backward?

3. The nature of the sinne was a very grosse one, against the light of an Heathens conscience, to deflour his neighbours wife.

4. It was a trespass against his faithfull servant Uriah, who was venturing his life to preserve David: This was horrible ingratitude.

5. This aggravation God addeth, That he had many other wives; and for him, as Nathan wisely reproved him, to go and take the poor mans lamb, who had only that, this was to become very guilty.

6. Here was great deliberation and consultation, how to cover the matter, and to make Uriah the father of it. O where is Davids heart that it doth not smite him all this while!

7. To bring this wretched plot about, he sends Uriah with
with letters to Joab for his own destruction; Doth not David here that which he condemned and prayed against so much in others, lie in wait like a Lion to devour the poor innocent?

8 His sin becomes more hairious, in that to colour this, he will have Uriah, and many other innocent persons set in the forefront, on purpose to be killed, and afterwards with most transcendent hypocrisy, excuseth it with this, The battle falls alike to all. So that here is a sinne with many sins complicated in it.

9. When all this is done, David takes Bathsheba to wife, delights in her, and rejoyceth with her.

10. To make his sinne out of measure sinfull, after these horrid sins committed thus against natural light, as well as spiritual, we finde no remorle of conscience, no trouble of heart, till Nathan the Prophet come and arouse him. But presently upon his reproof, how doth this mountain melt like wax before the fire? and therefore let no man encourage himself with Davids sin, unlesse he finde in himself also Davids repentance.

And therefore in the second place take notice, what way God takes to break him, and how much displeasure of God fell upon him.

First, He hath great terror and trouble upon him, which he expresseth by the most exquisite torment that is, viz. broken bones. It was with him, as if all his bones were brayed and pounced together. Thus fearfull is it to fall into the hands of the living God, who even to his own people is a consuming fire. As the Sunne which useth to dart forth resplendent beams of lustre, by grosse and thick clouds is darkned and obscured: So David, who heretofore rejoiced in God, took comfort in his promises, doth now like Dives beg for one drop of comfort, and findes a great gulf between that and him, insomuch that it cannot come to him, nor he to it. Now what are all Davids pleasures, all his lustfull delights to these wounds of his soul? Hath he not bought repentance at a dear rate? Let the godly hear this and tremble, and do no such thing.

Secondly,
Secondly, As he found hell thus within him, So God was also really displeased, his sins were uncalled, till he repented. So that God's displeasure was not only in David's sense and feeling, but in God's heart also. As the earth of his own heart was like iron, in respect of its yielding any fruit of comfort; so the heavens were like brass. God had spoke to his soul to be like the mountains of Gilboa, on which no dew of his favour shall fall. Therefore he doth not only pray for pardon, but plenty and iteration of pardon, multiply to pardon, as ver. 2. I need pardon again and again, I need a plentiful pardon, because I have sinned many sins in one sin. Now David might justly be more solicitous and fearful about the pardon of these sins, because there was no particular sacrifice appointed for murder and adultery, but an expectation of vengeance, either from God or man, but this must not be stretched to the Socinian errors, as before I have shewed.

Thirdly, He found in himself a loathsome guilt upon his conscience, whereby like Adam, he could run and hide himself, that God might not see him. Hereupon he prayeth, Wash me, cleanse me, purge me. Oh how loathsome and abominable was he in his own eyes: If David's righteousness be accounted a menstruous cloth, or dung by him; what debasing and abhorring thoughts must he needs have of his sins? he looketh upon himself as the swine wallowing in mire, and the dog licking up his vomit.

Fourthly, He feeleth a spiritual consumption and languishment upon him, that he cannot exercise any of those graces that he used to do. Therefore he prayeth for a principal or voluntary spirit, that with delight and strength he may do God's will. David ariseth as Samson, when his hair was cut off, thinking to do such great exploits, as he had before, but he findeth his strength gone.

Fifthly, He discovers a world of hypocrisy in his heart, and crieth out of that, praying for truth in the inward parts. He now (probably) fears himself for an hypocrite, questions whether any truth of grace be in him at all; and certainly it might justly amaze and astonish him, to consider he could do all that wic-
kednesse deliberately in cold bloud, without any remorse for a long while. This might justly plunge David into such a chaos, that he might fear the very pillars and foundations of his soul were shaken.

Sixthly, He had lost all that boldnesse and liberty arising from a good conscience, in declaring Gods truth, and in reclaiming transgressors from their evil ways, ver. 13. Some have said that David in this interval lost the gift of Prophecie, and making of Psalms. I cannot tell that; but certainly guilt and shame had so sealed up his mouth, that he could not reprove others for murder, adulteries, destructive craft, which he himself was so souilly guilty of. It was the Ancients Rule, Quisquid detriment aliis prius tibi ipsi dice, Speak that first to thy self, which thou art to speak to others. But how could David have any boldness here, till there was a coal of fire from the Altar to sanctifie him? So that all these things duly pondered, you may say, This Sermon is a Spiritual-Anatomy-Lecture, wherein Davids sin and punishment hath been so dissected before you, that every wise hearer may prevent the like desperate disease in himself.

And now I proceed to the thesis, or this doctrine in the general. And this method I shall use:

First, Speak of the sins briefly the godly may fall into. And then more largely of their relation they stand unto God after the commission of them, till they repent.

And to the former two things are considerable:
1. The Nature of the sins they commit. And
2. The Quality of them, whereby they may be differed from the sins of reprobates.

For the former, There is no sinne (except that against the holy Ghost) which a justified person, being left to himself, may not fall into, even such sinnes, that morall men, by the help of a natural conscience only, would readily abhorre. Thus David with deliberation and consent falls into adultery and murder, sinnes condemned by natures statute-law: You have Aaron guilty of Idolatry; Josephs brethren the Patriarchs, as much as lieth in them, murdering Joseph; and
when they have cast him away into the pit, they sit down to eat, which impieth their wonderfull security: and we reade not of their repentance, till many years after, being awakened thereunto by Joseph. Samson he was like one of the Roman Emperours, a compound of vices and vertues, insomuch that doubt might have been made of his godliness, had not the Scripture put him in the Catalogue of Saints. Peter, although it was a passion of fear that caused his sinne, yet his sinne was very dreadful, to lie, swear and curse, in the denying of Christ. This was such a sin that Peter thought it not possible he should fall into it. For first at the maids accusation, by comparing of the Evangelists together, he doth not only basely deny himself to be Peter, but addeth, He knew not Christ, yea he knew not what she said: An expression which we use about a thing that we are in the height manner ignorant of; and this he doth before all them that stood by. In the next place, after a little while (which as Maldonate computes, must be at least three hours) he denieth Christ again: We might have thought that Peters heart might have troubled him in that space, but in stead of repentance he aggravates his crime with an oath, he denied himself to be Peter; here was lying against his own conscience, accompanied with perfidiousness against Christ: Then the third time, a little while after, being accused again, he still increased his sinne, and did not only swear, but curse, that is, devote himself to the horridest judgements that can be, if he knew Christ, and this he did often, as that phrase, He began to curse, seemeth to imply; and his sin will yet rise higher, if that cursing be referred to Christ, but cursed and anathematized him, and all this while (though as some probably think) he heard the Cock crow, yet he repents not, till Christ looked upon him, and without question, would have denied him as often as the temptation was, had not Christ preserved him.

Thus I have given you examples of the hainous sins of Gods people, which are not to encourage in sinne, but if duly considered, a bridle against it. As he said, Plus debo Thoma, quam Petro, He was more beholding to Thomas doubting,

\[ \text{Ii3} \]
The Sinses of Gods People

then Peter believing, because by Thomas his doubt, Christ's resurrection was more confirmed: So in some sense, we may more acknowledge Gods Wisdom and Goodnesse in his childrens falls, then in their Graces; for hereby we are to tremble in our selves at our own weaknesse, be more careful against sinne; observe the way they took for pardon, and admire Gods goodnesse, who doth not utterly cast off his prodigal children.

Thus you see there is no kinde of crime, which the people of God through their own neget may not fall into. And as for that other Question, Whether they may not frequently commit the same sinnes? We have examples in Scripture for the affirmative, only the greater doubt is, Whether after a thorough and deep humiliation they may relapse in the same sinnes? But although we scarce have any instances of such in the Scripture, yet Gods command upon us to receive a brother seventy seven times offending, if he repent, may keep up the heart of such a sinner against despair, because goodnesse and love is in him as in the Ocean, in us as in the stream only.

The second thing considerable is, What kinde of sinnes these are? Whether they may be called sinnes of infirmity, though so atrocious in their nature, or raigning sinnes? Now herein godly Divines have differing expressions, though they mean the same thing. Zanchy in his Thesis of the Perseverance of the Saints doth industriously asert, That all the sinnes which elect believers fall into, are sinnes of infirmity: Thus he calls Davids and Peters: His main ground is, Because every regenerate man hath a two-fold principle within, the flesh and the Spirit, both which fight one against the other: by which means they are never carried out to a full consent and purpose in any sinne they commit. Hence he denieth they can be called raigning sinnes, or sinnes against conscience, that wait conscience, or that are from resolved purpose within. He giveth an instance from Jonah, and the mariners; We know the mariners had not any intent at first to throw Jonah into the Sea; Again, they rowed and used all their utmost endeavour to preserve him. Lastly, they pray to their gods, if possibily, they may not be necessitiated to
in what kinde to be ranked.

to drown him. Now in all this, the mariners, though they did throw him into the Sea, with their will and consent, yet they did it very unwillingly also. Thus, faith he, Jonah in this respect is like Christ, or grace in the hearts of God's people. And first, The people of God have no purpose to cast him out. Again, they use their diligent care in temptations not to do it. Lastly, they beseech and importune God they may never fall so souly: Therefore if at any time they are overtaken, it is with an unwilling willingnesse. Thus he. Neither is it any marvel if he judge so, when Bucer thought an Elish man, even before ever he be converted, doth not sinne with that full consent as reprobate wicked men do, but have many motions to the contrary. Now although Peter in his denial of Christ, might be thought with unwillingnesse and reluctancy to do what he did, yet it is hard to lay, David, who so deliberated and plotted to accomplish his wickednesse, did it not with some full consent at that time. And it may seem hard to call all the sinnes of the godly, sinnes of infirmity; Therefore others will grant them the name of raigning sinnes, but with this limitation, that this is not a total raigning: Sinne raigneth as a tyrant over them, not as a King; and although at some times, as in David's case, there be no actual resistance made, because all the actual exercise of grace is suspended, yet the seed of God doth in time revive again, and so doth cast out that usurper: So then, the Conclusion is, That the grosse sinnes, which some regenerate persons do commit, may be said to be sinnes accomplished with a full consent and delight, and for the time, no actual resistance made by the regenerate part, and so farre may be called raigning sinnes, but because God hath promised to blow up those sparks of grace in the godly, in his due time, therefore they raign but as tyrants, and that for a while, not as Kings, which then properly is, when sins are customarily committed with an antecedent and consequent consent.

But for the general, That there is a great difference between Saul's sins and David's, Peter's and Judas's, will appear evidently.

Differences between the sins of the godly & reprobate.
First, From that principle of supernatural life, which although much weakened, yet is not quite taken away, 1 John 3. He that is born of God cannot sinne, viz. so as Cain, or as one that is of the devil his father, Because the seed of God abideth in him. And Paul, Rom. 7. doth excellently describe this in the person of a regenerate man, where some Expositors do not limit the good he would do, or the evil he would not do, to motions and desires only of the heart, but extend it to the outward actions done in the flesh.

Secondly, There is a difference in respect of God: He doth not wholly cast off the one offending, as he doth the other. Compare Sauls sinne, for which God rejected him, and Davids together, and you would think Sauls sin farre the lesse; for Sauls was, because he spared Agag, 1 Sam. 15. and the best of the spoil, pretending it was for Sacrifice, and he dared not do other for fear of the people, but for this God rejected him. Now Davids was in a more grosse sinne against the light of nature, whereas Sauls was against a positive command of God only, and was a sin only, because forbidden, not from it self; yet God sheweth mercy to the one, and not to the other. Certainly, though Gods grace be the great reason of the difference, yet Saul sinned with more contempt and flighting of God, then David did. There was a more bitter root in one then the other.

Thirdly, A difference also may be seen in the consequent. When David was reproved, how prestently did he melt, and condemn himself? There could not be such a sudden thaw of Davids heart, if like Nabals, it had been like a stone within him. Thus Peter also, as soon as Christ looked upon him, He went out, and wept bitterly. It is true, we see Saul and Judas, after their wickedness committed, cried out, They had sinned, but yet it was only for temporal motives, fearing the losse of their honours or fame, and at most, out of a slavish fear of Gods wrath, not from any love of him, or faith in him.

Use. The Use is, If David lie thus in his gore, and what Michal said falsly concerning him, is now true, hath made himself like one
one of the vile fellows, let him then become a pillar of salt to season the godly. Without a gracious solicititude and diligent depending upon God, how quickly may a Starre become like a dung-hill? You see that the Snakes, and other poisonous creatures, which lie lurking in the holes of the ground, when the season is cold, do yet crawl abroad under the hot Sun-beams. And so those sins which thou supposest crucified in thee, may revive upon a warm temptation. Peter could not be persuaded he should ever be plunged into such foul perfidiousnesse; he thought all the men in the world would sooner do it then he. Now to prevent these scandals, hearken always unto the motions of God's Spirit. While the Cock croweth, do thou go out and weep bitterly. While the Angel stirreth the pool, do thou presently step in: And if thou art at any time overtaken, continue not in the sinne, return presently. The Candle newly put out, if presently blown upon, may be kindled again. The longer in the sinne, the more senselesse and stupid thy heart will grow; And know that of Bernard to be true, *Illud est cor durum, quod non trepidat ad nomen cordis duri*, That is an hard heart, which doth not tremble at the name of an hard heart.

---

*Kk*  
*Lect.*
LECT. XXVII.

How farre grosse Sinnes make a breach upon Justification.

Psal. 51. 9.

Hide thy face from my sinnes; and blot out all mine iniquities.

We come in the next place to declare, How farre a regenerate man upon the commission of such grosse sins, doth make a breach upon his justification.

And for the further clearing of this, I shall lay down,

First, What it doth not. And

Secondly, What it doth.

And in the first place, No grosse sinne committed by a justified person, doth make void the former pardon of those sinnes he hath been guilty of. God when he pardons, he pardons absolutely, not with a condition suspended upon our future conversation, which if not performed, his pardon shall be revoked. The Lutheran Divines do generally oppose this truth, Musculus also in his Commonplace, De remissioni peccatorum, handling this Question, doth encline to the affirmative, That new grosse sinnes committed, make void the pardon of all former sinnes, so that all his by-past iniquities do reviviscere, live again in their guilt and accusation of such a man. Tompson in his Distrriba, pag. 48. Though he plead vehemently for the intercision of a believers Justification upon the committing of grievous and loathsome sinnes, yet he denieth, That sinnes once
make a breach upon justification.

Once pardoned are ever imputed again, because (faith he) the irreversibility of that remission doth only depend upon the immutability of God's counsel, whose gifts are without repentance. For although (faith he) there is a necessity of Faith and Repentance, that sins be at first pardoned, yet that they should continue or abide pardoned, there is no necessity of Faith; and therefore none are damned for past sins pardoned, upon a defect of new Faith and Repentance, when new sins are committed. The Schoolmen handle this question, and generally deny, That sins pardoned ever are imputed again, unless in a certain respect, viz. as farre as by-past sins are virtually contained in the following sin, as if by a new sin a mans ingratitude is so great, that he becomes as guilty, as if he had all his former sins incumbent on him. But whatsoever mens judgments are, the Scripture expressions about pardon of sin, which are, The remembering of them no more, The blotting of them out, and throwing them into the bottom of the sea, &c. do plainly evidence, That God when he pardons a sin, pardons it absolutely, and for ever, so that it shall never live again to condemn him here or hereafter.

There are two places of Scripture that seem to give a check to this doctrine. The first is Ezek. 18.24,26, where God faith, If a righteous man turn away from his righteousness, and commits iniquity, his righteousness shall not be mentioned, but he shall die in his sin. Quid clarum? faith Bellarmine: What is more clear then this place? Hence this is strongly insifted upon by Papists, Arminians, Lutherans, as the Achilles.

Now to this place, these Answers are given,

First, That the Prophet speaks not of a truly righteous man, but a pharisaical, bragging man, who hath a conceit of his righteousness, without any reality at all, and such a feigned righteousness may quickly melt away; but this may seem too much forced (though learned men insift on it) partly, because the opposition is made of a righteous man to one really wicked; partly, because it is such a righteousness, which if a man had continued in, would have saved him, he should have lived by it. Others therefore say, The expression is only conditional, and by supposition, If he do this, which doth
only imply a paff, if a man be left to himself, not an effe, or that indeed he will do so; yea God ufed these conditional conminations, as a sanftified means to keep a righteous man from falling. This is a good Answer. But there are others with whom I joyn, that fay, The Scripture doth here confider a man as of himself; and what he is in his own power, not what he is by a Covenant of Grace (which is only per accidens, and ex hypothefi) a meer extrinfeal and accidental thing to a man. And now, speak of a godly man thus, we may fay, that he may fall, and lose the favour of God; For although in refpeft of Gods Predestination and Covenant of Grace, he cannot, yet that is meerly external, and from without. So that the Scripture speaks of a godly man, sometimes in refpeft of his external, relative condition, as elected and federated: Thus he is made unchangeable in refpeft of his state. Again, in other places it speaks of him in refpeft of his internals, and what is dwelling in him; and in this fense, He that stands must take heed left he fall. And that this is the right interpretation is plain, by the oppofition in a wicked mans estate; for there faith the Text, If the wicked leave his wickedneffe, and do that which is righteous, he fhall live. Here is no mention of Grace at all; Can any from hence inferre therefore, a wicked man without Gods Grace, is able to turn to God? No. Other places demonstrate the neceffity of that. So that it is plain, these Texts do not at all relate to any thing external and extrinfeal to a man.

The next place urged for the return of sins pardoned, is, Matth.18.32,34. where in the Parable, The Mafter is faid to forgive a fervant all his debt, but because the fame fervant {hewed not the like compaffion to a fellow-fervant, his Mafter was wroth with him, and charged all the debt he had forgiven upon him again. By which it may appear, That if we after our sins are forgiven, do {thofe things that are very difflnfefull to God, he will remember our former finnes againft us. But the scope of the Parable, which is the right key to open it, is not to {hew, That God will remember fins pardoned for new ones committed; but to manifest, That forgiveness of others is a neceffary qualification to be forgiven by God.
make a breach upon Justification.

God; and that we may not believe God will forgive us, unless we forgive others: and this is clear from the conclusion of the Parable, ver. 35. So will not my heavenly Father forgive you, unless you from your hearts forgive one another. Besides, every passage in the Parable is not Argumentative, but the chief intention only. Many things are flourishes in the picture, not lineaments.

In the second place, Neither doth a justified person so sinning fall from the grace of justification, or his Adoption, he is not cast out of the right of his inheritance. Whom he loveth, he loveth to the end; all this while, Christ's Intercession is effectual for him. Though he be a Prodigal living with Swine, and upon husks, yet he is a sonne still, Quod Christus naturae, nos gratiam, as Christ is perpetually the Son of God by nature, so we in him, and by him, are always the sons of Grace; and the perpetuity or stability of our Justification, is not founded upon any thing in us, but upon God's will and love, and his sure promises.

Neither thirdly, Doth he fall from the state of inherent or sanctifying grace, no more then imputed; For by God's gracious Covenant, the principles of Grace are more firmly infixed and rooted in a godly man's soul, then his soul in his body. Ut custodiat nos per fidem, custodit in nobis ipsam fidem, That he may keep us by faith, he keepeth faith in us, faith a learned man.

Neither fourthly, Doth a godly man fall into these grosse sins, without a mercifull ordering of them, even to the godly man's good. Although afflictions may befall a man to his good, yet some have questioned, Whether God suffers a godly man to fall into sins for good, because sins have an inward malignity and poison in their natures, which the evils of afflictions have not. But if Gregory said truly of Adam's sin, Faelix culpa, it was an happy fault, because God wrought luch a good, the good of a Mediator, which is a greater good then that sin was; no question but God can over-rule the sins of Gods people for their own advantage; as a godly man said, He got more good by his sins, then his graces, Andeo dicere, &c. (faith Austin, de civit. Dei, lib. 13.) I dare be bold to say it, That it is pro-

fitable
fitable for proud men to fall in manifest and open sins, whereby they may be ashamed, and made loathful in their own eyes, Salubrium sibi dissipavit Petrus, quando levit, quam sibi placuit, quando presumpsit. It was better with Peter dilliking himself in his weeping, then pleasing himself in his presumption. This therefore God doth to his people to prevent sin, he lets them fall into sin: And as Austin faith, Seetio dolorem operatur, ut dolor dolore tollatur, The cutting of the wound causeth pain, that so pain may be removed by pain, and sometimes venena venenis dissipantur, poison is driven out by poison.

And thus much for the Negative, we come to the Affirma-
tive; and in the general we say,

A godly man committing such a grosse sin, till he doth repent, is in a state of suspension from all the effects of Gods grace in Justifi-
cation, though not of abdication or exheredation. He is under
sequestration, though not ejection; he is under an interdiction, though not an exile. He is as Absalom that was cast out of his fathers family, though not from being a sonne. The English Divines expressed it well in the Synod of Dort, by a Leper who was shut out from his own house, so that although he had a right to his house, yet he had no claim by any law to enjoy his house: So though a godly man have a right to pardon of sin, yet he cannot claim this as due to him; as long as the guilt of sinne abideth on him. Hence that is expound-
ed, Purgem op, by sop, as an allusion to the Leper, who in such a manner was cleansed, not that this state is to be concei-
ved a, third estate between a state of Justification and Con-
demnation, but a suspending of the benefits of the former. In
which sense a godly man justly cast out by Church-officers for a sin, is said to have his sins bound in heaven. And in this re-
spect Zanchy faith, he doth, Quodammodo excidere a gratia Dei, and that they are made, quasi inimici, as it were enemies. Thus Perkins also, Upon the committing of such sins, faith be, God turneth the effects of his grace into the effects, cujusdam odii, of a kind of hatred to their sins, so that Quodammodo sunt in-
imici Dei. Now that the terror of this condition may more fa-
ften on the godly to make them cautelous against such fals, let us consider what particulars this general doth include.

And
make a breach upon Justification.

And first, It supposeh a present unfitnesse for the Kingdom of Heaven, or any gracious priviledge. There is no aptitude or preparation in a godly man so lapsed for comfort or salvation: but like the unclean man is to stand aloof from all these. Now how wosull is this to consider, that such a man who had Gods gracious Scepter always held out, to bid him come into his presence, must now finde the doors and gates of mercy for a season shut upon him! Now the master of the feast may say to him, How camest thou in here without a wedding garment? When David sate not, according to his custome, at the Kings Table, it was excused, he had uncleanness upon him. Alas, it is a godly mans aggravation of this guilt, why doth he not apply the promises as formerly? Why is he not had into the Spouses wine-fellar? Alas uncleanness is upon him. As Christ said to Mary, Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended; we may apply otherwise the promise of grace, Christ faith to thee, Touch me not, lay not hold upon me, for thou art not yet risen out of thy filth.

2. As there is no aptitude for gracious priviledges, so also God doth now change all his dealings and administrations towards them. Those effects of love, delight, comfort, assurance and sweetness they had, are now turned into the bitter effects of wrath, displeasure, trouble and grief of soul, sad pangs and convulsions of conscience, so that they have no peace with God nor themselves. Thus their sins swallow them up like Jonahs whale, and they are, as it were, in the bottom of hell. God is really offended and displeased with them, hereupon their conscience doth truly and fondly accuse them: And all this being fet home by Gods Spirit convincing of them of sin in all the aggravations of it. Oh the groans and agonies their souls must needs conflict with! This David doth evidently teach us in what he felt upon him. Hearken then to Davids cryings and groanings, and take ye heed how you abuse the grace of God, either doctrinally or practically to a secure committing of grosse sinne. Be sure (if ye belong to God) your sinne will finde you out; and no doctrine of free-grace will be Altar or Sanctuary safe enough for you to hide your selves in. God who was the God of all consolation, is now the God of all sorrow and
and fear. Thou thinkeft on him, and thy meditations are not sweet but troublesome. Now its not the Spirit of God that seals and comforts, but of conviction and humiliation. Now Chrifts bloud, which thou despisest, doth speak bitter things against thee. A drop of Gods anger falls into the conscience of a godly man thus awakened, like a drop of scalding lead into a mans eye. O what comfort do those pleasures, those lufts now afford him? Now he may say of them, as she of her husband, Thou art a bloud- dy husband.

3. Although he hath a right to the Covenant of Grace, to the privilidges contained therein, yet, as you have heard, He may not without renewed repentance claim any of these. He cannot say, my God, my Chrift, my pardon; no, God hath spit in his face, as the expression is to Miriam, and the soul is become filthy and noisome, and she must be washed again, ere Chrift will receive her. Though there be a Well of salvation, yet thou haft no bucket to draw out of it. As long as a godly mans heart stands thus averse from God, and hath a purpose to continue in sin, all the promises are like a fountain sealed up, and a garden enclosed. He is in a worse condition then the wounded man in the way to Jericho, for not only the Priest and the Levite (the Moral Law) passe by him, but even the good Samaritan, Chrift and the promises pour no oil into his wounds. All the while he applieth comforts to his soul, and supports himself with hopes of Gods favour, he liveth upon spiritual robbery. And he can with no more truth (if we speak of the actual use and application) say of the promises, then the devil of the world, and the glorious things thereof, All these are mine.

4. By this they incur the guilt of eternal damnation. There is a two-fold guilt, as some distinguish, one Potential (which by others is reatus simplex, a simple guilt) another actual (which by others is reatus redundans in personam, a guilt falling upon the person. Now it is upon all sides agreed, That by those sins he deserveth eternal damnation. And therefore a godly man so offending ought to bewail the forfeiture he hath made. If God should deal with him according to that strict rule, Cursed be every one that abideth not in all the things that the Law requi-
where should he appear? But may we not say, they have an actual guilt obliging them to eternal wrath, not absolutely, but conditionally, till they take the means appointed by God for their pardon? I see not but in a sound sense this may be said, for God doth not will to them salvation, while they abide in that state, though at that time he wils to give them such effectual grace, that thereby they shall recover, and so remove that gulf which is between them and God. So that at the same time God doth will to give them grace to repent and recover, and yet he doth not will salvation to them, till they do recover. Here is no contrariety in Gods will, because though this be about the same person, yet not in the same respects, for Gods will not to give salvation while in such an estate, and to give repentance that he may come out of that estate, do no ways oppose one another; and because of this later mercy, it is that we may alwayes say, *There is no condemnation to those that are in Christ Jesus.* Their sins are never imputed to them for their condemnation, but there is a conditional obliging of them, till they sue out their pardon. So that it is here, as Solomon did with Abiahar, 1 Kin. 2. 26. *Thou art (faith Solomon) worthy of death, but I will not at this time put thee to death.*

5. Because of this guilt and demerit of sin, it is, that our Divines do say, That if such an one, David (for example) should die before these sins be repented of, he would be damned. For if you suppose a justified person to persevere always in groffe and vile sins without reformation, you may as well suppose him to be damned. Hence there is as some observe, a twofold impossibility, *There is an impossibility that David elected and justified should be damned;* There is also an impossibility, that *David a murderer and an adulterer should without repentance be saved;* but God by his powerful grace will unty this knot by a certain and infallible recovery out of his sins, for that is a perpetual and sure Rule, *Election hath obtained, Rom. 11.* otherwise, speak of David as in that state before repentance, we may say, if he had died in it, he would have been damned. Thus *Besa, Twisse, &c.* Yet Gods grace which was so potent at the first to raise out of the grave of sin, how much rather,
rather if life be in us, will it quicken us to turn unto God?

6. From hence further it ariseth, That he needeth a particular Justification in respect of that guilt, which is to be done away. Some orthodox and learned Writers, Abbot and others, distinguish of a two-fold Justification, one universal, whereby a man is absolutely received into the grace and favour of God, becoming his Son. A second is particular, whereby sins are remitted to them that are already made the children of God, without which they would fall from their first benefit of sonship, The one is called Justification simpliciter. The other, Secundum quid. And this particular Justification they make to be often repeated. Thus Peter Martyr, Rom. 3. Lapsis post Justificationem, repetita denud Justificatione per fidem condonari. Thus Bucer, De- fenso, p 85. acknowledgeth an iteration of Justification after we repent and arise from more grievous sins. Others call it not a particular Justification, but an application of that universal Justification. And certainly, Justification doth denote the state of a man, but seeing the remission of such sins doth not put them into a new estate (for they never fell from that) we cannot so properly call it Justification; and I know not any place where the Scripture calls it so; and it would be very hard to say, That Justification is reiterated as often as sin is pardoned. Though therefore there may be some difference in the words, yet the matter itself is clear, viz. There is a necessity of the removing of this guilt, that so the person offending may be brought into God's favour again.

7. Seeing all this is true, then it followeth, That such a man so offending must renew an act of faith and repentance. So that the former acts of faith and godly sorrow, will not discharge or acquit from the new sins committed. Therefore lastly, it is a most dangerous error in practice, to hold, That after a known sin committed, the first thing a believer is to do, before repentance or humiliation, is to believe that that sin is already pardoned. Thus a late Writer, Cornwall in a Treatise called Gospel-repentance, wherein he labours to prove, That a believer entered into the Covenant of Grace, upon the commission of an actual known sin, ought to believe the actual pardon of that sin, before he actually repent of the same. Now although this is to be confuted, when
we handle Faith and Repentance, yet thus much we may say: That this Doctrine must needs be very unfound; For first, There is no sin actually pardoned before repentance, as at large I have shewed; and no sin is pardoned before it be committed, as in the next Question is to be shewed. So that it would be abominable presumption, yea and falshood to believe such a thing. Hence such a persuasion as this, God hath or will pardon my sins, can bring no comfort or peace to our conscience till we do repent; For a Scripture persuasion is, That God enabling me to repent, and to use the means, will vouchsafe pardon, and in this only can I have comfort. Besides, the Author makes the last work of faith the first; For upon a known sin committed, faith is to be exercised first, in the threatenings of God, to believe those due to him. In the next place, Faith is to rely upon Christ for pardon, that he may receive remission of sins; For as Rivet and Perkins urge well, There is no pardon offered on God's part, or received on man's, till he do believe, and then when these acts are done, God doth many times incline the soul to believe the sinne is pardoned. But the pardon of sin must be received by a direct act of faith, before we can believe that it is pardoned by a reflex. But this is more largely to be confuted.

Now the Objection may be, How can sinne thus farre prevail in the filth and guilt of it, and yet the man so sinning not fall from his justification? This will be cleared, if you consider these things:

First, That justification is an act of God meerly, it is not our act. We are said to be justified, and God he doth justify. Now Opus Dei non potest irritum fieri per opus hominis. Those acts of God which he doth, we cannot make void, but he ordereth them for their time and continuance, as he pleaseth.

Secondly, Consider, That sin doth not expell the grace of justification, efficiently, or physically, as darkness doth light, or coldness heat, but meritoriously by way of desert. Now God doth not with us according to our desert: when he entered into a Covenant of Grace with us, he so appointed it, that no sin should break the league of friendship, whereas if he had pleased, he might so have appointed it, that the least sin should have
have dissolved this bond; and if sin did expel the grace of Justification efficiently, the least sin would have done it. But now, if it was wholly at God's pleasure to make this state dissoluble or indissoluble; and if so, then that neither great sins, or lesser should break it; and this makes us to wonder, how David in his adultery and murder could be justified, because we possess our selves with this principle, That sin doth by a natural necessity expel the grace of God, whereas many Schoolmen are bold to determine, That de potentia absolutâ, God might pardon sin, though there were no repentance, or infused grace at all in a man.

Thirdly, That a particular, partial guilt, is not the immediate opposition to universal Justification of the person, unless it were to abide in him. Justification of a man's person will keep him from being actually condemned, though not from the guilt of condemnation. As a guilty person, thrown into prison, is kept from the use of his house, goods, and all comforts, but he is not deprived of them, till he be actually condemned: so a believer falling into grosse sins, is deprived of the use of all spiritual comforts, but not cast out of the right of them, because he shall never actually be condemned.
Lect. XXVIII.

Whether God in pardoning do forgive all Sinnes together, as well future as past.

Psalm 51. 9.

And blot out all mine iniquities.

The next thing in this Text to be considered, is the second Petition, which though differing from the former in words, yet is coincident in the matter.

In this was observable (as you heard) the Petition itself Blot out my iniquities.

2. The extent All my iniquities.

Now from hence we may justly take an occasion to handle that Question, Whether God in pardoning do forgive all sins together? So that sins past, present and future are remitted together, for that is the opinion of some, That as soon as ever a man is actually entered into the Covenant of Grace, all his sins, even future, are actually forgiven, and that they are bound to believe the same, even before they actually repent of any iniquity committed. This at large Cornwall maintaineth in his Book of Gospel-repentance. Yea there are some learned and worthy Authors, who seem to encline this way. Dr. Ames in his Medulla, in the Chapter of Justification, faith, Not only the sins of justified persons that are past, are remitted, but also in some sort those that are to come. Neither (faith he) can sins past and present
Whether God in pardoning present be altogether and fully remitted, unless sins to come be in some sort remitted also. Only he makes this difference, Sins past are remitted by a formal application, sins to come only virtually, sins past are remitted in themselves, sins to come in the subject or person sinning. But this is in effect to say, They are not remitted, but that God by his Covenant of Grace, will as sins are committed, give grace to repent, whereby there may be a forgivenesse of them. This is to say rather, No sin shall hereafter actually condemn them, rather then to say, they are forgiven. Dr Twise, vindic. Gratia, pag. 82. de Eurat. lib. 3. Quid si dicam in Justificatione nostrâ, &c. What if I say, in Justification we receive the forgivenesse of our sins, not only that are past, but of future also, that is, we are made more certain of their forgivenesse. For (faith he) that internal act of God, whereby he doth remit sins, cannot be renewed in God. Certissimum esse judico, &c. I judge it most certain (as he goeth on) to whom God once doth forgive sins, to the same man he forgives all his sins whatsoever they are; of which absolution there is indeed a frequent pronunciation iterated to penitents often in the Scripture. Thus that learned Author going upon those two grounds, 1. That pardon of sin is an immanent act in God. 2. That application of pardon to us, is no more then the sense and manifestation of that pardon, which was from all eternity. But the weaknesses of these grounds hath been already demonstrated, and we have other orthodox Writers speaking more consonantly to truth, denying that future sins are forgiven before committed and repent-ed of. When Grotius had objected, That the Protestants Doctrine was peccata condonari antequam sint ant, That sins were forgiven before they were committed, Rivet in his Apologia, p. 467. replieth, Idem nos absurdistissimum credimus. &c. Ye, we think such a Doctrine most absurd, and the imputation of it to us, most unjust; For though (faith he) God decreed to pardon our sinnes from all eternity, yet the execution of this is not from all eternity. As God decreed from all eternity to create the world, yet the world was not from all eternity. Those that know God hath decreed from eternity to pardon sin upon the condition of repentance. Those that know God hath not decreed the end without the means, will never ascribe to themselves pardon of sin, without these exercises of repentance.
do forgive all Sins together.

Thus the same Author in the same Book, pag. 533. Abburdam ist credere, &c. It is absurd (faith he) to believe a remission of sins, which are not yet committed, for neither in the decree of God is there an actual remission decreed without repentance preceding remission. To this purpose Perkins in his book of predestination, There is no actual pardon (faith he) offered on God's part to us, nor on our part received without faith and repentance. When Thompson in his Diatriba had made mention of an answer formed by some Author, That in justification all sins past, present and future were forgiven, and a justified person was bound to believe this; Bishop Abbot in his Answer, cap. 24. calls this incommoded dilatum, an incommodious expression, and argueth against it.

Having premised this, I come to lay down the grounds, That sins are not pardoned to a justified person before they be committed and repented of, and therefore it is dangerous presumption to believe such a thing. Only these things must be acknowledged.

First, That God when he pardons sins past to those that repent, He forgiveth all them together. God doth not pardon some, and leave out others. Thus the gracious promise, Heb. 8. of remembering our iniquities no more, and blotting them all out, is to be thus farre universally interpreted, that all those sins which then are found in the lives of believing persons, shall be removed and taken away. All past sins are forgiven together. And the ground of this truth is two fold, partly because the same grace and love of God which moveth him to blot out one, will also stirre him up for the other. And indeed if it were not so, God would have love to a man as his friend, and hatred to him as an enemy at the same time, whereas remission is reconciliation with God, and therefore every obstacle must be removed. Partly this ariseth from the nature of repentance, for where that is truly for one sin, it is also for all other sins, and then the guilt of all must needs be taken away.

2. We must grant, That to speak properly, there is nothing future to God, and those things that are not yet to us, they are present to him; For he calleth things that are not, as if they were; but
but although it be thus with God, yet we are not to conceive of things any other ways, then according to that manner of his dispensation, whereby things decreed from eternity are produced to act in time; and certainly, as sins future to us are present to him, so repentance also future to us is present to him. And therefore God's decree for remission, was also for repentance, and both are present to him.

3. This must be granted, **That although future sins are not pardoned before committed, yet by the Covenant of Grace, God will so preserve, that as sins are committed, so grace will be dispensed, that no sin shall actually condemn us.** And this may be the virtual remission of future sins, which some speak of. So that although a justified person may not believe that his sins are pardoned, which he shall commit, yet he may believe that God will keep him by his power through faith to salvation, and that if he fall in sin, God will renew repentance in his soul; and our peace of conscience doth not simply arise from hence, That God will pardon our sins, but that he will so preserve us from evil, and lead us into every good duty, that so pardon may be vouchsafed unto us.

These things explained, I come to lay down the Arguments, why none should presume, that because of his justification, all future sins not committed, or present sins not repented of, are forgiven unto him.

The first ground is from those places which presume and necessarily suppose sin to be committed, before it is pardoned. One place is brought by some learned men, *Rom. 3:25.* Where God hath set forth a propitiation, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past. Here (say they) remission of sins through Christ's blood, is restrained to sins past; and upon this some argue, Therefore future sins are not remitted. Thus, as I take it, argue Peter Martyr, Hiperius, Downam; but it is more probable, that by sins past are meant those committed before Christ came into the world. And Beza, who is followed by other learned men, make παρελθείν not to be pardon, but connivence, as if the sense were, God did passe by the sins of our fathers before Christ's coming, and did not manifest his wrath in a Sacrifice expiatory of their sins, till Christ himself came
do forgive all sins together.

came and suffered upon the Cross: so he makes this reason here, with that which is called expreßion, in Acts 17:30. Therefore I leave this, and urge one or two more places, 1 John 2:1. If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father. Here we see is intercession for sin, and a way for remission; but how? upon a supposition that sin is, If any man. Ezek. 18:22. Speaking of a wicked man that turneth to God, and now shall surely live, he expresseth it thus, All his transgressions that he hath committed shall not be mentioned to him. Observe, All that he hath committed, not all that he shall commit. A third place is eminently set down, Jer. 33:8. Where God makes a glorious promise of the pardon of sin; but take notice to what sins he limits it, even to those that have been committed, I will cleanse them from all their iniquity, whereby they have sinned against me, and I will pardon all their iniquities, whereby they have sinned, and whereby they have transgressed against me. Its of what they have done, not of what they shall do.

A second sort of Arguments is from the expressions God's word useth about pardon; all which do suppose, That sin goeth before, and that God doth not antedate his pardon. Such as these are, Remember not iniquity. Now although this be attributed unto God improperly, yet the very sense of the word supposeth, that sins were precedent, and now God by his grace will remember them no more. So the phrase to blot out, supposeth sin was already registred in God's Book. Men do not use to forgive debts before they be. Throwing them into the sea, what doth this imply? but that sins did appear before, and that in a terrible threatening manner: Covering of sin, How can that be understood, if sin be not with some loathsomenesse? Thus we might instance in all the expressions used by Scripture to represent pardon.

Thirdly, This truth may be proved from the necessary qualifications required in those that have pardon, which cannot be unless a man have already committed the sin, as John 1:9. If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to pardon. Now confession is always of a thing already extant. How absurd would it be for a man to go and confess the sins he will commit? This would rather be impudence then humiliation; look over all the confessions made by
by the people of God for themselves, or in the behalf of others, as Davids, Ezras, Nehemahs, Daniels, and you shall observe them all limited to sins that have been done, never extended to what they shall commit. Thus in the Old Testament when any had sinned, they offered Sacrifices. There was no Sacrifice appointed for a future sinne, but onely for that which was already committed. Thus to pardon is required forsaking of a mans sinne, Prov. 28. 13. Now how can a man be laid to forfake that which is not, to leave that which is future? Especially, as you have heard, repentance is commanded as the way wherein only pardon may be had: Now how can repentance be about that which is to come? Can a man repent of any thing but what is past? The two Greek words μετανοια, to be wise and understand after the fact is done, and ἐπιστροφὴν, a turning again to those whom we have offended, make it as clear as the Sunne, that there is no pardon of sinne before committed.

Fourthly, There is no promise in all the Word of God made for the pardon of a sinne before it be committed and repented of. If therefore the Word of God give no such encouragement, what presumption is it to make a faith, that all sins are pardoned, the Gospel-faith? For grant that such a thing were true, and to be believed, viz. That all sins are pardoned, yet that could not be the Gospel-faith, for the Gospel-faith is justifying faith: Now the object of justifying faith, is not ens complexum, a proposition, such as this is, All my sins are pardoned, but Ens incompleixum, a single object, which is Christ himself received and applied by faith: I am not justified by believing my sins are pardoned, but by relying upon Christ for pardon. But this by the way. The strength of the Argument lieth in this, God hath made no promise for the pardon of sin before it be committed and repented of. Therefore none may either believe or claim such a thing. The grand charter or privilege for pardon, as it is laid down in the Covenant of Grace, is contained in Jer. 31. 34. which is also repeated, Heb. 8. 12. Now this Covenant of Grace, as it promiseth pardon of sinne, so also a new heart, and actual exercise of Grace, so that they shall walk in all Gods wayes. Now the way wherein pardon is to be had, is repentance
ance and faith. We must not therefore conceive of the Covenant of Grace, as promising pardon and forgiveness, without any qualification in the subject: This would contradict other places of Scripture. Therefore in the Covenant of Grace, some things are promised absolutely, supposing nothing to go before, such as Regeneration, the working of Faith in us, giving his holy Spirit to us, and Union with Christ. 2. There are many privileges in the Covenant of Grace, and those are given, where God hath wrought some former effects of his Grace, and suppose them to be: such are Justification, pardon of sin, increase in Grace, Glorification; all these things are promised in the Covenant of Grace, but made good where there are the former effects of God's grace wrought in them. We do not therefore say, God doth not pardon sinne, unless repentance go before, as if God needed repentance, as if he could not do it without repentance, as if repentance made God the better, or made him amends. These are idle calumnies cast upon this Doctrine in some Pamphlets. But only God hath appointed one effect of his grace before another in order, and he will not vouchsafe one before he hath wrought the other. As for instance, God hath appointed no unclean thing shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, God will not give glory, where he hath not given grace. If one should tragically exclaim upon this, This is to make God need our graces, This is to make grace meritorious with God, this is to be a Papist, a Formalist, to make men rest in themselves, you would peremptorily judge this a vain, weak cavil: No lesse is it, when we are charged thus, for holding God will not forgive sin, but to those that believe and repent. It is not for any worth in what we do, but because God will have an order and a method in his graces, Justification where repentance is, Glorification where holiness is. It being not fit to give pearl unto swine, nor childrens meat to dogs.

Fifthly, If a man may believe his sins are pardoned before they be committed, and so before repented of, then he may have full joy and unspakeable boasting in God, while he lieth wallowing in the midst of sins. The reason of the consequence is this, By such an act of faith, we have peace with God, and we glory in him.
him. This floweth, as a proper effect of faith, though it do not alway follow, yet it may follow, and happily it is our weakness, if it doth not. And if so, then it was David's weakness to be troubled about sin: It was for want of a right considering of the Covenant of Grace, that he had no joy in his heart, and that his bones were broken. The Adversary feeth the necessity of this consequent, and therefore is not afraid to say, That a justified person, even when sinne is most prevalent, and the heart most hardened, yet then can glory in Jesus Christ, with a large heart, breaking forth into thanksgivings, Cornel of Gospel-Repentance, pag. 125. How contrary is this to David's experience, Psal. 32. who, while he humbled not himself for his sin, found nothing but terror and trouble in his own soul? And certainly this Doctrine must be very distasteful to every gracious heart, which shall make faith and assurance in the glorious effects of it, amicably concording (as it were) with great and grievous sins. And let the Adversary shew such an instance in all Scripture. For as for his example, in Paul, Rom. 7. who found himself captivated unto sin, doing the things he would not, yet giving thanks to God through Jesus Christ: This is clean contrary to him, for Paul did greatly humble himself, and was deeply sensible of this tyranny of sin, which made him cry out, O miserable man that I am, who shall deliver me from this body of sin? So that we cannot with any colour call him an hardened sinner, Somnium narrare vigilantia est, saith Seneca; and to complain of sin, especially in the first motions and suggestions of it, as Paul did, argues a tender life of grace in him. No lesse absurd is it, to bring Habakkuk to patrocinate this great errour; for although he said, He would rejoice in God, and glory in his salvation, Hab. 3.8, 9. in the midst of God's judgements upon the publick: yet this doth not suppose any personal grievous sins he was fallen into.

Sixthly, If sins be pardoned thus before committed and repented of, then it would be in vain to pray for forgiveness of sin, seeing it is already past. This Argument (as before was said) Gomarius urged against Tiscator, explaining that Petition [Forgive us our sins] for the sense and assurance of it only in our hearts. It is true, we may pray for a thing that is past, thus far, for the
continuance of it, but not for the thing it self. Although there can hardly be an instance in all Scripture given of such a Petition. We do not reade of any prayer in Scripture that God would elect us, and predestinate us, yet that might admit of the same interpretation which they give for pardon of sin, viz. To make us more asserued and perswaded of it in our own hearts. Hence when God speaks of pardon of sins, he useth many times the future tense, Jer.31. I will forgive their iniquities, which if pardoned before, would be very difficult to say; even as hard, as if God should say, I will predestinate and elect such men. It is indeed often said, That when we pray for pardon of sinne, we pray for the sense and feeling of it; but let such that interpret so, give any parallel place for such a sense, yet we deny not (as before hath been said) but reductively this may be included in that Petition.

Seventhly, If a mans future sins be already pardoned in a justified man, then in a reprobate man, all his future sins are actually condemned. The consequence is firm upon that rule, Eadem est ratio contrariorum, there is the same reason of contraries. Therefore if a mans future sins be pardoned before they be committed, then a reprobate mans sins shall be punished before they be. Now how contrary is this to Gods dispensation revealed in the Scripture? Where can we finde any one man punished for a future sin? Were not all the sins men are afflicted for in Gods Word, because they had done them, not because they were to do them? Indeed the Scripture, Matt.5. sometimes makes the desires and lusts of the soul after sin, to be the sin it self, but that is, because they are the proxime and immediate cause of such a sin; but we are now speaking of future sins, that it may be as yet have no preparation at all for them in any cause.

Eighthly, By what principles the Opponents can prove, That God pardons sinnes future, by the same we can prove, it is because of repentance future. So that still no sin will be forgiven without repentance. For suppose that were a true rule to stand upon, Gods internal will to pardon is an immanent act, and therefore from all eternity, will it not as well follow, Gods
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internal will to give repentance, is an immanent act, and therefore repentance is from all eternity. If another be a true Rule, That God hath given us all pardon from eternity, only we have the sense of it, and manifestation in our own souls, May we not then say, that we had the grace of repentance from all eternity? But it is declarative in time in our own souls. For although Justification be God's act, and repentance ours, yet we are passive in the infusion of this, as well as Justification, I speak not of repentance as an act (which cannot so properly be said to be infused) but of the frame of the soul. If a third rule should be true, That therefore sins are pardoned because the Covenant of Grace faith, It will pardon all; Doth not this hold also for repentance, seeing in the Covenant God promiseth to give a repenting heart? Lastly, If God may be thought changeable, because now he pardons, and once he did not, will it not as well hold, because he now gives grace to such a man to repent, and once he did not?

To conclude therefore, it followeth with an equal necessity, That if future sins are forgiven before they be committed, That God also did accept of future repentance before it was practised; or else if repentance be not received by God, till actually performed; so neither is sin forgiven till actually committed and repented of.

The result of this whole truth is by way of Use, To admonish us, That we make not any Doctrine about grace in the genius and natural consequence of it, to encourage or harden to sin. If the grace of God, which hath appeared to teach thee to deny all ungodly lusts, make thee love them the more: If because you are under grace, sin hath therefore dominion over you: If there be goodness with the Lord, and therefore you do fear him: then know all things work contrary to their nature, and Scripture-Direcions. All Gospel-grace is a cleansing, purifying, refining property; it is fire to get out the dross; it is water to wash away the filth; it is oil to mollifie the wounds of the soul; it is wine to make the heart glad, and rejoice in God. Do not while you promise your selves a liberty by grace, therein become servants of corruption; more especially let the children of God, who have had sweet experience of the Covenant of
of Grace upon their souls, take heed of falls and relapses. If the Prodigal son after that reconciliation made with his father, after all that glory and love vouchsafed to him, had again wandered into far countreys, prodigally consumed all his estate, living with swine upon husks, How unpardonable and unworthy would this fact have been? No lesse guilty wilt thou be, who hast had the ring put on thee, who hast fed on the fatted Calf, if after this, thou provoke God by grosse transgressions. Some have disputed, Whether it be possible for a godly man to be secure in sinning, and more willing to offend, because of Gods gracious Covenant, which will infallibly rescue him out of that sin. But what sin is not possible (except that against the holy Ghost) even to a regenerate man? Take heed then, lest thou love the Gospel, because it hath always glad tidings, and thou canst not abide the precepts or threatnings, because they speak hard things to thee. There may be a carnal Gospeller, as well as a Papist Legalist.
LECT. XXIX.

That full Absolution is not until the Day of Judgement; Wherein Pardon then consists: And whether the Sinnes of Gods People shall be manifested at that Day.

__ACTS 3. 29.__

*Repent, and be converted, that your sinnes may be blotted out.*

The Apostle Peter in this exhortatory Discourse of his to the Jews, deals like a wise Physician:

1. Discovering the danger of the disease.
2. Applying an effectual remedy.

The disease is that hainous sinne the Jews were guilty of, in killing of Christ the Prince of life. Which sin is aggravated by a three-fold Antithesis.

1. They delivered up, and denied Christ in the presence of Pilate, when he would have acquitted him.
2. They denied him, though he was an holy and just one.
3. They desired a murderer to be released rather then him. This is their sin.
In the next place, you have the remedy prescribed in two words, Repent and be converted. Repent, that denotes a change in the heart; and to be converted, an alteration in the outward conversation, μετανοεῖτε. Howsoever it be generally received that μετανοεῖτε signifieth only true and godly sorrow, and μετανόημεν, that imperfect and unsound grief which is upon hypocrites, yet this is not universally true, for μετανόημεν, is applied to true repentance, Mat. 21. 19. & 32. and μετανοεῖτε, to an outward repentance merely, Matt. 11. 21. The other is ἐπιστάσατε, which is to be understood reciprocally, Turn yourselves, or be turned. This exhortation doth not suppose free-will in us, it only denoteth our duty, not our ability. Neither is Grotius his assertion better than Semipelagianism, when he compareth the will of a man to the Mother, and grace to the Father, so that as children are named after the Father, and not the Mother: Thus good actions are denominated from grace, not free-will: for in our conversion free-will is neither a total or partial cause preoperant or cooperant, but the passive subject recipient of that Vm gratia vorticordiam, as Austin called it, the heart-changing power of grace. This duty of repentance is urged from the profitable consequent. Piscator calls it effectum willi, the effect of conversion, which is, That your sins may be blotted out. It is not an inference of causality, but of consequence. Blotting out, is (as you heard) from Merchants that expunge their debts, or the Scribe that raceth out those letters which ought not to be in the paper, or the Painter that defaceth those lineaments, which should not be in the picture.

In the next place, you have the time, when these sines shall be blotted out (that is) when the times of refreshing shall come, δόξα, is used Exodus 8. 15. Some do not understand this, nor that expression, The times of restitution of all things, ver. 21. of the Day of Judgement, but of that preservation the Elect should have, when the destruction of Jerusalem should be. Hence it is that they expound the day of the Lord so much spoken of in Peter, and other places, which is said to be coming upon the believers of that time, when God came to destroy Jerusalem, but there is no cogent reason
reason to go from the received Interpretation, which makesthe Day of Judgement to be the times of refreshing to the godly, for so indeed it is, because then they are eased from all those troubles and oppressions they lay under in this world. Hence our Saviour calls it, The Day of our Redemption, upon the coming whereof they are to lift up their heads.

The Observation is,

That a compleat and full Absolution from all sin, is not enjoyed till the day of Judgement.

The believers have not a full discharge till then: we are in this life continually subject to new sins, and so to new guilt, whereby arise new fears, so that the soul hath not a full rest from all, till that final absolution be pronounced at the day of Judgement.

Before we shew the grounds, whereby it may appear, that the remission of our sins is not fully compleated till then: We must lay down some Propositions by way of a ground-work

First, The Scripture not onely in this priviledge of remission of sinne, but in others also, makes the comple ment and fullnesse of them to be at the day of Judgement. Redemption is the to tal Summe, as it were, of all our mercies, and we are partakers of it in this life, Col. 1.14. Rom. 3.24. Yet the Scripture calls the Day of Judgement, when we shall rise out of our graves in a peculiar and eminent manner, The day of Redemption, Ephel. 1.7. Ephel 4.30. because at that day, will be the utmost, and last effects of our Redemption. Adoption, that also is a priviledge we receive in this life; yea a learned man (Forbes in his Book where he handleth the order of Gods graces) makes Adoption (as I take it) to be the first, and to go before Justification, yet the Apostle, Rom. 8. 23. calleth the last day, The day of Adoption. Hence (1 John 3. 2.) the Apostle, though he faith, We are now the Sonnes of God, yet he faith, it doth not appeare what we shall be, because the glory God at the last day will put upon us, is so farre transcendent and superlative to what now we are. Thus Matt. 19.28. the last day is also called
called The day of Regeneration to the people of God, yet in this life they partake of that grace, but because then is the full perfection and manifestation of it; Therefore the Scripture calls it, The day of Regeneration. Even as the Apostle Acts 13.33. applieth that passage of the Psalm to Christ's Resurrection, This day have I begotten thee, because then was such a solemn and publick declaration, that he was the Son of God. No marvel then, if the Scripture do also call the day of judgement a time, when sins shall be blotted out, because then is the publick absolution of the godly; and according to Philosophy motions receive their names from the term to which they tend.

Secondly, However Justification be said to consist in pardon of sins, yet there is a great difference between the one and the other; For Justification, besides the pardon of sins, doth connote a state that the subject is put into, viz. A state of favour, being reconciled with God. Hence it is, that this state cannot be reiterated often, no more then a wife after that first entrance into the relation is frequently made a wife. In this sense, the Scripture alwayes speaks of it, as connoting a state or condition, the subject is put into, as well as a peculiar priviledge vouchsafed to such. It is true, There are indeed learned men, who think Justification may be reiterated, as you heard, Peter Martyr, and Bucer. Others call it a continued action, as conservation. But although there is a continuance of Justification, and the godly are preserved in that estate, yet we cannot say, God doth renew Justification daily, as he doth pardon of sin. There are some that think the Scripture gives a ground for a second Justification, or the continuing and encreasing of it, and bring those places, Titus 3. 5, 6, 7. Rev. 22. 11. The learned and excellent Interpreter Ludovicus De Dieu in Chap. 8. of the Romans, vers. 4. largely pleadeth for a two-fold Justification; The first he makes to be the imputing of Christ's righteousness to us, received by faith, which is altogether perfect, and is the cause of pardon of sins. The second he makes an effect of the former, whereby through the grace of God regenerating we are conformable unto that...
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love in part, and are day by day more and more justified, and shall be fully so; when perfection comes: of which Justification he faith these Texts speak, James 2. 21, 24. Revel. 22. 11. Matth. 12.37; 1 Kings 8. 32. This two-fold Justification, he makes to differ, 100 Caelo, from the Papists, whose first is founded upon the merit of Congruity; The second upon the merit of Condignity. But the discussing of this will be more proper in the other Part (viz.) of imputed righteousness. *Auftin* seemeth to hold Justification a frequent and continued Act, (Lib. 2. contra Julianum, cap. 8.) When we are heard in that Prayer [Forgive us our sinnes] we need (faith he) such a remission daily, what progress soever we have made in our second Justification. He speaks also of a Justification bajus vitæ, which he calls minorem the lesser; and another plenam and perfectam, full and perfect, which belongs to the state of glory (Tract. 4. in Joannem, lib. de spirito, & lit. cap. ultim.) But the more exact handling of this will be in the place above-mentioned. It seemeth more consonant to Scripture, if we say, That Justification is a state we were once put into; which is not repeated over and over, as often as sin is forgiven; neither can it admit of increase or decrease, so that a man should be more or lesse justified, for even David, while he was in that state of Suspensation, was not lesse justified, though the effects of Justification were lesse upon him. It is true, in some sense learned men say, Justification may increase, viz. extended, not intensified, as they express it, by way of extension; when more sins are pardoned, not intensively in its own nature. Even as the soul of a man in its information of the body, admits of no increase intensively, but it doth extensively, the more the parts of the body grow, the further doth its information extend. But of these things more in their proper place.

Thirdly, *Hocsoever an Absolution shall be compleate at the Day of Judgement, yet our Justification shall not abide in such a way, as it is in this life.* Now our Justification is by pardon of sinne, and a righteousness without us imputed to us, which is instrumentally applied by faith, but this way shall then cease; for having perfect righteousness inherent in
in our selves, we shall need no covering. It is true, the glory
and honour of all this will redound upon Christ, and he shall
not be the lesse glorified, because he hath then brought us to
the full end of all his sufferings. I know some may doubt,
Whether any righteouſness, but that which is infinite can
please God; And therefore (as some think) the Angels were
accepted of God through Christ, though perfect: so it may of
the Saints in heaven: But I see no ground for this. This feem-
eth to be undoubted, That the way of Justification by faith in
Christ, ariseth, because of our imperfection and unfulneſſe
remaining in us, and therefore is Justification vie, not Patria,
a Justification of us in our way, not when we come to our
home.

Fourthly, Although pardon of sinne be compleated at
that great Day, yet this is not to be understood, as if
Gods pardon of any sinne were imperfect, and something of sin
did still remain to be done away. No, those expressıons of
forgivenesſe of sinne in the Scripture, denote such a full and
plenary pardon, that a sin cannot be more remitted then it is.
But because we commit new sinnes daily, and so need pardon dai-
ly; Therefore it is, that we are not compleatly pardoned till
then: As also, because the perfect pardon we have here,
shall then solemnly and publickly be declared to all the
world.

These things thus premisde, I come to shew the grounds
or particulars, wherein our pardon of sinne is thus com-
pleated.

And first, In our sense and feeling; For bowsoever God par-
don a sinne perfectly, yet our faith, which receiveth it, is weak.
This jewel is taken with a trembling and shaking hand. Hence
it is that we have not full faith and confidence in our spirits.
We may see this in David, though Nathan told him his sinnes
were forgiven him, yet his faith was not so vigorous and pow-
erful, as wholly to apply this to his own soul; and therefore
he had much anguish and trouble of heart afterwards. But now
at the last Day, all these fears, diffidence and darkneſſe, will
be quite removed out of our hearts. There shall be no more
disturbance in our souls, then there can be corruption in the

Wherein the compleatnesſe of the pardon of sin at the
day of judgeme nt confi-
cth.
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highest heavens, we shall then have such a Gourd, as no worm
can devour. Our souls shall not then know the meaning of sit-
ting in darknesse, and wanting Gods favour. There will
then be no complaints, Why hath the Lord forsaken me? Well, may Gods children be called upon to lift up their
heads, when such a Redemption draweth nigh; and well
may that day be called The days of refreshment, seeing the
people of God are so often scorched with the fiery darts of
Satan.

Secondly, Pardon of sinne will at that day be perfected,
Because all the effects of pardon, will then be accomplished,
and not so much as any scars remain, the wound will be so
fully healed. Although God doth fully pardon sinne, yet the
effects of this are delayed, many chastisements and sad affli-
tions are to be undergone: Howsoever, death it self, and
the corruption in the grave must seize upon justified perfons;
now these are the fruit of sin, and howsoever the sting of these
be taken away, yet they are not wholly conquered, till that laft
day: Then therefore may we justly say, Sinne is pardoned,
when there shall be no more grave, no more death, no more
corruption, but all shall be swallowed up in immortality and
glory.

Thirdly, Then, and not till then may we say, Remission
of sinnes will be compleated, Because then shall no more i-te-
ration of pardon be. Here in this life, because the root of
corruption abideth in us; there are daily pullulant branches
of sinnes, and so frequent guilt is contracted, whereby as
we have daily sores, so we need daily plaisters. It is with ori-
ginal corruption in us, as with that tree in Daniel, Chap. 4.
14, 15. although the branches be cut off, yet the stump is
still in the earth, and that sprouts out too fast by the tem-
ptations that are always by it. Hence it is that we alwayes
pray, Forgive us our sinnes, and because of these failings the
Apostle (2 Cor. 5.20.) writeth to, and exhorteth the godly
Corinthians, who were already reconciled to God, to be fur-
ther reconciled to him. But then this Petition shall whol-
ly cease, then there will be no Serpent to sting us, nor will the
eye of justifying faith to look upon the brazen Serpent exalt-
ed be necessary any more. The Lord will not only wipe away the tear of worldly grief, but also of godly sorrow at that time. Then, and not till then, will it be true, That God seek no sinne in his children. Then will the Church be without wrinkles, or any spot within her. In this respect it is the Church of God prayeth so earnestly for the Bridegrooms coming. For this it is, They look for, and haden in their prayers that day.

Fourthly, At that Day will pardon of sinne only be completed, if you consider the Nature of Justification. For what is that, but an overcoming the accusing adversary, and clearing of us against every charge? Now this is most eminently and fully done in those last Affizcs. The Syriack word to justifie, is also to conquer and overcome, because when a man is justified, he overcometh all those Bills and Indictments which were brought against him; Now this is manifestly done in the day of Judgement, when God shall before men and Angels acquit and absolve his people; and if the Apostle say in this life, Rom. 6.7. of a godly man dead in Christ, he is justified from his sins, justification in respect of Sanification, that sinne doth not conquer him, but he sinne; how much more will this be true at that Day, when all the guilt and filth of sin shall be totally removed? Oh what a glorious conquest will that be over sinne, hell and the devil, when the Judge of the whole world shall pronounce them free from all sin, and command them to enter into his glorious rest!

Having thus cleared the Doctrine, one Question may be briefly touched upon,

Whether the sinnes of Gods people shall be manifested at the Day of Judgement, and God for Christs sake then acquit them?

There are learned men for the Affirmative, They shall be published; and there are learned men for the Negative. Those that are for the affirmative, they say indeed, godly mens sins shall not be examined for their ignominy or confusion, but only that the goodnesse and grace of God may be made the more illustrious. For this they urge these Arguments,
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1. Those places of Scripture, which speak of the universality of the real objects, and personal: Of the real; as when its said, A man must give an account of every idle word, Mat. 12.36. 2 Cor. 5.10. an account must be made for every thing done in the body. For the universality of the object personal, 2 Cor. 5. We must all appear before the tribunal seat.

Again, They urge the opening of the Book, which shall be at that day, and that is nothing, but the manifesting of the consciences of men.

Further, Many wicked mens sins and godly mens are mingled together, and there cannot be a judgement of discussion preceding that of condemnation, unless godly mens sins also be produced.

In sum, They think this conduceth more to the setting up of Gods Justice, the exaltation of his mercy; neither (say they) will this breed shame to the godly, for in heaven they shall remember their sins committed on earth, but without any grief or trouble, yea with joy and thankfulness to God, because delivered from them, Quandoq; lati recordamus dolorum, said Gregory, We may with joy remember by-past grief.

But those that are for the negative, think this no wayes sutable to Gods goodnes, that the sins of the godly should then be published, for these grounds following,

1. From the judicial processe, where Christ calls the blessed of his Father to inherit the Kingdom prepared for them; and then enumerateth only the good works they had done; no question they had many sins and failings, but God takes no notice of them.

2. This agreeeth beft (they say) with those expressions of Scripture concerning pardon, viz. That God blotteth them out, That they are thrown into the bottom of the Sea.

3. The godly are said not to come into judgement, and there is no condemnation to them, yea they have already life everlasting.

Lastly, Christ is their Bridegroom, their Friend, their Advocate, and how ill becoming would it be one in such relations to accuse or lay open their sins?

Which of these opinions is truest, is hard to say, neither of them
them have cogent Arguments, and the Scripture doth not ex-
pressly decide the Question, yet the negative seems to have more
probability on its side.

The Use is, First, Of Comfort and glad tidings to the chil-
dren of God, however in this life they have accusations
from within, and from without, yet the day is coming, when
they shall have a glorious and publick Justification from all
Objections; Then Satan can no more accuse Joseph for the
noisome rags upon him: Then Joseph shall be brought out of
the prison freed from all guilt and calumny, and exalted to
great glory, and it may be therefore God suffereth thee to
be exercised with much guilt and fear here, that thou mayest
the more long for those days of refreshment. And as this
truth is for their great Consolation, so also it demonstrateth
their happiness: That that which is so terrible and dreadful
to wicked men, should be such matter of rejoicing unto them,
when they through horror shall cry for the mountains and
hills to cover them, these shall desire the graves and the earth
to deliver up her dead, that they may enjoy their Bridegroom.
Certainly, believers are not believers in this point as they
should be; What an heavenly contempt would it work in
them of this present world? What earnest desires, that this
Kingdom might at last come? This is their marriage day, the
day of Coronation. Then death, hell, grave, sin and Satan,
are all conquered.

And if the joy and peace, which remission of sin produceth
in this life be so exceeding glorious, what will that be when we
shall have no more streams but that fountain?

Use 2. By way of contrary, To terrifie and arouse wicked
men, for as the godly have but a glimmering, a little pittance
in this life, in respect of that fulness of Glory to be revealed
hereafter, so the wicked feel not the least part of that guilt,
torment, shame and confusion, which hereafter shall be poured
upon them.

There are many mens sins lie asleep, keep no noise either in
their own consciences, or before God; but then these Lions,
these mafty-dogs that lay tumbling at the door, will rise up
in rage, and wholly devour. Do not therefore take Gods for-
bearance
bearance for his gracious acquittance; Oh do not imbolden thy self with false encouragements, and say, The worst is over; As the Apostle said, These light afflictions were nothing to that eternal weight of glory: So on the contrary may the wicked say, These pangs and wounds of consciences which are felt here, are nothing to that eternal weight of sin hereafter. Bernard said, Descendamus in infernum viventes, ne descendamus morientes. Let us go into hell while we are alive, by a serious meditation, and holy consideration; that we may not go into it, when we be dead, by real miseries. As the Apostle faith, We are the children of God, but it doth not yet appear what they shall be; there is more glory then they can conceive: So wicked men are now the children of wrath, but it doth not yet appear what they shall be. Oh therefore that ungodly men were as wise as Jonah's mariners, who in the midst of tempests, seeing their ship necessarily sinking, throw away the goods that were a burden, knowing they and their safety could not consist together. Thus are ye to do, throw away thy sins, those heavy burdens that put all into danger, and so mayest thou safely arrive at last in heaven.
Lect. XXX.

Tenderness of Spirit, and true Humiliation, (not carnall Presumption) the Effect of the Sense of Pardon.

Luke 7:47.

Wherefore I say unto thee, Her sins which are many are forgiven her, for she loved much.

This Text is part of a famous History, which may well be called redemption, because of the three great things observable in it: 1. Great Sins: 2. Great Repentance and Humiliation: 3. Great Love and Grace of God through Christ in pardoning: And there is this one peculiar thing well observed about this woman in the History, that whereas others addressed themselves to Christ for corporal mercies, this only cometh for spiritual, even for remission of her sins.

For the better understanding of the Text, let us briefly consider the History. And

First, The woman is described by her quality inherent, a sinner, not in a common sense as all are, but in a more notorious manner: And therefore those that mitigate her fault, out of some reverence or honour to her, do not so much increase her
The Opening of the Text.

honor, (as Maldonat upon the place well observeth) as detract from Christ's honor. For the Physicians skill is most commended, where the disease is more desperate. That she was a known great sinner, appeareth, in that the Pharisee wondered at Christ, because he would have any commerce with her. Whether this woman was Mary, Lazarus his sister or no, is hotly disputed by Commentators, but impertinent to my scope.

In the next place, You have her great Repentance expressed, wherein for the general, you may see the Apostles Duty accomplished, as she had given her members to be numbers of iniquity, so now of righteousness; Insomuch that she is the true Looking-Glass of an humble Convert.

Her Humiliation is described:

1. In bringing of a Box of Ointment to anoint his feet; not his head (say some) because she thought her self so unworthy, she brought indeed an outward visible box of Ointment, but she had another invisible and spiritual one, even a contrite and broken heart.

2. She stands behinde Christ (as being loathsome in her own eyes) and was with his feet with her tears; which must suppose that to be true in her, which Jeremiah desirith, viz., her head to be a fountain of water, but as long as her heart was such a fervent lembek, it was no wonder to see such precious distillations: Chrysologus, upon this fact of hers, faith, The Heavens are wont to water the Earth with rain; but Ecce nunc rigat terra Caenum. Here the Earth watereth Heaven.

Lastly, The debasement of her self, further appeareth, in making her hair, heretofore the instrument of her pride and wantonness, now a towel to wipe his feet.

In the third place, Christ's love towards her is remarkable, and in the general, it is so great, that the Pharisee puffed up with his own pride, was offended at it, not considering:

First, That though she had been a sinner, yet now she manifested Repentance.
And secondly, That every commerce and communion with a sinner is not forbidden, but that which is of encouragement or consent unto his sinne: But our Saviours was like the communion of a Physician with the patient, to heal and cure: Hence our Saviour touched the Leper, whom he healed, yet was not uncleane, because he touched him to restore him to health: But as the people murmured, because Moses married a Blackmore; so the Pharisees grudged; because Christ showed mercy to sinners, but Moses indeed could not make the Blackmore white, whereas Christ doth purifie the defiled soul.

Now our Saviour doth aggravate his love to her,

1. By a diligent enumeration of those several acts of service, which she had exhibited to him, not mentioning any of her former sins; and all this he doth with an amity, or opposition to that carriage which the Pharisee had presented him with.

2. To convince the Pharisee, he declareth a Parable, that so from his own mouth the Pharisee may judge her love to Christ to be greater then his.

In the last place, his grace to her is further declared, by pardoning her sins though so sainous, which pardon is first declared unto the Pharisee in my Text, and afterwards to the woman herself.

In my Text is the first promulgation of her pardon; now because the words have some difficulty, and the later part is brought to prove love to be a meritorious cause of remission of sins: Two Questions are briefly to be resolved:

1. When this Womans sins were pardoned?

And the Answer is, That as soon as ever she repented in her heart of her evil ways, and believed in Christ; her sins were forgiven her; for to God doth promise, and this was before she came to Christ; but she cometh to Christ for the more assurance of pardon, and not only so, but that he should authoritatively absolve her from her sinne; for Christ did more then declare her sins pardoned, as appeareth by the standards by, who with wonder made this Question, viz. 49. What this that forgiveness signes also? Whereas to declare the forgivenesse of sin only, any Minister may do, as we read of.
The Apprehension of Sinne pardoned

Nathan to David, 2 Sam. 12, 13, so that her sins were pardoned by God before, at the first time of her faith and repentance, but now Christ, as the Mediator, doth particularly absolve her, and that in her own conscience, therefore he bids her, Go in peace.

The second Question is, Whether that expression [Much is forgiven, for she loved much] be causall, as if her love were antecedent, and a cause of her Forgiveness: or consequentall only, as an effect, or signe of her Forgiveness; In this sense, She loved much, because God did forgive her many sinnes, not she loved much, and therefore God forgave her.

Here is a great and vast difference between these two: Many Papists are for the latter, the Protestants generally for the former; and there is this cogent reason for it, for that Christ doth not speak of repentance, or love which should go before, and be the cause of the pardon of sinnes, is plain by the Parable he brings of a Creditor, who forgave one Debtor more, another Debtor lesse: Hereupon our Saviour asked the Pharisee, Which of them will love him most? Simon answered, I suppose him to whom most was forgiven: Now of such a love our Saviour speaketh, when he mentioneth the woman, which is clearly a love of gratitude, because much was forgiven; not an antecedent love of merit, to procure pardon; so that as from her actions of anointing and washing his feet, by way of a signe or effect, we gather her faith and love of Christ; so by her faith and love, as by a signe and effect, it may be gathered, that her sinnes are forgiven her. But you may ask, How could she come to know her sins were forgiven before Christ told her? I answer, By the promise of God made to every true penitent and believer: Though this assurance of hers was imperfect, and therefore admitted of further degrees; whereas then all this repentance and humiliation was not, That sinne might be forgiven, but from faith that they were forgiven. We may observe this.

Observ.1. That the sense and apprehension of pardon of sinnes already obtained, doth not beget carnall security, but a further
beg. is not Security, but fear and vigilance. 

This is a practical truth of great concernment. And for the opening of it, take notice of this distinction, as a foundation, (viz.) That there is in Scripture a two-fold repentance or humiliation of the soul for sin; The one antecedent and going before pardon, and this the Scripture requireth as a necessary condition, without which forgiveness of sin cannot be obtained: of this repentance the Scripture for the most part speaks, **Ezek. 14. v. 18,30. Matth. 3. 2. Mark 6. 12. Luke 13.3. Acts 3. 19.** and generally in most places of Scripture.

In the second place, There is an humiliation of heart, and brokenness of soul for sin, arising from the apprehension of God's love in pardoning, whereby we grudge that we should deal so unkindly with so good and gracious a God: This though more rarely, yet is sometimes spoken of in Scripture, as first in this woman, who out of the apprehension of God's love in pardoning so much to her, did pour out her soul in all ways of thankfulnesse. After this manner also was David's repentance, **Psalm 51.** for he was thus deeply affected after Nathan had told him, *His sin was taken away:* Although it doth appear by the Psalm also, that he had not as yet that sense of pardon, which did quiet his conscience. This kind of affection was also in **Paul, 1 Tim. 12. 13, 14,15,16. 1 Cor. 15. 8,9.** in which places the Apostle remembering his former sins, confesseth them, and acknowledgeth thereby his unworthinesse of all that grace and favour he had received; so that the Apostle doth not there humble himself that he may obtain mercy, but because he had obtained mercy. The most eminent instance of this kind of sorrow and shame, is **Ez. Kiel 16. 62, 63.** where God promiseth to establish his Covenant with them; and then mark the event of this, **That thou mayest remember, and be confounded, and never open thy mouth more because of thy shame, when I am pacified towards thee.**

So then, both these kindes of humiliations are to be owned and practised; and therefore it is a false and dangerous error,
error, to acknowledge no other kind of repentance than the latter: The Papists will not acknowledge this latter humiliation at all, because they deny all Faith and Assurance, that a believer may have of his sinnes in particular: And others, that there is only this latter, and therefore the fore-mentioned Author, in his Treatise of Gospel-Repentance, makes this only Gospel-Repentance: But as Gospel-Faith is not that reflect act of the soul in a man, whereby it is persuwaded that Christ is his, but a direct act of taking and receiving Christ to be ours; so a Gospel-Repentance is not that mainly where by we are humbled, because we receive God's love to us in pardon: but principally in that loathing of ourselves to obtain pardon. It is therefore great ignorance in that Author, in his Treatise of Gospel-Repentance, when pag. 58. he calls Repentance that goeth before this Faith, (viz.) that my sinnes are pardoned, a dead work; as if the Faith that justifieth, and without which it is impossible to please God, were the believing that my sinnes are pardoned; whereas the Scripture makes it to be, the receiving of Christ, and laying hold on him: And seeing that the object must in order of nature be before the act that is employed about it, it followeth infallibly, That I must have Justification before I can believe I have it. Repentance therefore may be thought to go before a two-fold act of Faith: First, That whereby Christ is laid hold upon, and made ours; and so the Repentance that precedeth this, may be called legal and flattering. Or secondly, Before a persuasion that my sinnes are pardoned, and before this act of Faith, Repentance must necessarily go, because the Covenant of Grace dispenseth pardon only to such.

But because I have already spoken enough of the former kind of Repentance, antecedent remission of sins, vindicating the necessity of it; I shall press upon this latter, as being most proper to my Text, And that Assurance of apprehension of pardon doth not beget security, but rather increase godliness, will appear several ways.

And first thus: Those places which speak of God's gracious Properties, do represent them as Grounds of Duty,
begets not Security, but fear and vigilance.

as well as of Consolation, Psalm 130. 4. There is forgiveness with thee, that thou mayest be feared: Mark that expression [There is forgiveness with thee:] which implies forgiveness to be in God, as in a Fountain: and therefore he doth easily, and plentifully forgive; but lest any Spider should suck poison out of this sweet flower, he addeth, That thou mayest be feared; here is no encouragement to security. Thus Hosea 3. 5. there is a gracious promise of God to his children, that they shall fear him and his goodness. As it is God's glorious property to work good out of evil, so is it a most devilish quality to work evil out of good.

Secondly, The Promises of God, they also require an holy and humble walking, 2 Cor. 7. 1. The Apostle having in the Chapter before, mentioned those glorious promises in the Covenant of Grace, that he would be our God, and we his sons and daughters, makes this inference, Having those Promises, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness, perfecting holiness in the fear of God; So that here is no danger, as long as we keep close to the genuine use of the Scripture. Thus also Ephes. 4. 30. Grieve not the Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed, &c. Where Assurance is so far from encouraging to sin, that by sin it is weakened and destroyed. The more gracious then we perceive God to us, the more humiliation and debasement we finde in our selves. Thus the Apostle Peter, 1 Pet. 1. 19. If ye call on the Father, who without respect of persons, judgeth all men, passe the time of your sojourning here with fear. To make therefore doubting a duty, and meritorious, as some Papists have done, is to betray great ignorance of Scripture motives.

Thirdly, That assurance of pardon is apt to kindle spiritual affections, is plain, if you consider the Nature of such assurance.

First, Originally it is wrought by the Spirit of God, as a man by the power of free-will, is not able to doe any supernatural good thing, so neither by the strength of natural light, can he discern the gracious privileges God bestoweth upon him, 1 Cor. 2. 12. The Spirit whereby
whereby we know the things that are freely given us of God, is opposed to the Spirit of the world: If then this persuasion be not the fruit of the flesh, but of the Spirit, Is it any wonder, that it inclineth us to holy things?

Secondly, This persuasion of pardon cometh in the use of those means appointed by God, 2 Pet. 1. 10. By giving great diligence in the use of the means, we only come to assurance. How then can such a persuasion of forgiveness cause a neglect of the means?

Lastly, That Spirit which doth thus assure, doth work also at the same time, concomitant gracious effects, especially fervent and effectual prayer, Rom. 8. Gal. 3. Now where constant powerfull prayer is, that soul is like a tree planted by the waters side.

Fourthly, That this persuasion of pardon doth inflame much to holiness, appeareth from the nature and state of those who are in it. They are sons. Now by experience we see, that in an ingenuous son, the more apprehension there is of his fathers tender love and kindnese to him, the more obsequious and serviceable he is; Can we think that the fathers great love to his Prodigal son was not like coles of fire poured on him to melt and thaw him? We rather see jealousies and suspitions of love to breed hatred at last. Hence diffidence worketh despair, and despair hatred of God. It is therefore a special duty lying upon the people of God, to entertain good thoughts of God, and to be persuaded of his loving kindnesse to them.

Fifthly, That the people of God do yet mourn and abhor themselves for their sins, though persuaded of the pardon of them, ariseth from the sincerity and uprightnesse of their heart, whereby they hate sin as sin, and grieve for the dishonour they have put upon God. It is indeed lawfull, yea a duty to repent of sin, that it may be pardoned, because the Scripture propounds this as a motive and encouragement to the duty: And it is a vain thing, to affect more high and spiritual strains then the Scripture. But humiliation of sin, when pardoned, and after the knowledge of the pardon, doth evidently discover an upright heart, that the dishonour of God is more trouble and grief to him,
him, then his own punishment and destruction; whereby it is, that he doth so accuse and condemn himself for dealing so wretchedly and frowardly with so gracious a God.

Sixthly, That ingenious principle of gratitude and thankfulnes which reigneth in the godly, will put them upon all these services. Godliness in the lives of the godly may be considered two ways; 1. As a means wherein they attain to eternal life. 2. As an expression of thankfulnesse unto God. Hence Ursine in his Catechism, inscribeth that part of Divinity which containeth our duty, de gratitudine, of thankfulnesse. 1. Eph. ii. 107. quia quod quis est nisi qui amans se Deo vicem reponit amoris? quem non fit nisi revelante spiritus per fidem eternum Dei propositum de sua salute? Who is a righteous man but he that returneth love to God for Gods loving of him? And how can this be, but by Gods Spirit revealing his purpose of Election, concerning the just mans salvation?

Use of Instrucution. Doth the apprehension of great pardon breed great humiliation, then we may see the necessity of that Ministry and preaching, which doth discover the depth, length and breadth of sin. They take the best way to set up grace, and magnifie Christ, who do amplifie the polution of sin in us. Now that we may come to be convinced how much God doth forgive us, two points are much to be insisted upon.

1. The Doctrine of original corruption, for thereby we shall see our selves guilty of more sins then ever we thought of. A man without this Scripture-light is like one in a dark dungeon, which is full of Serpents, Toads, and all venemous creatures, but is not able to see any of them, and so thinketh himself without any danger at all. If therefore thou wouldest see how much is forgiven, reckon up all the debts thou owest. The mercy and skill of the Physician will then appear, when the worst of thy disease is made manifest.

A second point much to be pressed is, The pure, strict and exact obligation of the Law, which being set as a pure glasse before thee, all thy deformities will appear. In this sense it is good to be a legal Preacher, and a legal hearer often; that so knowing the holiness of the Law, and our imperfection, we may esteem the more of Gods grace in pardoning so much; As God in the
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outward passages of his providence, doth therefore suffer one trouble to follow another, like so many waves, that so the greater their calamities have been, his wisdom, power and goodness may be the more conspicuous in delivering of them. Thus it is also in his spiritual administrations, he will not reveal the riches of grace, but to the poor in spirit, nor will he give ease and refreshment, but to those that are heavy laden and burdened. And this is the reason why a Pharisee, a Formalist, a moral man, a self-righteous man, doth not love Christ, as converted Publicans and sinners do.

Use 2. Of Admonition, to those who have sinned much, and to have had much forgiven them, let such know their expenses of practised grace, must be according to the receits of justifying grace. Let such know, the pardon of many sins is a talent to be greatly improved. As thou hast abounded in many sins, and God in many pardons, so do thou in much thankfulnesse. How thankful would we be to a man who hath delivered us often from a temporal death! But behold a greater love is manifested here. Thou who hast (it may be) been the chiefest sinner of many thousands, be now the chiefest believer of many thousands; If thou hast been a great sinner, and art not now a great actor, and spiritual merchant, negotiating for God, fear the truth of thy grace; much love should be like much fire that consumes all dross; quicken up thy self with such thoughts as these, Lord, who was more plunged into sin then I? Whose diseases were greater then mine? It may be thousands and thousands for lesse and fewer sins then I have committed, are now taking their portion in hell. O Lord, this thy overflowing goodness doth overcome me! Oh that I had the hearts of all men and Angels to praise thee!
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TO THE JUDICIOUS READER.

Reader,

He Wisemans Divine Observation, mentioned Eccles. 12. 12, may justly put any man to some pause and deliberation, that is publishing Books to the world; for two discouragements are there spoken of; and if Solomon acted by the holy Spirit thought good to say so much in those days, what would he say to the multitude of Books that since have filled the world?

The first Discouragement is the endless number of Books, and this is especially true in Polemical Discourses, for there bellum e bello nasceitur, one controversy doth not end, but beget another, as one Circle in the Water produceth another. And the second is, the weariness
risomeness that much study or reading bringeth to the flesh; so that it is like Paul's worldly sorrow that causeth death; yea this is not the worst; for Books, especially controversial, do produce weariness even to the spiritual part of a man, and do exceedingly dispirit and hebetate the vigorous actings of the soul in a practical gracious manner.

Now these Considerations would have prevailed with me, not to have troubled the world with ingratefull Controversies, but that formerly an obligation lay upon me to finish this Work, to which also I have been often sollicited by worthy and learned Friends; neither will that Objection of deadening and dulling the affectionate part, hold much in this Debate, for it being wholly busied to advance Christ both in what he did and suffered, as in reference to us; hereby not onely the Truth will gain upon the Understanding, but the goodness of it exceedingly sweeten, and ravish the Affections: So that we may say, Out of this strong one, comes meat, and who so will seriously walk in this study shall finde it not a barren Wilderness where are only briars and thorns, but a Land flowing with milk and honey.

The principal and main Truth asserted in this Book, is the Imputation of Christs Active Obedience, as well, and in the same manner as his Passive in the matter of Justification, and that as a Believer is not to divide the Natures, or the Offices of Christ; for neither his Obedience in this great work of our Redemption. A Doctrine that doth openly and plainly proclaim more honour to Christ, and
and more comfort to the truly humbled sinner, than any of its Competitors. And therefore at first Reformation out of Popery, generally received by all the Learned and Godly Protestants, and as strongly opposed and argued against by all the Popish Writers, who concluded it to be the known and avouched Doctrine of the Protestants: But afterwards it came to be doubted of, and at last to be decried and denied, when on the contrary some Papists began to close with it.

Now the Opposers of this imputed Righteousness, as it relateth to Christ's Active Obedience, go upon different Principles.

Some (as the Socinians) do so deny it, that they raze the very Foundation itself, and at the same time take away the Imputation of Christ's Passive and Active Obedience, making both to be a mean humane figment, abhorring from all Reason.

Others (as the Papists) admit in some sense the Imputation of Christ's sufferings, but spend their whole strength against the Imputation of his Righteousness, as if in that we were to be Justified.

Among the Protestants there are some eminent and Learned men, who have also been for the Negative, viz. the Non-Imputation of Christ's Active Obedience, as the matter of our Justification; though the number for the Negative, is nothing equal to the number for the Affirmative. Its not my purpose to pass such a severe Condemnation upon the Opinion of the Dissentients, as I see some learned men do (although the Doctrine asserted in this Book is heavily branded, as being the seed of Antinomianism,
nism, and endangering both Law and Gospel, by such who are of a contrary Judgement) but rather am grieved publickly to manifest a difference from such who are eminently usefull in the Church of God. But cordial Esteem and Reverence may be to those, from whom Truth (as we judge) doth necessitate us to dissent. If any of the learned Opposers of the Opinion herein affirmed shall condescend to low, as to confute the Arguments propounded in this Treatife; If I am not convinced by the Light they bring, I shall think it a Duty still to maintain the interest of this so precious and wholesome a Truth. But Experience may teach us, That though Learning and Understanding will enable us to confirm true Doctrine, yet onely Grace and holy Meekness of Spirit, doth fit us for the right managing of it: Therefore because in Replies, we are prone to discover our nakedness, and to strive for a Doctrine more, as it is our Opinion, and as we are concerned in it, rather then as it is the Lords Truth, who as he needeth not our lie, so neither our passions; I do think it the most profitable and peaceable way, to propound and propugne the Doctrine in Thesis, and whatsoever Arguments are brought against it, nakedly to examine them, without Replies to a whole Book or Discourse that happily may be published by the Opponent: For what Reader doth not see, that such Contests are spent in personal reflections, in verbal mistakes, and conduce very little to any mans Edification? Truth being seldom more cleared by those whose Disputations are in pugno, and Syllogismi in calcibus, as Hieros once said of some
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Some in his time. Hereby also there are more Interpretations upon Interpretations, and Books upon Books, then upon the Doctrine itself, that is, the principal Subject. Its an happy thing to have a sound Judgement in the matter maintained, and a gracious Spirit in the manner of maintaining it.

The Method I follow in this Book, is,

First, To treat of the Righteousness of God in general, wherein I do maintain against Socinians, That there is such an Attribute in God, whereby he is inclined to punish sinners, if there be not Satisfaction given.

Secondly, That Christ by his Sufferings in Soul and Body, as also by his Active Obedience, did truly, perfectly and really, not metaphorically satisfy this Justice of God, against Socinians also.

Thirdly, That the Righteousness of God, as well as his Mercy is demonstrated in our Justification, and that because God is thus Righteous, none can be accepted to Eternal Life, without perfect Righteousness.

Hereupon in the fourth place, We examine what this Righteousness is, first, Negatively, then Positively; Negatively, we shew, That its not any supposed Righteousness we can have by Nature, neither is it the Righteousness of the Law, no, nor the Personal Righteousness we have, consisting in Evangelical Graces, and good Works.

Neither lastly is our Faith, as it is a Work, accounted unto us for Righteousness: But Positively, it is an Imputed Righteousness, or a Righteousness without us: The matter whereof is Christ's Righteousness, consisting
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Consisting partly in his Sufferings, and partly in his Obedience and Conformity to the Law of God. This is the brief Summe of that which is more largely maintained in the Book.

The Lord make this Tractate serviceable and useful unto thee for thy Spiritual Edification in Christ.

August 14th 1654.

Anthony Burgess.
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A TREATISE
OF
JUSTIFICATION.
PART II.

SECT. I.
Of the Righteous Nature of God.

SERM. I.
Demonstrations of God's Righteousness;
The Kindes of it, and in what sense
its attributed unto God.

PSAL. II. 7.
For the Righteous Lord, loveth Righteousness.

Avid being now in exile, and like a Bird (as
vers. 1.) flying from mountain to mountain
for his life, supporteth and comforts himself
with arguments from God's Righteousness.
He that had an Harp to drive out the evil spirit
from Saul, stades faith in God to be of such
efficacy to chase away all unbelief and distrust in his heart.
Therefore
Therefore _ver. 1._ he professeth his confidence and dependance on God, which is aggravated from the malice of his enemies proceeding so farre, _That the very foundations are destroyed; all help and power is gone; What then can a righteous man do? Yes, he telleth us what is to be done, There is a righteous God in Heaven, whose eyes behold all things below, yea his eye-lids try the children of men: A Metaphor from men, who when they look narrowly into a thing, shut their eyes a little: Thus God's knowledge is intuitive and exact; but this knowledge of Gods, is not a meer idle, speculative beholding, for thereby God trieth the righteous, viz. by afflictions; but as for the wicked, his soul hateth them; obserue the emphasis, its more then simply to say, God hateth them. This hatred of God in respect of the wicked, is to be illustrated by an allusion to his judgements upon Sodom and Gomorrah; Every wicked man may fear that God should inflict the like, or equivalent punishments; for all this described in the Text, though terrible, yet is not as dreadful as hell; though one said of Sodom's judgements, that God did pluere gehennam & Coel, fire and brimstone, that is the extremity of pain; an horrible tempest, that is the violence; and snares, that denoteth the inevitability; lastly God will rain all these, that denoteth abundance even to overflowing. Neither let any wicked man think this is onely to some eminent notorious sinners, like those of Sodom, for the Psalmist concludes, _This is the portion of every wicked mans cup._ But for the godly he ends with an happy proposition, _The righteous Lord loveth righteousness, and which is equivalent, His countenance beholds the upright._ The Hebrew word signifieth a diligent, exact and constant beholding, as if God were so in love with such, as he never takes his eye off from them.

I am upon the former proposition, which indeed is two, one implied, the other expressed: _Implied, The Lord is a righteous Lord._ 2. This righteous Lord loveth righteousness. To open the words.

The Lord Jehovah is first described by this Title Righteous, readdick, from which say some the Greek word δικαιος comes, as they say, _lm of justur_, but Aristotle deriveth that from
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from 
because justice consists in an equal dividing between two. The word Righteous, or God's Righteousness is used several ways; sometimes its the same with his Goodness, Mercy and Benignity, or at least his Fidelity and Faithfulness in his Promises. Thus David often praieth, Psal. 31. 1. Psal. 71. 2. So also Psal. 103. 17. that God would deliver him in his righteousness, i.e. his Mercy and Goodness: And this Righteousness of God he professeth he will make mention of; and talk of to others. Indeed some learned men, Osianer, Cameron, and all the Socinians upon a wicked interest they drive at (but the two former they do it innocently) affirm, That the Righteousness of God is never used for that whereby he punisheth sinners; but for mercy and fidelity; for say the Socinians, That whereby God avengeth himself on the wicked, is called vengeance, fury, anger or severity; But though it must needs be granted that righteousness is used so in many places, yet

1. Its more properly the Syriack use of the word, when it denoteth mercy, although the Septuagint do many times translate the Hebrew word for mercy Chessed, by δίκαιον. But

2. It cannot be denied but that in many places, its used for that propensity in God, whereby from his hatred to sinne, he punisheth wicked men; and thus it must be here, as the Context evidenceth. Thus it is evidently used 2 Chron. 12. 6. Rom. 2. 5. Therefore in the next place, righteousness attributed to God, signifieth in the general, That rectitude and purity in God's Nature, whereby he is free from all sinne, and hateth all iniquity. And then more particularly, that Attribute in God, whereby he doth punish ungodly men: And in this sense it is taken here, both for the general and particular, as is more to be shewed. We observe then from hence,

That God is a righteous God. Psal. 145. 17. Hence 2 Tim. 4. 8. he is called the Righteous Judge. And Abraham expostulateth with God on this point, Gen. 18. 25. Shall not the Judge of the whole world do right?

This Doctrine is of great importance, and my purpose being
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Of Gods righteousnes two-fold.

Of Gods universal Righteousness.

ing to treat of that righteousness whereby a believer stands justified before God, its necessary to lay this as a foundation.

To understand this truth therefore consider these Propositions following;

First, Take notice, that the Scripture attributeth a two-fold Righteousness to God, one we may call Universal, the other Particular. Universal Righteousness is that purity and integrity of his Nature considered absolutely in himself, whereby he is free from all sinne, and so its the same with Ἰαβαρ Ταμίν, &c. Even as Aristotle makes all virtue to be in Justice, because every virtue consists in a just and due temperament; and as the Apostle makes δικαιοσύνη a general to all sinne; so that Righteousness thus considered, is the same with Purity, Holiness and Uprightness, whereby whatsoever God doth, he doth it in a condecent and beseeming manner of a God. As Anselm said, Quando parcis justum est ut parcas, quando punis: When God spareth he is just, and when he punisheth he is just, that is, in whatsoever God doth, he keeps up that rectitude and holiness, which a God is to do; he doth not shew himself as a creature in those things, but as a God. Now this universal righteousness is meant in this place as the foundation, for the Psalmist argueth God will punish the wicked, and defend the upright from his nature, because he is thus universally righteous. This universal Righteousness the Scripture describeth partly positively, by the infinite purity and holiness that is in him. As the Apostle, God is light, and in him there is no darkness at all, 1 John 1. 5. and partly by his opposition to sinne, Hab. 1. Thou art of purer eyes, then to behold iniquity. So Psal. 5. 4. Thou art not a God that hast pleasure in iniquity. Thus you see we are to apprehend of God, as an infinite, holy, pure and perfect God. Hence 1am. 1. 13. the Apostle faitheth, He can never tempt others actively to sin, or he himself be passively tempted to sin.

In the next place there is his particular righteousness, and that may be distributed according to all those relations he taketh upon him, he is the Lord having absolute dominion overall, and so he is a righteous Lord in using that Sovereignty;
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Righteousness; He is a Judge, and therefore a righteous Judge, as the Apostle calls him; he is a Father, and our Saviour, John 17.25. calls him righteous Father; He is the Governor and Ruler of the world, and all this is administr'd in righteousness. Thus there is no relation, no office or state that God is pleased to asswme, as a King, an Husband, but in all these the Lord works righteously.

Again, This particular righteousness of his may be divided into several kindes or species, not that there are such multiplied beings in God, for he is most simple and pure; but we thus distinguish according to our conceptions: As if a man should look in many glasses at the same time, it would be but one face, onely there would be multiplied reflections, and many faces in the several glasses. Thus Gods essence is one and the same, every thing in God, being God, but the diversity of objects, maketh a multiplied reflection to our understanding. The kinds of his particular Justice, are (as some make it.)

1. His Mercy, they make even Gods grace and love a kind of his Justice, because its so proper and just, that the chiefeft good should be merciful.

But in the second place, there is the righteousness of his fidelity and promise, whereby he keepeth his Word; for in his promises there cometh an obligation, if not of God to us, yet of God to himself: Thus they lay he is sibi debitor in whatsoever he hath promised.

3. There is Righteousness vindicative, whereby he punisheth wicked and ungodly men, as Moses describeth God by this righteous property, That he will in no wise acquit the guilty, Exod.34.7. Therefore its but the devils case thou art put into, when thou dreamest only of mercy in God, not at the same time remembering his righteousness.

Secondly, Justice and Righteousness is truly and properly attributed unto God. There are many things attributed unto God, and that by Scripture language, which yet must be understood improperly, or metaphorically. Thus the Scripture speaks of his eyes and hands: Thus it saith, God repents and is grieved, all which are to be understood...
out any imperfection in God: Yea the words Decree and 
Council, if strictly taken, cannot be given to God, because 
in their rigorous sense they imply imperfection. Hence Scal-
liger said, Tam impia vox est consilii in Divinis, quam plura-
litas Deiatis. But righteousness is an absolute perfection, 
implying that which is excellent, and so in the highest degree 
to be affirmed of God.

When I say, Righteousness is thus an absolute perfection, 
I understand it of that general righteousness, whereby God 
is true and holy in his Nature, and in all his ways: for as 
for political and civil righteousness, even Aristotle could 
say, it was absurd and ridiculous to attribute political virtues 
to God. Indeed there is a righteousness called commutative, which consists in an equality inter a damnum & acceptum, and this some Jesuits, as Suarez Disput.de justitia Dei, would have truly and properly in God. But Vasquez another Jesu-

te doth solidly oppose it, Tom. i. Quest. 20. Dis. 85. be-
cause it would bring down God from his glorious Sovereign-
ty, and if there cannot be any strict Justice between a Father 
and a Sonne, a Master and a Servant, much less between 
God and the creature: Its true, all things we take from man 
and give to God, as to know, to understand and will, they 
have an imperfection, as they are in man, because they are 
accidents to man, and of a finite nature, yet we say (exclu-
ding the imperfection) they may in an eminent and transcen-
dent consideration be given to God analogically, not univoc-
ally; for a thing may be said to have imperfection in it acci-
dentially from the Subject, or essentially in its formal Nature, 
and what is of this later sort cannot properly be affirmed of 
God, as to grieve and repent. Now all such Justice as would 
make God a debtor to the creature, as if he did receive 
equally for what he hath given, supposeth an imperfection 
in the very nature thereof, as the Apostle argueth, Who hath 
first given to him? Rom. 11.35. And what hath thou that 
whom hast not received? Whether there be strict Justice between 
God the Father and Christ in the work of our Redemption, 
is nor in this place to be discoursed on: Its certain, between 
God and a meer creature there cannot, and therefore all
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those Popish Doctrines of Merit and Satisfaction must fall to the ground. We see then in what sense Justice is attributed properly to God, and in what sense not.

The third Proposition, There are many Arguments that do strongly demonstrate God to be thus righteous. As

1. There is an inward principle in a man's conscience, whereby he is persuaded of God's righteousness, for what is it that makes a man upon the omitting of grosse sins, such as the Law of Nature forbids, to have fear and remorse within, but the apprehension of a righteous God, who will call to a dreadful account? The very Heathens had that up often, ἦξει δοίς εὐθνον ὄμω, God hath a just and an avenging eye: Therefore Rom. 1. 32. it is brought as an aggravation against those notorious sinners, That though they knew the judgement of God, viz. That they which commit such things are worthy of death, yet not only do the same, but have pleasure in those that do them. The Gentiles knew this judgement of God. Hence Rom. 2. 15. Their consciences are said to accuse: If then you ask, How can it be proved God is a righteous God? I answer, From thy own heart, thy own soul; in this respect it is naturaliter Christiana, as Tertullian said: Oh then, where will those wretched sinners appear, who live in all prophaneness and injustice, though a conscience within them crieth aloud that God is righteous! How canst thou stop thy ears to these loud cries? All thy mirth and jollity cannot raze this out, There is a righteous God.

2. The providential government of this world, so vast, and consisting of men so unruly and carried by their lusts, doth demonstrate a righteous God. The world would be a Babel, would be an hell, had not God established an order of Superiors and Inferiors, of Governours and governed, as David acknowledged it was the Lord subdued his people under him, Psal. 18. 47. And when God touched the peoples hearts, then they followed Saul, 1 Sam. 10. 26. Thus David acknowledged Gods reigning in the world, that he is the King of the earth, and that he judgeth righteously, Psal. 67. 4. So that the harmony of a musical instrument doth not more palpably demonstrate the art of an Artificer, than the government of this
this world, doth the righteousnesse of the Governour, who is God; If a City, if a Nation cannot subsist without righteousnesse, For, take away Righteousnesse (faith Augustine,) and what are Kingdoms but great robberies? how much lesse can the world abide without a righteous preserver of it? Righteousnesse is said to go before God, Psal. 85. 13. because that makes way for him in all his works.

3. The Scriptures they are an undeniable and infallible principle to prove his righteousness. This is proclaimed in many places, Psal 74. 19. Psal. 36. 6. Psal. 103. 6. Indeed when we look upon the divine dispensations of Gods works in the world, beholding the godly sometimes in an afflicted condition, and the wicked in a prosperous; we are apt to question the righteousness of God. Through these waters of afflictions, that which is strait seemeth crooked, as in David and Jeremiah. But then come we to the Word of God, there righteousness is affirmed in all his ways, whatsoever our thoughts may be. The man that judgeth by the eye, thinketh the Sunne lefse then the world, but the Astronomer judging by principles of art, knoweth it is otherwise; Thus while we judge of Gods wayes according to humane principles, we call that unrighteous, which by Scripture light will appear most just.

4. The righteousness that Angels and Adam was created in; yea that Image of God which is repaired in every godly man, consisting in Righteousnesse and true Holinesse, this doth necessarily inferre Gods righteousness; for as the Psalme argueth, He that made the eye, shall not he see? He that teacheth man knowledge, shall not he know? Thus he that makes man righteous, shall not he much more be righteous? Is not this called the Image and likenesse of God? And why so? but because this is a representation of his Divine Essence. The creatures represent a God, but this Image doth a righteous God: If therefore thou seest any man working righteousnesse, and loving righteousness, in all his words and actions, know that righteousness is much more in the cause, in the fountain, which is God himself.

5. The particular effects of Gods primitive Justice, or his Judgements
judgements which he executeth in the world do also demonstrate his righteousness. God is not so in heaven, but his judgements, sometimes extraordinary, as in drowning of the world, burning the Cities of Sodom and Gomorrah; and sometimes his ordinary ones, do teach every one, that God is not only merciful, but just. Psal. 89. 14. Judgement and justice are the habitation of thy throne. Isa. 28. 17. By the description there of judgement laid to the line, is excellently shewed the exactness of justice God keeps to in destroying, he is as careful in destroying the mercies of a people, as an Artificer is to build an house.

6. Gods justice is evidently seen, in that the godly are not acquitted without satisfaction through Christ; even the righteousness of God makes way for all the glorious effects of his mercy, when that is satisfied then comes pardon of sins, and salvation: but of this more largely afterwards.

Lastly, The appointing of judgement and everlasting torments to all impenitent sinners, will then convince all the world of his righteousness, Act. 24. 25. Paul preaching of this made Felix tremble, and 2 Pet. 2. 3, 4. Jude v. 15. speak terribly of this argument; Oh let not ungodly men take their ease and pleasure alwayes! Think of this righteous God, that hath appointed such a righteous day: as thy works have been so will God render to thee: Shall not unquenchable fire, eternal gnashing of teeth and everlasting howling in tormenting flames make thee afraid? Nebuchadnezzar made a Law, That whosoever would not worship his Image should be thrown into a fiery fornace, and this did so terrifie every one, that none refused but the three Worthies; yet this fornace was not like to hell, whose flames never go out. Take heed then of abusing mercy, for this will bring thee at last into the hands of justice: Oh then there will be righteousness without any mercy, not a drop of water to cool the top of the tongue! Oh wretched and seduced sinners! Will your moment pleasures recompence those eternal torments? Are thy sins as great a good to thee, as hell will be a losse and torment?
Serm. II.

More Propositions concerning the Righteousness of God; Shewing that we must judge of it only by his Word; That its essential and natural to him; The Rule of all Righteousness: That God cannot do any thing against his Righteous Will. How many ways Righteousness is taken when attributed to God; And in what sense he is said to be Just in forgiving and rewarding his People.

Psalm. II. 7.

For the Righteous Lord loveth Righteousness.

We are to adde more Propositions that may clear this main Point about Gods Righteousness; And the fourth in order is, That although there be many principles that demonstrate Gods Righteousness, yet we must judge of it only by the Word. Though humane reason cannot but say, God is Righteous, yet we must not assert such a Righteousness in him
him as that would imagine, but what the Scripture directs us to: This is the Pillar to direct us in this wilderness: This is the Starre to guide. We must only learn of God, what we are to think of him, as by the light of the Sun we come to see the Sun. If the Heathen could say, that in respect of the celestial creatures and the knowledge of them, our understandings were but like the Owles eyes to the Sun, dazled more then enlightened: How much more is this true of God! What is the reason then that so many stumble at those Points in Divinity, about Gods permission and suffering of sin to be? about his discriminating of persons by Election and Reprobation? about the induration of sinners and punishing one sinne with another? about the imputation of Adams sinne to all his posterity? In these Points many have charged God with injustice only, because they judge of God by principles of humane justice. But it is well observed by Musculus, Its hard (faith he) to understand what a just God is, because its difficult to know what God is. Therefore when such opinions come to be discussed by thee, raise up thy minde to think of God, as a God; he is not a creature, he is not a sworn Judge tied by Laws, he is not under a Superior to command and prescribe him, and therefore those things are justly done by God, because he hath an absolute Dominion and Sovereignty, which if a creature should do, it would be unjust. That is excellent of Gregory to this purpose, Qui in factis Dei rationem non inventit, in infirmitate sua invent cur rationem non inventiat. He that in Gods Works cannot finde a reason of them, may easilly finde in his infirmities a reason why he cannot finde a reason. To suffer sinne to be when we can hinder it, this no creature may do; but God doth it justly. So to harden another man in sinne, no creature may do, if he could do it; but God as a just Judge doth it, not indeed by infusing wickedness, but by withdrawing or denying mollifying grace. So to cooperate to that action, to which the deformity of sinne doth necessarily adhere, a creature may not do it; but God being the suprem Lord, and not tied by such laws as men are, he therefore may as a God do that, which a man cannot do without sinne; yet this is not to be
understood, as if God had an absolute power to do any thing against his Wisdom, and his Holy and Righteous Will, as is to be shewed; only this is brought to silence those prophane disputers of the world, as Paul did, Rom. 9. who would bring God to account, and not submit to him, as having a supream Dominion over all. As many points in Religion, so the several passages of Gods Providence in this world, have made men doubt and dispute about his Righteousness, That it should fare well with a wicked man, and he prosper in his sines, and on the contrary fare as ill with a godly man, so that he shall even perish in his righteousness, Eccles. 7.15. or at least as the same wise man observeth, Eccles. 9.2. All things fall alike to all, even to the righteous and the wicked, &c. This consideration hath not only amazed the Heathens, but we see David and Jeremiah staggering under it; and indeed if we consult with humane principles, we undertake to measure the vast heavens with a little finger: but go we to Gods Word, there we see admirable arguments, declaring Gods Righteousness in all these Providences, especially that we must suspend our judgements till the last day, when God will manifest to the world his Righteousness: For as it is in the Scripture, if a man should make a full period in some verse, where there is but a comma or a colon, it would be blasphemy; As to take that verse of the Psalmist, Thou art not a God that hast pleasure in iniquity; if a man should make a full stop, reading Thou art not a God, this would be blasphemy; but if he read to the period, its excellent sense: So whosoever judgeth of Gods Righteousness by his Providential passages, before God hath made a full end, he may charge God foolishly. Learn we then from the Scripture, to judge with fear and reverence about Gods Righteousness, believing him to be Just and Righteous in all his Works, even when we cannot demonstrate it.

The fifth Proposition, Gods Justice and Righteousness is essential and natural to him, and so is the same with God. Howsoever Vorstius blasphemously asserted Accidents in God, denying what is in God to be God, That being, God, is a most simple uncompounded being, it must needs be so. God is,
Of the Righteous Nature of God.

as Tertull. de Trin. faith, not ἄλον σύνολον, but ἄλος ἄλον, he is not an integral whole consisting of parts, but totius forma, a most perfect uncompounded whole. Otherwise if we admit composition, we must also grant imperfection in him. Justice then being a property in God, its the same with his Nature: and if you say, How can God be just and mercifull to, if both be his infinite Essence? I answer, Very well, for these two Properties as essential in God, are not opposite to one another; indeed the effects of justice and mercy are sometimes contrary, but the Attributes themselves are not, of which more afterwards, as also how farre the effects of his Justice are natural, and yet free to him.

The sixth Proposition, God is so Righteous, that his Nature and his Will is the rule and measure of all righteousness. Even as in artificial things, therefore this or that work is done right or artificially, because conformable to the Idea of the Artificer which he hath in his minde: Or as Aquinas faith, Gods knowledge (viz. practical) is the cause of all created truth, and the rule of it, so also Gods holy Will is the rule and measure of all created good and righteousness; a thing being therefore just, because consonant to that eternal rule of Righteousness. Indeed there are somethings that are just and righteous in their nature intrinsically, as to love God, to do righteously with man, and these are not just because God Wils them, but they are just, and therefore he Wils them; yea such is his Perfection that he cannot but Will them, neither can he dispence to the contrary: Though even these things are therefore just, because conformable to Gods nature, or that eternal Law of Righteousness within him; for seeing they are not the first, and uncreated righteousness, but created, they must needs have a rule to measure them by.

2. There are righteous things, not from their nature, but meerly from a command, and so are righteous because commanded, as in the forbearing to eat of the forbidden fruit; so all the Levitical worship, these had no intrinsical holinesse, but therefore they were good, because required. Lastly, Bradwardin addeth a third kinde, which he calls mixta, mixed or compounded of both the other: For although it was not
of the Righteous Nature of God.

intrinsic evil for Adam to eat of the forbidden fruit, setting aside the command, yet supposing the command, then it was intrinsically evil for a creature not to obey the command of his Creator. Now as this is a mixed righteous good thing, so Gods Will about it is mixed, the one part being willed because righteous, the other righteous because willed. And this very consideration must needs convince that God cannot Will any thing unrighteously, for how can the Rule of Righteousness be unrighteous? we may better say, there cannot be any sinne, then that God can Will it, for if he should Will it, it would not be a sinne; as if the arrow were the mark, it could never miss. Oh what obediential resignation should this teach us, resign thy self unto Gods Will, as that which is most Righteous, and wherein there cannot be the least inordinacy.

VII. God cannot do a thing against his Just and Righteous Will. The seventh Proposition, We may not apprehend in God any such absolute power, whereby he may do a thing against his just and righteous Will. There is by the Schoolmen large Disputes about Gods absolute power, whether he may not forgive sin to a sinner, though he remain impenitent; and with the Socinians, Whether God may not absolutely pardon sinne freely without any satisfaction; but howsoever men may speak boldly here, intruding to things above mans reach, yet this must be concluded on, that it is a great dishonour to apprehend a power in God to do any thing against the rules of his Wisdom and Justice: (As when some Schools determine, that God may command the hatred of himself, yea that by such an hatred of God a man may mereri, merit;) for that were to conceive him a God that had power to sinne, and so to be no God: Therefore some have wholly rejected that distinction of Potestas absoluta and ordinata in God, for if it be so (faith Bonaventure) then there would be a potestas in God inordinata, to act and work inordinately: but it cannot be denied, that God hath a power to do many things, which yet he will not do; as Christ said, his Father could send him legions of Angels, and so he was able to raise up children to Abraham, even out of stones; but if God should do these things, then he would do them justly also, and righteously;
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so that do them or do them not, in each God is Righteous. And thus Scotus well explained that distinction, That there is no potentia absoluta in God, contradistinguished to ordinata, for if God should work otherwise then he did, that potentia would be ordinata. Let us not therefore give liberty to endless disputes about an absolute power in God, which we cannot comprehend, but satisfy our selves with that Will and ordered Power of his that is manifested in the Word. We may say of God and his Attributes, as Austin said of the Trinity, Dicimus tres Personas, non ut discreatur, sed ne tacetur. And that is a truth, Deus verius cogitatur quam dicitur, & verius est quam cogitat.

The eighth Proposition,This doth much tend to the clearing of the true doctrine about Gods Righteousness: Righteousness when attributed to God is taken three waies: Sometimes for an attribute in God, the same with his Nature: Thus in the text and Ps.145.17. Sometimes it is taken for the actual administration of Righteousness, for the execution of his just judgements, 2 Chron.12.6. Ezra 9.15. Lastly, for the judgements themselves, Jer. 33.15. Isa. 16.5. Even as the mercy of God is sometimes taken either for the Attribute of God, or for his actual compassion, or for the effects of his mercy, and so Gods will is either taken for the το δελεκτηνυ, the power to will, or τιν δελανιν, the act of willing, or τι δελαντον, the object willed. Now when we speak of Gods Righteousness, its of great consequence to know whether we mean his Attribute of Righteousness, or the effects, for these two exceedingly differ, as in these considerations.

1. Its a lawfull and ordinary prayer which the Church often useth, whereby she deprecateth the Justice of God, and fleeth to his Mercy: They supplicate, that God would not deal with them according to his Justice, but according to his Mercy; Now if in this prayer, by Justice should be meant Gods Attribute, there would be some blasphemy in the prayer, for God cannot but be Just, and deal justly: we may as well pray, that God would not be God. But if by Justice we understand the effects of Justice, then the prayer is very good and sound, viz. that God would not, though Just in his
his Nature, yet bring such effects of his wrath upon us, that
could overwhelm us. We pray not then against the Attribute of
God, but against the effects of it, which are subject to the
liberty of his Will, whereas his Attributes are not.

2. The effects of God's justice are various and different,
there are more upon some then upon another, but his Attri-
but cannot be so. When God executed some extraordinary
punishments upon some notorious sinners, as the old world,
the Sodomites, there we may say, God wrought more effects
of his Justice upon those sinners then others, yet we cannot
say, God is more just in punishing of them, then in other
wicked men. Even as it is in God's mercy, take it for an At-
tribute, we cannot say, God is more or les mercifull; but if
for the effects of it, then he is so in his Justice, God is alwaies
alike just, he is not more just at one time, then at another;
but the effects of his Justice may be more at one time, and in
one place then another.

3. Hence it followeth that Righteousness taken for the
effects of it, are not the same with God, neither is there a na-
tural necessity of them; but if taken for an Attribute, its the
same with God, and so God had been a just God, though
there had been no creatures made, no sinne to be punished.
As he is a Wise God, and a mercifull God, and a Mighty God,
though he had not demonstrated any effects thereof. God is
necessarily Righteous, but he doth not necessarily work such
and such effects of his Righteousnes.

4. If God's Righteousness be taken, as often it is in Scrip-
ture, for the effects of his righteousness, then there is a con-
trariety between them, and the effects of his mercy. To be
preserved alive by Mercy, and to be destroyed by Justice are
contrary, and so cannot be together upon the same subject.
Now, though the effects be thus contrary, yet the Attributes
from whence they flow are not contrary, for God is both at
the same time, infinitely Righteous, and infinitely Mercifull,
there is no contrariety between them, but the effects of these
may be in such an high degree, that they can never be toge-
ther; as a man cannot be saved and damned at the same time,
for these are the effects of Mercy and Justice in an high degree.

Indeed
Indeed if we consider some effects of these Attributes in a more remiss degree, then they may be together, and in many things God doth shew forth both his Mercy and Justice togeth-er, yea even in hell God (they say) doth some work of mercy, because he doth punish *citra condignum*, he breaketh not out to the utmost of punishment since doth deserve.

Lastly, If we take Gods Righteousness *ad intra*, as an At-tribute in him, we cannot say that God hath less of that, then of Mercy, if that also be taken as an Attribute; God is as just as he is mercifull, and as mercifull as he is just. There-fore when it is said, James 2:13. *Mercy rejoiceth against judg-ment*, and when God is described mercifull, ready to forgive, but slow to wrath, these places are to be understood of the effects of these Attributes, not the Attributes themselves, for so God is no more inclining to Mercy then to Justice, they being both Infinite Perfections in him: But if we speak of the effects, then in this life, God is more ready to shew forth the effects of his love and long suffering, as at the day of judge-ment he will more demonstrate the effects of his Justice. This is the time of mercy, then the time of Justice. Lastly, It cannot be denied but that the Scripture speaking of Gods re-warding holy men with eternal life, doth attribute it to Gods justice, as 1 John 1:9. *He is faithfull and just to forgive us our sinnes*. Heb. 6:10. *God is not unrighteous to forget your labour of love*. 2 Thess. 1:6. *where it's made a righteous thing with God to punish the persecutors of the Church*, but to give rest to them that are troubled.

This being clear, we are to examine whether Justice be here taken strictly, or meerly improperly, so as to signifie no more then the truth and fidelity of his promise, infomuch that if he should not bestow heaven upon the godly, he would be only unjust in his Word; not that he owed a godly man hea-ven, and had received of him equivalent for it. Some Papists, especially Suarez (as you heard) contends for this earnestly, That there is a true proper commutative justice between God and the godly man, when he is made happy. But this is too proud and high: 1. From the transcendency of the reward to our godly actions. In all strict justice there must be an
equality between the thing given and received, but now heav-
en is so far above all our duties, that if all the glory of the
world should be given to a man for lifting up a straw, it would
not be comparable. Genes. 31. I am less then the least of thy
mercies, faith Jacob, then much more less then the greatest;
if a man be less then a drop of water, much less then heaven it
self: so Rom. 8. These present sufferings are not worthy to that
eternal weight of glory. 2. Our condition is such, that there
cannot be any strict justice between God and us, because what-
soever we have it is his gift, Rom. 11. Who bath first given to him?
So that although God vouchsafe grace to us, yea and makes
a promise to this grace, yet he doth not lose his dominion over
us. We are his servants still, and therefore the more we have,
the more we are bound to be thankfull to him, and not to stand
on terms of justice. Therefore we see the Scripture attribu-
ting both Election, Vocation, Justification and Salvation, all
these from the first to the last, solely to his grace and good
pleasure. And hence it is that eternal life is called the gift of
God, and an inheritance, which exclude any such thoughts as
may crave it by way of justice.

Use of Instruction. How unwise they are for their salvati-
on, who look upon God as mercifull only, not at all attend-
ing to his justice, whereas you have heard God is equally
Righteous, and that he is no more mercifull then just! Hence
you have threatenings as well as promises: Why then doth not
this wound thy heart more? Is there not an hell as well as an
heaven? Is there not damnation as well as salvation? Why
then dost thou hope alwaies for one, and never fearest the
other? Now indeed mercy compasseth you about, by mercy
you eat, drink and sleep, but at the day of judgement Justice
will inviron you, then Justice prepares eternal torments, then
Justice crieth aloud, Depart ye cursed; above, below, within,
without, thou seest nothing but the effects of a just and righ-
teous God.
S E R M. III.

More Propositions about the Nature of Righteousness; Also shewing wherein God's Love to the Righteous doth appear.

P S A L. II. 7.

For the righteous Lord loveth Righteousness.

W E proceed to the second Proposition, which is expressed and declared, viz. That the righteous Lord loveth Righteousness; such as his Nature is, such he is, and such he loveth: A righteous God loveth righteous men. The Hebrew word for Love signifieth vehemently and greatly to love, and therefore seldom rendered by the Septuagint εἰρήνη, but ἠγαπάω, which is greatly rest in our love, and to be satisfied therewith as Christ is called εἰρήνης. The love of God is two-fold:

1. General and common, which is carried out to a creature as his creature.

2. More peculiar and special, whereby he doth will to the persons loved everlasting happiness and salvation; Of this love it is that the Psalmist speaketh; As for the Object of this love it is said to be righteousness. Its usual with the Hebrews for emphasis sake to put the Abstract for the Concrete, righteousness for a righteous person, as here. But then secondly, there is a further emphasis, the plural number for the singular.
regular, its righteousnesses in the Hebrew, to shew that he only is righteous, who hath all the parts and kindes of righteousness. Thus you have the word in the plural, Isa. 33. 15. As at another time it doth ingeminate the word, to signifie the emphasis also and fulness of righteousness, Deut. 16. 20. Thou shalt do justice, justice, that is, as the Translators render it, that which is altogether just.

Observe that God being righteous in his Nature doth only love righteousness in the creature. The righteous God loveth a righteous man. To manifest the truth of this, consider

I. First, That as we mentioned about Gods righteousness, so also about mans, There is a two-fold consideration of it: First, General, as it signifieth the rectitude and conformity of the whole man to Gods Law; and in this sense its most frequently used in the Scripture, and so is the same with a holy, pure and upright man. This righteousness Adam was created in, and is called the image of God; for although there was among the Romans righteous men, as Fabricius of whom they said, they might sooner turn the Sunne out of its course, then move him from what is righteous; and among the Grecians there was Aristides the just, so called by all for his righteousness, yet these did not arrive to the righteous men the Scripture speaks of, who are sanctified in their Natures, and have the Image of God by his gracious power repaired in them.

2. There are the parts and kindes of righteousness in a more particular manner, as it consists in dealing between man and man: This is distinguished from godliness, Titus 2. 12. and thus among the moral Philosophers, justice is made a special distinct moral virtue, from other virtues: By this a man hath a constant will and purpose to give to every one that is due to him; without this Societies cannot exist, and whosoever is righteous the former way, is also in this later way, he is righteous in his words, just and faithful in all his actions, as 1 John 5. He that is born of God doth righteousness.

II. Secondly, The proper Nature of Righteousnesse lieth in a conformity to the Law of God, which is the rule of righteousness,
nells, even as the proper formal nature of sinne, lieth in the
transgression of the Law. Indeed God's righteous nature and
his will, is the original and archetypal rule, but the will of
God revealed is the archetypal or copy of that original, so that
if we would judge whether an action be righteous, or a per-
son righteous, we must gather it by his conformity to the
Law of God. Indeed there go many things to righteousness,
1. An integrity or universality of the parts of it, called
therefore the Image of God; so that as a man's body is not
an hand or foot, but the comprehension of all; This neither
is righteousness in one action, or in one kinde, or at one
time, but there must be an universality of these.

2. As universality, so there must be a debitum, a due or
an obligation for the Subject to have it, as in the understand-
ing a meer nesciency is not a sinne, but an ignorance of that
we ought to know; so in the will a meer non volition, or
omission is not a sin, unless it be of that which is due either
to God or man.

3. There must be purity of intention, a love of righteou-
sesse for righteousness sake. As Anfelm defined justitia to
be Restitudo voluntatis proper ipsam servata: whatsoever is
not done for righteousness sake, and out of care to it, but
for applause, profit, or other carnal ends, that is not true
righteousness,

Lastly, Which is the formal nature of righteousness,
there must be a commensuration or adequation to the rule of
righteousness; so that ἄξιον and ὑποκειμον are all one, that
which is righteous, and that which is established by a Law.
Now the righteousness of the Pharisees, though so highly
estemed amongst men, yet was rejected by God. As a rot-
ten post, that shineth in a dark night, but when the Sun ariseth,
then all know what it is. Thus when Christ by the light of
his Ministry discovered what true righteousness was, that of
the Pharisees was manifested to be light and empty, for their
righteousness failed in universality, because they omitted
many things, and such as were chiefest failed in the debt and
obligation of it: Christ asked, Who had required those things
as their hands: it failed in the purity of intention, for they did

Many things go to Righteousness.

1.

2.

3.

4.
all things to be seen of men. Lastly, it failed in conformity to a Law, for being no commandment was for many things they did in which they placed righteousness, there could not be any conformity to a Law: for without a Law as there is no transgression, so no righteousness.

Thirdly, There are persons who are truly and really righteous. This is to be noted, because the Papists generally calumniate the Protestants, as if they held there were no righteous persons, with an inherent righteousness. Among Protestants (say they) a man hath no righteousness, but an extrinsical and imputed one; so that though a man be full of iniquity, yet he is a righteous man, because Christ's righteousness is made to him, but this is a notorious reproach; for although we say indeed, that the holiest men which live, have not a holiness inherent in them, whereby they stand justified before God, yet they have a true personal, inward, habitual righteousness, as also an outward actual one, which doth in truth, though not in perfection agree with the rule; and this is clear, for the Scripture giveth both the titulum, and the rem, the title and nature of righteousness to them. The title thus, Abel and Noah, Zachary and Elizabeth, are said to be righteous persons, and it gives the nature of it to them, in that it saith, They walked in all the Commandments of the Lord unblameably, as also in that they are renewed according to the image of God, which consists in righteousness and true holiness, for although this righteousness they have be not perfect, yet its true: So that hereby even God himself distinguisheth them from sinners and ungodly persons, and although some cleaveth to them, yet they are denominated righteous from the more noble and excellent quality in them, as we say a man is rational, though his body be void of reason. There are then persons sanctified by the grace of God, who are truly and indeed righteous.

But yet fourthly, God loveth none to justification and special favour with him, unless he have a perfect compleat righteousness answering the rule, which because the most righteous men on earth have not, therefore they need a righteousness without them to be made theirs. Hence Paul Phil. 3. Would not be found in his own righteousness,
righteousness, but that which is by faith in Christ: And David also prayeth God would not enter into judgement with him, for then no flesh would be justified, Psal. 143.2: We must not then trust or depend upon this inherent righteousness of ours, but fly to an imputed righteousness. As Luther expressed it, We must go from an active righteousness to a passive, from that we do to that we receive, for God requireth a perfect righteousness which we have not: But of this more in its proper place. Come we to shew wherein God's love to righteousness doth appear.

And first, There cannot be a better testimony of it, than the Law of God, or his Commandments, Which in all particulars requireth exact and perfect righteousness. The holiness of God's Word doth demonstrate the Divinity of it: All the moral Philosophers have not attained to the shadow of that righteousness, which the Word commands; this requireth inward and outward righteousness; this commands a righteous heart, and righteous thoughts, and righteous affections, a pure spring as well as pure streams. Hence it is when a man comes to be sanctified, that with Paul, He delighteth in the Law of God, Rom. 7. and with David accounts it above all riches and sweetness, Psal. 19, because its such a spiritual and holy Law: but wicked and unsanctified men they cannot endure it.

Secondly, God's love to righteousness appeareth in all his hatred and wrath against sin. Its that only which God hateth and will punish to all eternity; God hateth not any, because afflicted, poor or miserable; yea he pitieth such, but if thou art wicked, then his soul is set against thee: Look in the Scripture, and whosoever you read of God's hatred, anger, vengeance and fury, its always because men have sinned against him, Psal. 47.7. Thou lovest righteousness and hatest iniquity. These two are necessarily joyned together: Even as we are commanded Rom. 12. to hate that which is evil. The word signifieth, to hate it, as we do hell it self, to be as unwilling to sinne as to be damned, and then cleave to that which is good. The word signifieth to be glued to it with Intimate and adhering affections; if we then would know how greatly Wherein God's love to righteousness doth appear.

1.

2.
greatly God loves righteousness, it will appear by his wrath and punishments of unrighteousness, Psal. 7.11. God is angry with the wicked all the day long. There is not an hour, a moment wherein God is not provoked against a wicked man, especially God's hatred against sin, is seen in ordaining everlasting, endless torments, and that for the least sin, so that the least vain thought, or idle word, if not repented of, God hath appointed eternal torments, as their reward, though thou hast committed no other sin. Therefore it is not only against hainous and notorious sins, but even the least that God hath prepared those eternal flames of hell. Hence we see his fury against the Angels, throwing them into everlasting chains of darkness, and meekly because of sinful thoughts, and corrupt motions of the will, for they being spiritual substances, were not capable of other sins: Oh then, let every one tremble at the commission of the least sin, seeing God hath declared such anger against it.

Thirdly, God's love to righteous persons appeareth in all his mercifull and gracious works he vouchsafeth to them. They onely are the object of his Love and Delight, to such only he doth communicate himself. As

1. By the Scripture we see his constant approbation and complacency is in such, Psal. 1.6. The Lord knoweth the way of the righteous; he knoweth it by approbation, by love and special blessings vouchsafed to it: So that all the way of a righteous man, not onely some actions, but his whole conversation is pleasing to him, we may say the contrary to what is spoken of the wicked; God is pleased with the righteous all the day long. That is a remarkable expression, Psal. 34.15. which for the excellency of it is alledged 1 Pet. 1.12. The eyes of the Lord are upon the righteous, and his ears open to their cries. The eyes of the Lord are upon them, not towards them, to shew the great delight and care of God, he never takes his eye off them, yea both eyes and ears are for them. This (to speak after men) implieth that God is (as it were) taken up wholly with them, as if there were no other work to be done in the world.
world by God, but his attendance and care over the righteous: Oh then, how happy are such that walk in all Righteousness! The eyes of God are always upon them for good.

2. As his great love is thus towards them, so his preservation and protection of them is admirable in all calamities and miseries. Thus Noah, because a righteous person, and a Preacher of Righteousness, hath an Ark to preserve him, when the whole world is drowned; and so Lot, 2 Pet. 2.8. a righteous man, and whose righteous soul was vexed, tormented, as if he had been in hell (the word may so signify.) The Scripture faith concerning him, That the Lord knoweth how to deliver such. Prov. 11.8. The righteous is delivered out of trouble, and the wicked cometh in his room: Yea, Prov. 21. 18. The wicked is said to be a ransom for the righteous, that is, God will give up many wicked men to destruction to preserve a righteous man. Are not then those promises or Scripture truths powerful demonstrations of God's love to righteous persons?

3. God's love to the righteous doth further appear, in that for their sakes he keeps off judgments from the wicked of the world, as Gen. 18. we have a full proof of it, when God condescended so far, as to say, For ten righteous men's sake, he would not have destroyed Sodome and Gomorrab; So that righteous men are the pillars and a foundation of the Land: Therefore the Prophet complains, Isa. 51.1. The righteous man perisheth, and none layeth it to heart: Why should they lay to heart the death of a righteous man? Because for his sake God continueth many mercies, and with all his death is a sad Prognostick of imminent calamities: Therefore its added, The righteous is gathered; A Metaphor either from those who gather up their Jewels and Plate together, when a fire is rising upon an house, or else from the Shepherd that gathereth his Flocks together into some place of defence, when he seeth a violent storme coming.

4. God loveth the righteous, in that his goodness is not only vouchsafed to them, but to their posterity also. So accept
table is righteousness to God, that where he findes it, not only the persons themselves, but their seed after them shall be blessed, Prov. 11. 22. The seed of the righteous are delivered. When righteous parents are dead and forgotten by all their neighbours, yet God remembreth such; and though their seed be exposed to the world, and all do forget their parents, yet God will not: especially that famous place is never to be forgotten, Psal. 37. 25. where David professeth, That in all the experience he had from his younger years to his old age, He never saw the righteous forsaken, or his seed begging bread. This place hath much exercised the thoughts of Interpreters, for we reade David himself asking for bread of Abimelech the Priest; and Lazarus, whose soul was received into heaven, lay at the rich mans gate, begging even for very crumbs of bread. To this many reply several answers. Some place it upon Davids experience, he doth not say, that in no age the righteous or his seed may not beg bread; but he in all his time had not observed it. Others place it in the nature of beggary, that is, say they, a punishment and a curse by the Law of God; and therefore though the righteous may be so poor, and their seed also, as to need sustenance from others, yet the curse of this poverty, which is called beggary, is taken from them. Thus some reconcile that seeming contradiction, Deut. 15. 4. where God promiseth so to bless them, that there shall be no poor amongst them; yet at vers. 7. he faith, If there be any poor amongst you, thou shalt release unto him when seven years come, &c. By the former poor is meant a Beggar, one that is cursed by Gods Law; By the second, any needy person that wants relief from others.

Others they answer this difficulty from the word [forsaken] They never saw the righteous forsaken, nor his seed, though begging bread, not forsaken, because if God doth not always provide necessaries for them, yet he doth support them inwardly, and bless them with a contented spirit, as the Martyr said, If they took away his food from him, God would take away his stomach from him.

Others, They answer it from the exposition of the word righteous,
righteous, which (say they) doth not signify a strict, just, righteous man, but a liberal beneficent man; for by liberal things a liberal man is said to stand, Isa. 38.8, and many promises of earthly comforts are made to such as are compassionate to those that are in necessities.

Some answer it from the Hebrew word seeking or begging, which signifies such an anxious, careful seeking as Heathens do, without any faith in God, and any hope to speed.

Others distinguish between an occasional begging, and a constant, perpetual way. David begg'd bread of Abimelech and Nabal; so Elisha of the widow of Sarepta: but this was occasional not perpetual.

But lastly, That which is most satisfactory is, that such places which either promise or declare the outward prosperity of the righteous, are to be understood by light from other places of Scripture, and that is, They shall never fall into such outward calamities, unless when God seeth it good for them, for sometimes chastisements and afflictions are better than mercies, as Austin said, There was crudelis quaedam misericordia, and misericors quaedam savitiae. This is certain, when wealth and outward comforts are good for them and their seed, they shall always have them; and if they were as necessary to them as Christ is, God would no more deny that to them, than he doth Christ. But you must know, these promises of earthly mercies are more frequent in the Old Testament, as being more suitable to that dispensation.

5. God loveth righteousness, because in and by that God doth comfort and support the hearts of those that are so. It is observable what is said, Isa. 58.8, of a righteous man, His righteousness shall go before him, i.e. that shall make way for his acceptance with God and man. There shall not be any Law or barre to him from coming into Gods presence. He shall not with Esther say, I have not been called into the Kings presence, and so make it hazardous to go in unto him. Their righteousness, as you see in Job, was the testimony or evidence they had against all fears and doubts. Hence Prov. 3.32. His secret is said to be with the righteous; and Ephes. 6.14. it is called the breast-plate of righteousness. This is a good Nurse in our old
age. This is like young Abishag in old Davids bosom: as
Hezekiah, Remember, O-Lord, that I have walked before thee
in truth and uprightness of heart.

Lastly, God will crown righteous men with everlasting glory.
If Mal.3.ult. God faith in the end of his dispensations even
in this world, they shall discern between the righteous and
the unrighteous, how much more will this be true at the
day of Judgement, when the goats shall be placed at the left
hand, and commanded to depart into everlasting fire, but the sheep
and the righteous shall be called to inherit that glory which was of
old prepared for them!

Use of Instruction. Doth the Lord love righteousness,
then do thou exercise thy self in the way of righteousness
all the day long, both universal and particular righteousness.
Conform thy whole man to Gods rule, live not according
to thy lusts, to the principles of the world, but according to
Gods will; Be righteous in thy words, in thy actions, in all
thy dealings. Beware no such wicked thought arise in thy
heart, as to think, If I deal righteously, if I do not lie, cheat,
defraud, I shall not enrich my self, I shall lose such and such
advantages. Its a Proverb raised from hell, He that useth ho-
nesty or righteousness shall die a beggar; I grant that in this
wicked world, a mans righteousness may hinder him of ma-
ny advantages, which unjust men will greedily imbrace, and
therefore Thracsmachus the Heathen called Righteousnesse
μάλιστα γεννόμενον παρθένον, a general and noble folly. But stay till
the end of all, till the day of Judgement, then you will see
the difference God will make between the righteous and un-
just, then the unjust will vomit up all this sweet morsel, and
will become a beggar indeed, crying for a drop of water, and
cannot have it.
S E R M. IV.

Answers some Objections against God's Righteousness in himself, and his love to Righteousness in men.

Psalm 11.7.

For the Righteous Lord loveth Righteousness.

I shall conclude the subject mentioned in the Text, viz. God's Righteousness in himself, and his love to it in man, when some few eminent Objections are Answered. The work remaining to be done, is to clear some Objections which are made against God's Righteousness; for even Owles have adventured to look into this dazeling Sun, and Dwarfs would measure these Pyramids.

And the first Objection usually raised is this, How can God be said to love Righteousness, to approve and command that only, seeing that in the Scripture we see him commanding those things that seem to be very unjust and against nature? The famous instances are, 1. God's command to Abraham, that he should offer up his only son Isaac, Gen. 22.2. Was not this to will Abraham should do that which was most unnatural? 2. They instance in the Israelites, Exod. 11.2. Exod. 3.22. Exod. 12.35. Where God commands Moses to speak to the Israelites, that they borrow Jewels and Vessels of Gold of the Egyptians, as if they intended to restore them again, whereas thereby they robbed and spoilt the Egyptians. Is not this for God to allow and command thefts and lying? The third instance is from Hosea 1.2. Where the Prophet...
Prophet is commanded to take a wife of whoredoms, i.e. an eminent and notorious whore, and to beget children of whoredoms. And ver. 3, the Prophet did thus. Now this seemeth to be a very wicked and scandalous thing that the Prophet is commanded to do; and therefore by these instances, How can we say God doth so love Righteousness that he hateth all iniquity?

But these texts may easily be cleared.

For the first, God's command to Abraham to kill his son, was not absolute and peremptory, it was only a command of trial, to discover his faith and obedience; for though Abraham received it as an absolute command, yet the event shewed it was only conditional, and for trial. But secondly, Grant that God had peremptorily required this, so as that Abraham had obeyed it, yet herein God had willed no unjust or unrighteous thing, because God hath an absolute, supreme, and unlimited dominion over all men's lives, so that although one man is bound not to kill another, yet God may take away any man's life, when and how he pleaseth: God may annihilate all men, seeing he only created them, and gives them all the being they have. So that if God might have destroyed or killed Isaac immediately by his own hand, he might also command Abraham to be an instrument thereunto. Hence also it is, that God might without injustice or wrong have commanded men to have been sacrificed to him as beasts were, as we see the Heathens did their, thereby acknowledging God's supreme dominion: but he being full of mercy and compassion appointed the sacrifice of beasts in man's stead, which was witnessed by the sacrificers laying his hand upon the sacrifice. Its true God by reason of his justice cannot destroy or afflict his creature by way of punishment, unless it be for sinne, for they two are necessarily conjoin'd; but simply to kill or destroy from his dominion and supreme power, he may without any shadow of wrong; yea such is God's infiniteness, and we are so totally depending on him in all things, that he cannot do us any injury at all.

And as for the second instance, we must confess that it did much perplex Austin of old, to answer Faustus the Manichee, who held, that the God of the Old Testament was not the same
sake with the God of the New, and they bring this particular, where God is said to command the people both to lie and steal from the Egyptians: but we shall answer to the first thing, that which seems to be stealing and robbing; secondly, to the manner, that which seemeth to be lying and defrauding. For the former, it was not theft or robbery in the Israelites to take the Egyptians goods; for God (as you heard) who is the Lord of all things, he may take the goods that one man enjoyeth and give them to another, and this he doth when men have wickedly abused them to his dishonour. Now the Egyptians had abused their gold and silver to idolatry, they had oppressed the Israelites and not paid them for their work and service; God therefore whose is the earth and the fulness thereof, he bestoweth those goods upon the Israelites: Even as he took the Land of Canaan from the Nations that were the lawfull possessors thereof, for their impiety and wickedness, and gave it to the Israelites. Thus we are in these instances to have an eye upon Gods dominion, and although he hath given such good things to the inhabitants of the earth, yet he hath not alienated his dominion, or propriety, but he is Lord still, and therefore when any abuses the mercies he betrufteth them with, he takes them away and giveth them to others. But you must know that though God doth thus, yet men may not upon presumption that other men are wicked and unworthy adventure to do so, being bound by the Law of a Superiour, but God is not so tied: And by this we may answer that question, Whether God can dispense with the Law and duties of nature, or the morality of any of the ten Commandments, to give a man leave not to love him, or to lye and steal? For seeing God is thus holy and righteous, he cannot approve of, or command anything that is intrinsically a sinne, or dispence with any duty that is intrinsically good, for the Decalogue in the moral part of it, is of eternal, immutable and perpetual verity. As the fire burneth in every Country alike, so what is naturally just and righteous, is everywhere so. Even Tully, lib.3. de rep. could say, that the Law of nature was such a Law, Nec proregari fas est, nec derogari hoc aliqud licet, nec satis abrogari potest.
potest, non per Senatum or per populum can we be freed from this Law: yea God himself, because his holy Will is an eternal Law to himself, cannot free the creature from it. Indeed some Schoolmen have said, No action is intrinsically evil, but becomes so, because God forbids it, and therefore say that usual position, Some things are evil because prohibited, Some things are prohibited because evil, is true only with man, not with God, with whom they say nothing is evil, unless because of his prohibition. Hence is that detestable position of Mayso, lib. sent. dist. 17. que. 2. That God might have made a Law, that whosoever shall blaspheme him should be blessed in heaven, and whosoever should praise him should be thrown into hell. But the bitter root of such opinions is, because they hold nothing is intrinsically evil or good. Its true if we speak of actions in their physical entity, so there is no evil intrinsical to them; but take them as moral actions, so to hate God, to lie or steal can never be but sines. The Israelites action therefore in taking the Egyptians goods, was not theft, not that God dispensed with his Law, but altered the object and propriety; so that by the true Master of all, that which was the Egyptians is now become the true possession of the Israelites. And further, Theft is the taking of another mans goods against his will, but God did so bow the Egyptians hearts, that they willingly gave them their goods. Hence Exod. 12. 36. where it is translated the Egyptians lent them, according to the Hebrew it is, They even made and provoked the Israelites to ask of them, they were so willing to help them. And as for the later doubt, which the Manichees objected, God by Moses taught them to lye and defraud, for they borrowed these goods of the Egyptians, intending to spoil them thereby. Its true Austin could not well resolve it, but said, Though we cannot tell how they did well, yet we are to believe it. But though we translate the word borrowing, yet the Hebrew word is for to ask and require, therefore we cannot from the text prove any more then that they did crave and ask those goods of the Egyptians, and although there was no reason why they should grant them such a request, the Egyptians having been such oppressing enemies always
alwaies of them; yet here appeared God's wonderfull power, that he could so suddenly turn their hearts and make them favourablc to them. *Bonvfoins* the Jesuite in loc. faith, they might lawfully borrow those Jewels of the Egyptians, and yet be not guilty of any fraud, though they paid them not again, because there was such a condition implied. Unless these goods prove to be our own, and thus it was with them. But though the Israelites in borrowing did not reveal all the truth, yet they denied none; and it is not necessary in every case to reveal all the truth, though it be always necessary to deny none.

The third instance is from *Hosea* 1.3. God's command to Hosena, that he should take a woman of whoredoms to wife. This instance hath also much tortured the thoughts of most Learned men; yea great parties have been made about it. There are three several waies of Interpretation, all which have Learned abettors; but which way soever it fall, there will not appear any thing as if God did love or command unrighteousness. *Ribera* the Jesuite holds that the Prophet did really take a notorious whore to wife, though by her marriage to the Prophet she became holy, and so the scandal was taken away, and for this he alreadgeth many Authors; but this seemeth not probable, and therefore *Tarnovius* doth by many solid reasons confute this, *Exercit. Bibl.* 605. In the second place *Tarnovius* following *Luther*, faith, The Prophet took a godly sober woman to wife, but put those infamous names upon her and her children, thereby to admonish the people of Israel, that they were guilty of such whoredoms. The third is of *Rivet* and others, who make this not to be really done by the Prophet, no not so much as in vision, but understood it as a Parable, Go thou and prophesie to the people of Israel, who have indeed been married to the Lord, but they have proved full of whoredoms: and they are called the Prophet's wife, because he was now in a special manner by his prophesie to take care of them. This is thought to be the most genuine interpretation, and accompanied with least inconveniencies, for though it depart from the letter of the text, yet that is lawfull, when in the letter there is any indecent
of the Righteous Nature of God.

indecent or dishonest thing commanded, as Austin of old observed. But as for our purpose, in none of these is any unrighteous thing commanded; no not in the first interpretation, because they say, this woman, though formerly an whore, yet by the Prophets marriage of her was reduced to a sober and chaste life: And thus much for the direction of your understandings in those famous instances.

A second doubt, which not only the Learned, but the ignorant, yea all make, is; That if God thus love righteous men, in all these several ways, as hath been showed. How comes it about then, that many times the righteous man is in a worse outward condition then the wicked? that he may perish in his righteousness? Do not these glorious words seem to be like a deceitful brook to the weary traveller? and do not Divines, when they answer this Objection by several distinctions, as the Astronomers, who when they are not able to answer many arguments, fain Orbs and Epicycles in the Heavens? Is not experience against all this?

To which we Answer, Though God hath made such promises to the righteous, yet seeing none is absolutely and completely righteous, it is no wonder if they meet with several afflictions for those relics of corruption abiding in them. In heaven, there the righteous is compassed about with all blessedness, because he is inwardly perfected with all righteousness, as in the upper region there are no disturbing Meteors: But we are not in this life so high, and therefore being subject to many unrighteous, unholy thoughts and actions, it is no wonder that we have the rod sometimes on our backs.

2. There are many particular exercises of righteousness, as its taken for the universal rectitude of the whole man, which cannot be demonstrated but under afflictions and calamities. Now God will have us put forth every kinde of righteousness: Were there not afflictions we could not discover our patience and humility, nor such love to God, and obedience to him; afflictions being like the winde that bloweth upon the flower, which makes it smell the sweeter, and like the pouring of Frankincense, that is the more fragrant.
3. God though he afflict the righteous, yet cannot be said the less to love them, yea he loveth them the more; and did he not love them, he would not chasten them, for whom God loveth he chastens, Rom. 3. and Heb. 5. Without this we are bastards and no children. Now the love of God in afflicting his own children, is discovered, In the original of afflictions, In the final cause of them, and In the effects thereof.

In the Original, for they come from God's tender love; though he be angry, yet it's an anger of love, and therefore whom God hateth he will not punish; yea he delivers them up to their lusts without any affliction to hinder them, so that thou maist from those very afflictions say, Now I know the Lord loveth me, that he will not let me runne with all delight in the waies of sinne; as David confessed it was God's faithfulness to afflict him, for till then he went astray, Psal. 119.75.

2. There is love in the Final cause, God therefore chasteth the righteous, that sinne may be bitter, that the light of his countenance may be more to them, then all the world; that they may be weary of this Egypt, and long for Canaan; Were not these thorns put under us sometimes, we should lie down too sweetly and securely in the bosom of the creatures, so that some afflictions are as necessary as thy food and raiment to thee: This rod of correction beats out the folly in thy heart, this filing of thee takes off thy rust.

3. There is love in the Effects thereof, for being sanctified by God, they purge from sinne, they consume the dross, they winnow away the chaff, and are the happy physic which God the wise Physician administers to the soul; so that although, as the Apostle faith, No affliction is for the present joyful, but grievous, Heb. 12.11. yet the effect thereof is peace and righteousness. There is not any affliction God hath brought on thee, but thou wilt say in the end thereof, that God loved thee, therefore he did so to thee, yea thou wilt blest God, as David did, for those chastisements; Who was I that the Lord did take such notice of me, that he hedged in my way with thorns? Oh I had been undone, if I had found the way to sin broad and open!

Lastly,
Lastly, these afflictions are of love, if you consider the usefulness and serviceableness of them to assure and evidence unto us the truth of our grace, for when we shall continue in the way of righteousness, when there is no earthly encouragement, yea when there are all outward disheartenings, this is a sign we love righteousness for righteousness sake: as Jacob's love was manifested to be unslaine, when he endured all that hardship for Rachel, Job discovered the sincerity of his heart, when he would trust in God and depend on him, even then when God seemed to be most against him: He did to God, that which Paul speaks of the Galatians, he loved them, though they loved him the least. When righteousness and prosperity go together, thou canst not tell to which thy heart doth most adhere: as a servant behind two great Lords, you cannot tell to which he belongs till you see them part: Thus when righteousness and outward advantages go together, you cannot well tell which you love best; but when it cometh to this, that thou must part with righteousness or worldly profits, and thou wilt readily leave the later, to enjoy the former, this declareth the soundness of thy graces: That thou art like the sea, which though never so much water rain upon it, yet that keeps its natural taff and saltness. Though afflictions one after another come upon thee, yet thou dost not repent of thy righteousness, but art resolved to live holily, though for its sake thou lookest goods, honours, and life itself.

I shall only mention one Objection more: If God be Righ-
teous and thus loves righteousness, then how comes it about that he suffer's sin to be, which he can so easily hinder? yet how are these many places of Scripture to be understood, which attribute even the evil of sin to him? Thus God is said to harden Pharaoh's heart, Exod 4.21. Joseph tells his brethren that it was not they, but God that sold him, Gen.45.8. David saith, God bid Shimei curse him, 2 Sam.16. God bid the lying spirit go and be in the mouth of the Prophets, 1 Chron.18.21. God is said to give men up to their lusts, Rom.1. God is said to give men up to strong de-
lusions to believe a ly, 2 Thess.2.11. Yet that great sinne of killing the Lord Christ, is said to be forordained by the hand and coun-
I acknowledge this is a deep Point, and require a large Answ.  
Treatise, it hath exercised both the Ancient and later Teachers in the Church of God: But so farre as it may relate to our matter in hand, I shall answer in some particulars; and the rather because Lorinus the Jesuite from this text, God loveth righteousness, doth charge the Protestants as making God the author of sinne, and so to love sinne as well as righteousness. To clear this, consider first, That in the doctrine of Gods will about sinne, some speak in the defect, and some run into a blasphemous excess. The Papists would conclude all that God wils or doth about sinne, under a mere bare permission, though in the explication some use more rigid and hard expressions then the Protestants do. But certainly those Scripture expressions before mentioned, signifie more then a bare permission. In the excess run those blasphemous Libertines, against whom Calvin wrote, that made God the author of all the sins they committed, saying it was not they that did thus and thus, but God in them, as some alate have written blasphemously to that purpose. But the truth lieth between these, it goeth not to the right hand or left: for its certain the Scripture attributeth such actions as are sins to God, even as it doth at other times hands and eyes; so that all the difficulty is, how we must understand these and not blaspheme the holy Nature of God. Learned men alledge a speech of Hugo, Godly souls are startled when they hear God wils sin, viz. to be, and they abhor it, Non quia non bene dicitur, sed quia non bene intelligitur. In the first place therefore, let this be laid down as a firm Conclusion, That God cannot properly and positively will sinne in others, or sinne himself, or tempt, and incourage, or incite others to sin, neither can be be the author of sin. The Sun may suffer an eclipse and lose the manifestation of light, but James 1. with God there is no shadow of change. The Word of God speaks wholly to this purpose, Psal. 5. Thou art not a God that willest iniquity: The Hebrew word signifieth to take pleasure and delight in it: yea Hab. 1. his eyes are so pure they cannot endure to behold it. Thus whatsoever anger or wrath you reade God hath, its only against sin; for this all.
all his judgements are, for this he hath appointed those eternal flames of hell; so that though the damned creature lieth roaring to all eternity, yet he cannot get a day of ease; how then can God be said to Love or Will that which he only abhorreth, and hath decreed to punish with such unspeakable torments? James 1. 23. doth directly speak to this, God is not tempted, nor can be tempt others, but every one is seduced by his own lusts: And indeed there are strong reasons for this: First, Because of the perfect and infinite Knowledge in God, whereby he knoweth evil in all the abhorrency and vileness of it; so that if God should sinne (pardon the supposition) it would be against the greatest light that ever was, which is the highest aggravation of a sin, as we see in the Apostate Angels; but Gods Knowledge is so perfect, that no evil can intrinicate into him. 2. Gods holy Nature and Will is the rule and measure of all righteousness; so that if it were possible for God to Will a sin, it would by his willing of it cease to be sin, it would thereby be made good; so that we may better say, there can be no such thing as sin, then that God can Will it. 3. Sin hath no proper efficient but a deficient cause; now the perfection of God is so Infinite and Absolute, that there cannot be any defect conceived in him: Therefore not only in the Church of God, but even amongst the wisest Heathens, this hath been an ingrained principle, that God could not Will sin. Therefore take heed of charging thy sins upon God, thou canst not help it, God giveth not thee the grace he doth others. This we are prone to, as appeareth by Adam at first, The woman thou gavest me, bid me eat: So by the Apostles exhortation, James 1. Let no man say God tempted him, for how canst thou charge God thus foolishly, when he hath implanted a conscience to accuse and arraign thee upon the commission of sin? Though none know of it, yet thou fearest and tremblest; which made Seneca say, Maxima peccantium pars est, peccasse, and sceleris in scelere supplicium est. Whence come those fears and horrors, if God did not hate sin?
SER M. V.

A Modest Enquiry into Gods Providence about Sinne. How farre he works about it, and yet no sinne to be imputed to him. And why God lets sinne to be.

PSAL. II. 7.

The Righteous Lord, loveth Righteousness.

GOD (we have heard) is neither the willer or author of sinne. This both Scripture, and the reason of Heathens have acknowledged; yet seeing that sinne could not be, if God would hinder it, and therefore both at the same time it is contra voluntatem Dei, yet not sine Dei voluntate; and seeing the Scripture in many places doth so clearly attribute such things as are sins to God. Let us modestly enquire into Gods Providence about sinne, how farre he works about it, and yet no sinne to be imputed to him. Modestly (I say) because in this Subject Augustine doth often runne to a modus occultus, sed semper justus, and a modus sine explicabilitas sine inexplicabilitas. Yes that profound Doctor Bradwardine de causa Dei, cap. 32. after he had in a most sublime manner descanted of this Theme, he ends his Chapter with this, In magnitudine hujus questionis mallem maiores audire, quam ego minimus respondere.

That
That we may therefore avoid all rocks, let us consider first how farre, or wherein Gods will is conversant about sin, and wherein it is not. And

First, This is agreed upon by all, that God hath a permissive will about sinne. He doth not simply and absolutely will it, nor yet peremptorily ill it, for then it could not be, but he wils the suffering of it. This permissive will of God is an efficacious will in some sense; for it is not as when a man faith to another, Do what you will, I will have no hand in it one way or other, but its truly and really a will, not of the sinne but of the permission of sinne, only the Orthodox call it a permissive will, in opposition to that approving and efficacious will God hath in good things, for the good things that are, God doth both facere and ordinare, make and order; but evil things he doth not make, onely he orders them. The word then is used to shew a difference between Gods will in good things and in evil; so that its a wretched calumny of the Papists, as if the Orthodox did hold, That Judas his betraying of Christ, was as much willed by God, as Peters confession of him. We grant, that God hath a permissive will, as Genes. 20. God told Abimelech, He had not suffered him to commit sinne; only we say, Permission is not all God doth, and the Scripture expressions of Gods work about sin, signifies more then that; only when we say, God permits sin to be, we must not take permission in such a sense, as when Christ said, Moses suffered the Israelites to give a bill of Divorce for the hardnesse of their hearts; for according to some mens opinion, that permission made such repudiating to be no sin: nor is it in such sense, as when its disputed, whether a Magistrate may suffer fiew-houses or hereticks; for in that sense, though permission doth not signifies an acquittance from sinne, yet an immunity from punishment; but God never permits sinne in any such sense: only by permission we mean Gods will not to impede or hinder a man from sinning, when if he please he can do it immediately. Therefore Gibiers expresseth it well, That God doth not permittere potestari, but potentiis; lib. 2. de liber. he doth not permit it, that any one shall have right or privity or privilege, and impunity to sinne; but to the powers or faculties
faculties of the soul, by not restraining them. This permissive will of God must needs be acknowledged; for who can say, sinne comes into the world absolutely against Gods will, he would have hindered it, but could not; this is to make Gods will not omnipotent, and mans will stronger then his.

Hence in the second place, Let us say no more in Gods will about sinne, then the Scripture, and plain reason will compel men, yet we shall never be able to satisfy cavilling spirits. For grant but this bare permissive will; will not the profligate man cavil and say, Why doth God suffer me to runne head-long into sinne? Why doth he see me tumbling and falling, and doth not reach out his hand? If a man should see a blind man running head-long upon deep pits and precepies, it would be a sinne in a man not to stop that blinde man; yet God seeth blinde, infirm, miserable man falling into sinne, but doth not say him. Thus profligate men would cavill, and all, because they would have God obliged and tied by such Laws, as man is: Yea, if we do grant a fore-knowledge in God barely about sinne, that he fore-knew when he created Adam, that he would sinne and undo all his posterity, at this the froward heart of man will cavill, as well as at any thing else. This is good to be observed, because of some men who affect new opinions, thinking thereby to stop every froward spirit in this point; for that's impossible; for seeing God doth permit sinne, Sciens & volens, and if man should do this, it would be blame-worthy in him, we must needs acknowledge, that God is not bound by such Laws, as man his creature is.

Thirdly, Gods will, yea and his working or causality goeth to the material of every sinne. He produceth every act to which sinne is annexed, though not the sinne, In him we live, and move, and have our being; the tongue of the blasphemer, the hand of the thief could not move to sinne, did not God inable thereunto; only as man doth it, he fianeth, because he is deficient from that rule, whereby he ought to walk, but God who is perfection it self cannot deviate from his eternal Law of holiness within himself. This indeed hath greatly

exer-
exercised some, how God can produce the act of sinne to which deformity is annexed, and yet not be the author of sinne; and the rather, because sinne being either a privation, or else as others a positive relation at most, it cannot be brought about any other way then by causing the fundamentum, which is the material ad which sinne adhereth; As the withdrawing of light doth thereby produce darknesse, and darknesse cannot otherwise come to be, there cannot be any positive efficiency of it: Neither will it avail to say, God wils not sinne qua sin, in this action, for so neither doth man, it being not possible that a man intending evil, should thereby work it, for evil qua evil is not the object of the will, no more then falsum qua falsum can be of the understanding; how then to clear God, and yet make man culpable, is the great work to be done; and those emphatical expressions of the Scripture about Gods will concerning sinne made those Libertines Calvin wrote against Opus. ad liber attenuate not only the actions, but the laxity and inordinati- tion thereof to God, whereby they could not endure that it should be said, Such a man murdered or committed adultery. They said it was blasphemy to say so, because it was Gods work not mans. Thus, saith Calvin, they transformed God into the devil, and made him equal, if not worse, then him. But as the Cloud was light to the Israelites, and darknesse to the Egyptians; so the Scripture is a Rule of light and order to godly, sober mindes, but a cause of stumbling and off- fence to carnal, vain hearts. But you may say, How can it be that the same action proceeding from God, and from man, that it should be a sinne as it cometh from man, and not from God? Some to avoid this, as Durand of old, and Dodo of late, have maintained, that God hath no immediate con- course or efficiency in our actions: God, say they, created man with a power and ability to do such and such actions, he giveth him onely the power, and man acteth afterwards wholly of himself. But the Scripture speaketh otherways, In him we live and move; and if this were so, then God could not repreffe the action of a creature without destroy- ing the power; but we reade, God hindered the fire
from burning; and yet it remained fire having a power to burn.

Others, they say, Therefore God is not the cause of the sinne, though of the action, because he cooperateth only in the way of a physical or natural cause, not moral, by approving, counselling or allaying of it, as Canus and Vasquez; but that is not satisfactory.

Bellarmine, and so most of the Jesuites, they say, God is freed, because he concurreth only as an universal cause, he offereth his aid, as that which is indifferent, and so by man is used to a good or bad action. But certainly this cannot clear God; for how unworthy is it to conceive of God thus? As if he should say to man, Here I give you assistance, use it as you please, either to a good or an evil action. Bradwardine solidly confuted this Assertion of old, De causa Dei lib. 3. cap. 29. Constante & liberà voce dico illum nolo pro Deo habere, &c. I cannot hold him for a God, whose most blessed will, I a most wicked sinner can velut maliculam debilem opprimere & necessitare ad horribilem actum peccati necessitate to sin. This is to make God (faith he). Servitut operis miserabiliter subjectum.

Again, If Gods concurse be thus indifferent to a good or bad action, then that which they flander the Protestants with, may truly be retorted on them, That God worked no more for Peters confession of him, then he did for Judas his betraying of him. The good is no more of him, then the evil.

Therefor e Bradwardine he grants, That seeing God doth will the act, to which sinne is annexed necessarily, he doth also will the sinne, yet sinne is not imputed to God, because he doth not absolutely will it, but secundum quid: Yea, he fayth, that in respect of God, who is the universal cause, there is no sinne, that sinne is so called onely in respect of a particular cause, for to God both mala and bona are bona, seeing he orders all sinne to good, yea to a greater good, then sinne can be evil. Thus Joseph told his brethren, You thought evil to me, but God turned it to good. But the most solid answer may be, That though God doth enable to that act, to which sinne
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adhereth, yet God doth neither sinne, nor cause man to sin, because what God doth, he doth most perfectly, nor is tied to hinder sinne; but man works in a defective manner, not according to the Rule; so that sinne is immediately from the instrument man, or the devil, which God useth, not from God; as the Sunne-beams shining upon a noisome carcasse, the ill smell is not to be attributed to the Sunne, but to the dung-hill.

Others say, As a man that driveth a lame horse, he is the cause of the horses motion, but the lameness is from the horse; or as a man that writeth, the motion of the pen is from the hand, but the blotting and blurring is from some unfitness in the pen. Or lastly, as the Musician is the cause of the Tune upon the instruments string, but that there is any harshness or jarring, is from the instrument it self: So then conclude of this truth as most certain, that all those actions or motions to which sinne cleaveth, as they have a physical entity, or natural being, muft needs be from God, the chief and first being; as every stream muft needs come from the fountain; hence is that Rule, Omne malum fundatur in bono, there cannot be a pure and meer evil, but it must adhere to some natural good.

Fourthly, As God doth thus concurre to the act of sin; so also he doth will sinne as a punishment. Thus in those places forementioned, where God is said to harden, or to give up to lusts, it is to be understood as these sins are punishments. Nor can this be any love to sinne, but a terrible demonstration of his wrath against it. Some have denied that one sinne can be a punishment of another, but the Scripture is very clear in this, he is not the cause of the evil in the punishment, but of the punishment in the evil: for although sin as it is sin is voluntary to the sinner, and so he finds a delight in it: Yet as by this he is left by God to run more obstinately in wayes of sin, and be thereby at last deprived of all happiness; so it is a misery and a punishment. Indeed God did not will the first sin by way of punishment, but as Augustine observeth all sins since the first, are both sins, causes of sin, and punishments of sin: Although as Pererim well observeth, Thos.efficaci-
an words the Scripture useth are not applied to every sinner or sinner, but to such as are notorious and in a more then ordinary manner left by God, as Pharaoh and the Jews for abusing such mercies. It's no wonder then if God be said to will sin as a punishment, for that is good, and an act of justice, yea it would be absurd to say, God only suffers or permits that, for in this God doth demonstrate his holy and righteous nature, and hereby evil is made good; and as Aquinas faith, Inordinatum non inordinatum relinquit. Neither may we say, How can sin being a privation come from God the Judge? for we see even in humane judicatories, when the punishment is privative, as the loss of honour or goods, yet the judgement about it is positive.

Fifthly, God may be said to will sinne not as sinne, but as its a means to declare his justice or mercy. Although sin be not in itself medium per se, of any good, no more then venomous or poison is of health, yet by the wisdome of God, its made conducible to those wise and holy ends which he intends, and in this sense its true, then even mala are bona, in respect of God's ordering of them for a greater good, then evil suffered can be evil; and howsoever the Papists calumniate this expression, yet Gibierf expressly afferts it, lib. 2, de liber. Evil (faith he) may be so either per modum objecti, as if it were an object to be desired or approved of, or else per modum medii, as it may be used by God for advancing his glory, and so God doth will it. Neither doth God herein offend against that Rule, We may not do evil that good may come of it, for God doth not do evil, his permitting of evil to be, is good, though the evil be not good.

Sixthly, God's work and will about sin is seen in the denying of that grace which if the sinner had he would not offend. And thus God may be said to cause sinne, as removens prohibens; As he that withdraweth a pillar or foundation of a house, may be said to pull down the house: Gods denying of grace is either meerly negative, when he doth not at first offer or vouchsafe it to man. Thus the Heathens live without the knowledge or offer of saving grace: Or secondly, Privative, when he doth withdraw such grace, either in whole or in part, that he be-
Noweth on some men: Thus many unregenerate men, though they had not true sanctifying grace, yet they had many workings and mollifyings of God's Spirit, which they neglecting and contemning, God in a just judgement denieth them any such workings any more. Thus God is said to make the eyes of the Israelites blinde, and their ears deaf, and their hearts hard, not by infusing any wickedness into them, but by denying such softning or preparatory works that they have upon them. Thus the Sun may be said to harden by withdrawing its beams, and he may be said to kill a man that takes away the food and sustenance he should live on. A terrible judgement it is, and the portion only of such who live within the means of grace, and abuse them; men are sensible of judgements upon their bodies, their estates, but not upon their souls: How doth a man complain that hath lost his eyes, it makes him weary of his life? Yet how many hundreds are there that are deprived of the spiritual eye, and yet lay it not to heart? neither stand with the blinde man, where Christ is to come in his Ordinances, praying, Lord, that we may receive our sight!

Seventhly, God's will and work in sin is seen by delivering up to Satan, letting him have power and dominion to do what he will. Thus into the false prophets God sent lying spirits, and Judas had the devil entering into his heart, Job. 13.27. Oh there are many prophane, cursing wretches that have nothing more in their mouths then this! The devil take them, and that proveth too true. The devil hath taken thy soul, the better part of thee already. Its he that keepeth all at peace within thee, though a childe of the devil, though in gall and wormwood, yet thou playest, rioted and runnest into all excess; whence is this obstinateness and wilfulness, but because the devil is in thy heart. As the godly are filled with the holy Ghost, whereby they boldly speak the things of God in the midst of all dangers; so wicked men being filled with the devil, can drink, swear, be prophane, and contemn all the thoughts of hell and damnation. As we see in the Egyptians, they ventured to go into the sea, when it was made dry for the Israelites, they feared not but boldly go on, and then on a sudden the
Of the Righteous Nature of God.

Of the Righteous Nature of God.

waters overwhelm them. Thus do wicked men, they boldly and desperately venture upon such and such a sin, which when committed, as God's anger ariseth to their utter perdition. Oh then be afraid lest thy sins be so great that God deliver thee up to the devil! And as the bodily possessed were thrown sometimes into the water, and sometimes into the fire; so thou fallest, sometimes in one grievous sin, and sometimes in another; when God leaveth thee thus to sin and Satan, he doth, faith Chrysostom, as if a great Captain should forsake his Army in the midst of their cruel enemies upon which ru-ine followeth inevitably.

Lastly, God's will and work about sin is in removing all those externals that might curb sin, he will not chasten or affliet them, as Hos. 4.14. So Ephraim is joyed to idols, let him alone; or else he removeth the Word and faithful Ministers, and when they are thus in the dark, they must needs fall: or if God do continue such mercies, as he did wonderful things to Pharaoh, it is to harden them more. These mercies fat them to destruc- tion: These Sun-beams do the more blinde them; and there-fore that is one way that Austin acknowledged God hardens by his patience: three ways he may do it, 1. Per Permis-sionem. 2. Patientiam. 3. Potentiam. Thus whatsoever befalls the wicked man it becomes a snare to him, it furthers his sin and damnation.

In the next place, you may ask, Why doth God suffer sin thus to be? And here as Gibier, lib. 2. de liber. observerth, we may better ask for a reason of the sin suffered, then of God will suffering it; for that is to ask a cause of God's will, which cannot be, for then there were a greater thing then that, but in common speech we say, God doth will sin to be for these ends,

1. That thereby Christ may be exalted and magnified; Out of sinne God works the greatest good, even Christ our Medi-ator, which made Gregory say, Felix culpa, que talem mer-ruit habere redemptorem, if sin had not been, Christ had not been.

2. God by the permission of sin exalts his attributes, of justice in punishing, of mercy and grace in forgiving, and of wisdom in
in ordering of it; let us not then prophanely cavil at the being of sin, but heartily admire all the glorious attributes of God exalted thereby, as sin hath abounded, so Gods grace and mercy hath abounded.

3. God makes sin turn to the very good of him that committed it, because Paul was a blasphemer and a persecutor, the chiefest sinner of all, therefore he was more humble than all. This made Austin say, *Ande dicere quod utile est superbis in aliquod manifestum peccatum incidere.*

4. By sin committed, the graces of the godly are more orient and glorious. Contraries do illustrate one another. As in speech there is a figure called *Antithesis,* whereby the oration is more glorious, so there is, saith Austin, an *eloquenta rerum,* by evil good is more praised. Thus the dark night sets out the day, the dark shadows in the picture adorn it, and the pauses or silence in singing make the melody sweeter.

Lastly, *Many excellent graces in the godly could never have been demonstrated, had not God suffered wicked men to satisfy their will.* The patience, zeal and fortitude of Martyrs were seen by the wickedness of Nero and Dioclesian persecutors. As the Gardner (saith Plutarch) sets his garlick and unfavourable herbs near his violets and roses, that so their sweet smell may be the more diffused; thus God makes the goodness of the godly admirable by the wickedness of the wicked.

Use of Admonition, to adore that wisdom and power of God, who can and doth turn all the wickedness in the world to such wonderful good; so that the godly may say, *their sins, yea and the sins of the Churches enemies have been happy sins.* If a man come into the Artificers shop, he admireth at all the crooked and toothed instruments that are, to what use they be: but the Artificer makes curious and polished materials by such instruments; even thus God doth with all wicked men.
SECT. II.
Of Christ's Sufferings, Merit and Satisfaction.

Serm. VI.
That all men through Adams Transgression are plunged into Sinne, cursed by the Law, and obnoxious to the wrath of God, which is also upon them and cannot be removed, unless there be a way of Satisfaction found out. That Christ voluntarily became man, and offered himself as a Sacrifice upon the Cross to satisfy God's Justice and expiate our Sinnes.

Rom. 3. 26.
To declare (I say) at this time his Righteousness, that he might be Just, and the Justifier of him which believeth in Jesus.

Rom vers. 25. to the end of this vers. 26. we have a Divine and Theological description of our Justification; so that both the matter described, and the manner of the description are admirable. As there is the Song of Songs, and was the Holy of Holies, so this part of
of Scripture may be called Evangelium Evangelii, the Gospel of the Gospel, it being the summe and breviry of it. This noble and divine priviledge of Justification is described in all the causes of it, the efficient, which is the grace of God; the material or meritorious cause, Christ crucified; the instrumental cause, Faith; and which is observable, not only Cajetan, but Lapide in locum, do acknowledge and call faith the cause applicants of our Justification. Lastly, There is the final cause, and that for the notableness of it is twice repeated, vers. 25. and in my Text. For though the former preposition be ei's, and the later æs, yet that cannot make any difference, as some would have it. Therefore our Interpreters adde [Ifay] to declare [Ifay] as hereby intimating how worthy it is of our observation and notice again and again. Thus we have this Scripture, like the grain of mustard-seed, little in quantity, but it will grow up into a vast tree; so that if we may allegorize) both the birds of the air may build their nests here, the sublime and most penetrating understandings may finde a subject imployning them to the full; and the beasts of the field, even prohane and wicked men, but sensible and weary of their sinnes, may come and finde a shadow of refreshment from this Text. So truly might Calvin in loc. Say, Non est insignior locus, there is not a more signal and eminent place in all the Scripture for describing the nature of our Justification, then this: And if the true doctrine of Justification be the Pillar of the Church, this is the Pillar of that Pillar. My work is only to treat on the final cause, expressed in this vers. 26. Which is set down, 1. Generally, To declare his Righteousness, with the circumstance of time when, [at this time.] 2. This final cause is distributed into the finis cuius, That he may be just, and the finis cui, a Justifier of him that believeth. Let us consider the final cause first as generally set down, æs ædeçiv: Budens makes the word properly to signify that dilation or complaint which men made against such who were guilty of male-administration in the publique; but here it is the same with ëndyµa that is used 2 Thess. 1:5. a very pregnant place to expound this: yea we have the word in the text used for the same purpose, Rom. 9:22. What
if God willing to shew his wrath? But all the difficulty is, what is meant by t<om> righteousness here; for in the Scripture, especially in Paul's Epistles, the righteousness of God is taken two ways, either for the attribute whereby he is righteous, or else for that righteousness whereby we are justified, which the Apostle often calls the Righteousness of God, either because its of Gods procuring, or of his imputing, or because acceptable to him; of which more in its time. Howsoever some Papists understand this of the later righteousness, following Austin, not quâ Deus justus est, but quâ indicit hominem; yet the context doth evidence the former: only if meant of the former, then the question is, Whether righteousness be not taken for the goodness and mercy of God, as in many places it is; and speaking thus of the grace of God in our Justification, it might seem to favour this interpretation. Thus inconstant Grotius in his Comment upon the place understands it, it seemeth at his later end Socinianizing, so that he kept his worst wine to the last, and his secunde cogitationes were peiores; for in his defence of Christ's Satisfaction against Socinus, pag. 24, 25. he doth with strong reason evince, that by righteousness is not meant Gods mercy, but that property in God whereby he is prone to punish sinne, and there are two reasons for this interpretation: First, because Paul doth oppose this time wherein God appointed Christ to die for our sinnes, unto the time of the old Testament, where God had a πανεξίης, which is not a remission, but a transmissi-
on of the punishment of sinne: God did not exact in the old Testament the price or satisfaction for our sinnes, but deferred it till the times of the Gospel: Not but that the Fathers then had pardon of sinne, and God did by many visible temporal judgements punish the wicked, but the expia-
tory service was not performed till Christ came; though the benefit of it did extend to times past, because Christ's death did work as a meritorious and so a moral cause; now for a moral cause to work its not necessary it should exist imme-
diatly, its enough if it have esse cognitum, as the Schools say, that there be a minde which knoweth it and looks to it, as God did. Gods time then in the old Testament was a for-
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bearance or putting off the punishment of sinne, called therefore δικαιον. Chrysostom observeth well (though Sixtus Senensis saith its false, whereas he is deceived, following the Vulgar translation) that δικαιον patience is never attributed to God, because God cannot be said to suffer: but either ἡμιδικαιονia, or here in the Text δικαιον. This is the first reason. Secondly, By Righteousness we must understand the justice of God, because Christ is here said to be a propitiation, and that through his blood; so that although the grace of God be discovered in our justification, so also is God's justice, for therefore Christ shed his blood to appease the wrath of God; and he is called here the propitiation, in allusion to the Mercy-seat made of pure gold, wherein God doth graciously reveal his will as reconciled, called therefore a placator or reconciler. This is a cogent reason, and thus Cajetan and Pareus take righteousness; and in this sense righteousness is often used, 2 Thess. 1.6. Heb. 2.2. Act. 17.31. The last day of judgement is said to be in δικαιονια, Rom. 16.5,7. Indeed learned Cameron noteth upon ver. 21. that the righteousness of God is used alwaies for his goodness, mercy and salvation, and that it is never used to signifie that which we call justice, whereby God punisheth sinne. But Lodov. de Deiu upon this Text, doth solidly confute that assertion, shewing that although sometimes it may signifie the mercy of God, yet often, and most properly its attributed to God, as the just Judge of the world; and he instanceth in some places above mentioned, adding also, Isa. 59.16. and so faith he it must be understood in this Text, for God sheweth his privative and vindicative justice, when by Christ's blood, Satan hell and death, all the enemies of God's children are overcome; and this, faith he, is evidenced, because the Apostle mentioneth a propitiation and redemption through Christ's blood, and this the Jews acknowledged by their sacrifices, who thought thereby they obtained mercy after justice was satisfied.

One thing more is to be added, that the Apostle useth three words of some affinity with one another: The first is δικαιονια, that is once only, Rom. 5.18. translated Justification. The second is δικαιονων, and that sometimes is taken for the Laws
Laws and Commandments of God, *Luk. 1.6.* sometimes for the constitution and appointment of God to punish, as *Rom. 1.32.* and sometimes for Justification, *Rom. 5.16.* in a clean other sense then *Aristotle* useth it, who distinguisheith *Ethic. lib. 5.* from *δικαιοσύνη,* and makes it to be the correcting and punishing of that which is unjust. The third word is *δικαιοσύνη* here in the Text, and often in other places, applied sometimes to things, and sometimes to persons or actions, sometimes to God, and sometimes to man; whereas then we see Christ set forth to be a propitiation for sinne, for this end, that God might declare his justice and righteousness, his severity and anger against sinne. Observe,

*That Christ crucified is a demonstration of Gods justice and Observe.*

anger against sinne. You may not look only for full demonstrations of Gods grace and love, but also of his justice and anger. *Justified by his grace, there is mercy; through the blood of Christ, there is justice.* Now the limitation of the manifestation of Gods justice in the Text, *viz.* to this time, the time of the Gospel, is very observable; for we are apt to think the time of the Gospel only a time of demonstration of Gods grace; that God never revealed so much love as in these daies: and indeed this is true, therefore its called the acceptable time, the time of salvation, the spiritual Jubilee: But yet withall its a time wherein God demonstrateth his justice, that his hatred against sinne is so implacable, that only the blood of his dear Son can pacifie him. God manifested his anger against sinne in the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, as also in the drowning of the whole world; but Christ crucified on the cross may more evidence Gods fury and displeasure against sinne, then any of those judgements: yea the torments of damned persons in hell do not so visibly shew forth Gods irreconciliation with sinners, as Christs oblation of himself by way of an expiatory sacrifice for sinne. But that the truth of this doctrine may appear, its good to take notice of these Propositions.

**First, That all mankind through Adams transgression, is wholly plunged in sinne, and thereby cursed by the Law, and obnoxious to all the wrath of God threatened in his word.** This the Apostle
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Apostle layeth as a sure foundation, to evince God's grace and justice in our Justification, Rom. 3:19. That every mouth may be stopped, and all the world become guilty before God: This is a dreadful doom that the Apostle passeth upon all: First, he applieth all those notorious transgressions which the Psalmist reckoneth up, Their throat an open sepulchre, their feet swift to shed blood, &c. to every one by nature; for though some only are actually so, yet feminally and habitually all are so; as young Serpents and Vipers are full of poision, though they have not vented it. No man is born without this depravation. Then secondly, Hereby faith the Apostle man's mouth is stopped. The defect of his condemnation is so evident, so clear to his own conscience, that he cannot plead any thing; not a word to say, his judgement is so palpably just. Thirdly, Every man's mouth is stopped. None can plead the ingenuity and goodness of his nature: no Jew, no Gentile, no Heathen, though never hearing of Christ, can open his mouth for justification; how blame-worthy then are those Authors, who will open their mouths for the salvation of such! But this is not enough, for fourthly, We are all hereby become guilty, or subject to God's judgement; Every man is a sentenced wretch to condemnation, every day, and every hour, yea, moment this may surprise. Paul said he died daily, but every natural man may fear being damned daily. And lastly observe the universality, All the world: There is not any one born in a natural way of Adam, that is exempted. All the world is thus at the mercy of God; They have sinned, Hell is ready, Tophet is prepared, and justice is lifting up the arm to give that eternal blow, only God faitheth his hand: There wants nothing but a command from God, and then all the curse of the Law, and devils of hell lay hold upon thee as their own: This is every man's case: So also Gal. 3:10. everyone is pronounced cursed, that continueth not in all things the Law requireth: Now no man doth that, but the clean contrary, breaketh every command, and that all the day long, his thoughts being always and only upon evil; therefore we are all in this cursed estate: The ground is cursed, the creatures are cursed, but none as man is cursed, whose condition
is worse then Toads or the vilest creatures that are; he had a thousand times better never to have been born, or to have been made a Serpent or Toad, then a Man, if never recovering from this natural state he is born in.

The second Proposition. As man is thus plunged into all sinne, so the anger and wrath of God is accordingly upon him. For though sinne may merit and justly deserve Gods wrath, yet some may think God will not take advantage, his mercy may be so great, that he will pass by all this relation: And thus indeed the Socinians, who deny Christ's Satisfaction, and so lay the ax to the root of all Christianitie. They say, notwithstanding mens sinne, yet God was never unreconciled with us, and that there is no such thing as justice in God, which necessarily requireth such a satisfaction; yes, they make this doctrine of Christ's Satisfaction to Gods justice, to be horrid blasphemy: But what monstrous doctrines and blasphemies will not breed in mans heart, if not guided and assisted by God? for what is more clear in Scripture then Gods righteous anger and judgements against wicked men? Ephef. 1. Are we not all the children of Gods wrath? Is not God said to be angry with the wicked all the day long? Is not the wrath of God said to abide upon him that believeth not? So that such places do not only prove we are at enmity with God, but God also at enmity with us. Doth not the Scripture delight to call him a consuming fire? and that in respect of sinne? But (say the Socinians) God is said 2 Cor. 5.13. to be reconciling the world to himself, and for that purpose the Gospel is the ministry of reconciliation; so that though we be enemies, and not reconciled to God, yet God is to us, he was never unreconciled with mankind; but they forget one passage in the Text, God was in Christ reconciling the world; so that had it not been through Christ, the great gulf between God and man would have continued. Indeed God is said to be first the party though offended, to seek reconciliation, partly to demonstrate his love the more to us, though he need us not, though he is happy enough without us, though not he, but we have done the wrong, yet he offers reconciliation, and hereby mans made the more inexcusable; partly in allusion to the custom amongst
Why God first seeks to man to be reconciled.

amongst men, whom though the inferiour be bound to seek the face of his superiour whom he hath offended, yet he da-reth not be so bold the distance is so great. But lastly, the offer of reconciliation is attributed to God, because it is impossible for man abiding in his sinfull condition, but to persist in all frowardneff and rebellion againft God. As David first sought out a way for reconciliation with Abfalom; thus also God doth, because we, if left to our selves, should live and die in an obstinate averfness to him. Besides, The Text only faith, God is reconciling the world to himself; now there is a great difference between God reconciling and reconciled: The former fuppofeth in God a propensity to bring about the way of reconciliation; not that he is already reconciled, but this floweth from a general love and pity he beareth to mankinde, whereby he procureth a way that actual reconciliation may be obtained between man and God; yea Ephes. 2.16. compared with Col. 1.20. there is inferred a reconciliation of Jew and Gentile, Angels and Men together, who by sinne were made enemies; and all this is in uno tertio, to God himself, which fuppofeth that there was not only enmity between one another, but also against God himself: Let this then be firmly concluded on, That God is an angry enemy and a profefed adversary unto every man abiding in his natural condition, and that therefore it belongs to his justice not to bear or suffer the contempt of his Majesty, but to be avenged on all, unless there be a way of satisfaction found out.

Hence the third Proposition is, That Christ voluntarily became man, and offered up himself as a sacrifice upon the cross to satisfy Gods justice and expiate our sinnes.

This is that the Socinian ear cannot endure, though this be the Christian treasury; therefore they hold Christ to be but a meer man, though a constituted and gifted God after his re-surrection; and because a meer man, they deny by his death he satisfied God, but that he died as a Martyr to confirm the doctrine he preached, and to be an example unto us to walk in all patience and self-denial; and whereas they complain that we use the word Satisfaction in a fundamental point of Religion, which yet is not in Scripture: We answer, The thing
thing is there, though not the word; there is redeeming, laying down a prize, becoming a sacrifice and propitiation, which is all one with Satisfaction; and they who will elude those words above mentioned, may they not, if the word satisfaction had been expressly mentioned evade it? would they not say, as they do about redemption and a sacrifice, that its only metaphorical? that the word is used sometimes when there is no price or expiation of the fault made, as in 2 Sam. 19.7. Mark 15.15. But that Christ by his death did pacifie the wrath of God, and make an atonement to God's justice, may easily be believed, if we do seriously consider with our selves, that it must be some weighty, urgent and important cause, that should make Christ to dye, and that so ignominiously. Its such a wonderfull mystery that it may make us stand astonished, considering how dear Christ was to the Father, his only begotten Son, his well-beloved Son, who was in the bosom of the Father, yet God spareth not him, and that to become a curse for us, to dye a cursed death with all shame and ignominy. Who can think that all this should be to confirm doctrine only, for that Christ, did enough by his miracles and holy life? and besides all the blessed Martyrs that suffered for the truth, abundantly confirmed that: Shall we then think that God would put his only Son to die in that unheard of manner, and for no more then the Socinian expresseth? Is here such infinite love and unspeakable riches of grace only for this? Is he called a Saviour and a Mediator for no other end? Who that hath reason can be thus perswaded? But if this do not convince, the Scripture arguments are so powerfull, that they will compel us, and its wonder to see how the Socinians place and displace, pervert and subvert every phrase, every word, yea every comma, that they may not be forced to believe that which they are resolved against. And

First, All those places of Scripture where Christ is said to redeem, purchase, or buy us by his blood, do plainly demonstrate that a Satisfaction was given to God by Christ's death. The words are λυτρων, ἀπολυτρῶν, ἀπολυτρωθῆναι, ἀπραξίαν, &c. Rom. 3.24. Tit. 2.14. Heb. 9.12. 1 Cor. 6.20. In all true and proper buying and redeeming, there is a price and a satisfaction, and thus the Christ's death a satisfaction to Divine Justice. Arg. 1.
Scripture speaks of Christ's blood. Neither doth that weaken this Argument, to say, That to buy or redeem doth sometimes signify to obtain a thing without any price; as, Buy without money, and the people of Israel are said to be redeemed out of Egypt, for none of those places have such circumstances to evince this meaning, as when it speaks of Christ's death: the question is not, Whether the words may not be used metaphorically in some other place? but Whether it be in these texts or no? and we say, the Scripture useth these expressions constantly of Christ's death, and why then should we depart from the literal meaning, unless we will turn all the Scripture into an Allegory? especially when its made an opposition to other kinds of buyings, as 1 Pet. 1:8. You are not bought with gold and silver, but with the precious blood of Christ.

A second Argument is taken from all those places of Scripture, where remission of our sins is attributed to Christ's death as a cause, yea that he is said to die for us. Heb. 9. 13. Rom. 3. 14. Now how could the forgiveness of our sins be attributed to Christ's death, if he died only for an example; his blood is said to be shed for the remission of sins, yea that without blood there is no remission of sins. Christ then died not out of necessity of nature absolutely, as men do, but voluntarily; and to this death of his our pardon is attributed as a cause: Why? but because God would not forgive, had not there been such a cause procuring of it. Its not thy tears, nor all thy penal satisfactions Popery hath brought in, that could pay the least farthing, much less all the talents we owed to God. This Argument is the more strengthened if we take in all those places, where Christ is said to die for us. 1 Tim. 2. 5. Matth. 20. 18. Where the prepositions are not only \( \text{\textit{for}} \) and \( \text{\textit{to}} \) for they may sometimes signify the final cause, \( \text{\textit{viz.}} \) for our good, but \( \text{\textit{\&\&}} \), which doth alwaies signify a compensation, or a substitution in the room of another thing: Thus Matth. 5. 30. An eye \( \text{\textit{\&\&}} \) for an eye, a tooth \( \text{\textit{\&\&}} \) for a tooth; neither are the adversaries ever yet able to shew that \( \text{\textit{\&\&}} \) doth not alwaies signify in our stead and for us, so that Christ died for us. And this is that which doth so commend and glorifie the
the love of Christ, that he should come and dye in our stead, that he should be made a curse in our room; that whereas God's anger and fury was to fall upon us, he should interpose and say, Let all fall upon me. No wonder if the Scripture commend this to us, as a superlative, transcendent love: Jonathan's love to David was not so much as a drop to this Ocean. All the prophane instances of men dying for others, or devoting themselves to death for the public good, are but starnes, or not so much, to this Sun; for here was not a meer corporal suffering, as some would have, Papists and Pinchins lately, but in his soul; strong conflicts he endured with God's displeasure, crying out, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? When Isaac was to be sacrificed, God provided a Ram in his place; this was our condition, when we were to suffer eternal vengeance as the just reward of our sinnes; then Christ interposed, saying, Behold I come to do thy will (O God.) So that Christ did not only dye for our good, for so Paul suffered for the good of God's Church, but in our stead and our room; That came upon him, which should have fallen upon us. Oh how should this indear Christ to us! Think, If when Christ was to dye, God the Father had spoken from heaven to thee, I appointed my Son indeed to dye, but come thou and be buffeted, spit upon, reproached and crucified in his room, come thou suffer agonies in his stead; Must thou not have been compelled to do this, as they did Simon to bear the Cross? Yet Christ did all this with willingness for thee.
SERM. VII.

More Demonstrations of the Satisfaction of Christ's Death to Divine Justice; With Answers to the Socinian Objections against it.

Rom. 3. 26.

To declare (I say) at this time his Righteousness, &c.

I shall mention one or two more Arguments, to prove,

That Christ died not only doctrinally, or exemplarily, but by way of atonement and expiation, so as to satisfy the justice of God, and appease his anger: For as David in an evil cause, beingpossessed with rage, as soon as ever he heard Uriah was dead, began presently to be pacified: So the justice and anger of God being prepared to consume sinfull man, no sooner heareth of Christ crucified, but is accorded by an happy temperament through Christ with mercy. Therefore that Christ's death was expiatory is manifested further,

First, By those places of Scripture, which speak of that happy exchange which God hath made for us, by imputing our sins to him, and his righteousness to us. So that as God for our sins laid on him did break and wound him: Thus for his righteoussness made ours, the Lord doth not onely forgive, but crown with everlasting glory.

Among
Among other places, there are these eminent Texts, Isa. 53.4,5,6,7. &c. which Chapter seemeth to be an History rather then a Prophecy of Christ's sufferings. As for Grotius his opinion, That the man here spoken of in the Text, was Jeremias, primarily and literally, though he acknowledgeth more sublimely Christ to be understood, Annotat. in Isa. cap. 4.53: we passe it by as a Jewish fable, though all along his Annotations he mentioneth not Christ, but endeavoureth to shew how Jeremias did bear the Jews sins, how he was wounded for their transgression, and did bear their iniquities, viz. by his preaching and instruction: Even as the Socinians explain it of Christ. But to the diligent Reader all things are as plain, as if he did with his bodily eyes see Christ crucified on the Cross, sweating blood in his grievous agonies: Let us consider the Prophet thus ocularly demonstrating Christ wounded, and that not for any sinne he had done, but for our iniquities; and whereas the Prophet informs us of the judgement most men had to see him thus extraordinarily smitten by God, viz. that he was some grand Impostor and Deceiver, At the 4th ver. he faith, Surely (that is a word of confidence, and of causality) he hath born our griefs, and carried our forrows. By griefs and forrows are principally meant our sins, as 1 Pet.2.25. Though Matth.8.15. seemeth to apply it to bodily diseases, which the Socinians greedily catch at, saying, As Christ took away bodily diseases, not because he did bear them on his own body, he had no palfie, no lameness or blindenesse: so he takes away our sins, not by having them imputed to him, as a Surety in our stead, but by removing them, which they explain in several respects. But to that place of Matthew, among other answers there are two most probable. First, of those who think both sins and bodily diseases are properly and literally intended, and so Peter applieth it to one, and Matthew to another; but some learned men dislike this, because, say they, there cannot be two literal senses, or meanings of the same Text. And therefore in the second place, they say, by forrows and griefs is directly and principally understood sins, but indirectly and by consequent bodily diseases, either because they come from
sin, or because our Saviour in curing of bodily diseases did principally look to sinne as the cause of them, and therefore told the healed person, Her sins were forgiven her. Thus Christ by taking our sins upon him, did thereby acquire a right and power to remove those punishments that follow sinne, and the Hebrew word Sabal, whatsoever may be said of Nasa, doth alwayes signifie to bear or carry, and not to take away: Oh then the unspeakable love of Christ in bearing our sins for us! This was more then to bear any outward calamity for us, for its sinne only that displeaseth God, and makes him offended. To this purpose is vers. 5. The chastisement of our peace, or our pacifications was upon him, and by his stripes we are healed. What can be more expresse this? In him was no sinne found, but our iniquities bruised him, wounded him, crucified him; our sins were the spears that ranne into his side, we are all crucifiers of Christ, we may all say with Judas, We have not only betrayed, but even crucified the holy one: A sad meditation it should be to humblenesse: It followeth at vers. 6. The Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all, he hath made to meet on him, as when many violent waters meet in one breach that is made, it hurrieth all away: Had not the Lord Christ been God as well as man, our iniquities would have carried him away like a torrent, he could not have stood in the gap to stop the wrath of God that was breaking out. Though these things were bitter to Christ, yet they cause unspeakable joy to the believer, for God will not require punishment for the same sins twice, he will not punish them in Christ, and in thee also: when justice shall make inquisition after thee, thou wilt be found in Christ, as the manslayer in the City of refuge. Here is an Altar from which justice may not take thee and destroy thee. As if the Prophet could not speak enough of this glorious mystery, he repeateth again vers. 10. It pleased the Lord to bruise him, to grind him to dust, and although this was so terrible, yet vers. 12. He poured out his soul to death, which denotreth the free and spontaneous offering himself to all this misery.

A second Text which confirmeth this reciprocal imputation, is 2 Cor. 5. 21. He who knew no sinne became sinne for us, that
that we might be made the righteousness of God in him. What can be clearer? This Text seemeth to be written in the Sunbeams, its so evident for our purpose. Christ though he had no sinne in himself, yet became sinne; if you take it but for a Sacrifice of sinne, it is enough; and indeed he could not be a Sacrifice for sinne, unless sinne was first laid upon him:

And why is all this? We may say, That we who knew no righteousness, may become the righteousness of God in him; Righteousness, and the righteousness of God, but in him. Thus we are Jacob in our elder brothers clothes, as Ambrose of old hinted, which Calvin further amplifying, so affected Pighius the Papift, that he came off from his inherent righteousness, to that imputed by Christ. Now truly, what the Prophet Isaiah, Chap. i. brake out into, Hear, O Heavens, and hearken, O Earth! in respect of that unnatural rebellion of the Israelites, we may, because of this wonderful and unheard of love, its more than any sinful man dares to pray or hope for: That Christ should become thus a Sacrifice for us, that he should be bound to loose us, guilty to free us; it should be received into our hearts, as such unspeakable love, that we should even with the Church swoond and faint away in the ravishments of it. And yet there is

A third Text that goeth higher, Gal. 3:13. Christ redeemed us from the curse of the Law, being made a curse for us. What vassal could expect that his King should come and die an ignominious death that he may be set at liberty. Yet thus Christ did to us, and that his enemies, and rebels against him. This goodness of Christ is so transcendent, that we may justly conclude, Though one man had his heart full of as much love, as all the Angels and Saints collected together, yet he should cry out, I am straightned within, O my leanness, my leanness!

The last sort of Arguments may be taken from those places of Scripture, which expressly call Christs dying a Sacrifice for our sins. Now its the proper notion of a Sacrifice to expiate sinne, to reconcile God. Thus the Heathens, though they were guilty of horrible Idolatry, yet thus farre they had a true
true impression upon their consciences, that something must be done to pacifie God. Hence the Scripture doth so often attribute \textit{expiation} to Christ, 1 John 2.2. Chap. 4.10. and this \textit{expiation} is to expiate sinne, Heb.2.17. Now that Christ became a Sacrifice thus for our sins, ye heard Isa.53.10 and often in the New Testament, Ephes.5.2. where he is called not only \textit{expresed}, but \textit{Sudis}, which is always applied to a bloody Sacrifice. And the Apostle in the Epistle to the Hebrews, especially Chap. 9.26. Chap. 10.12. doth at large prove his Priestly office from this oblation of himself a Sacrifice, whereas if this were done only doctrinally, as Socinians plead, he had no Priestly office at all. Now the Apostle sheweth all these Sacrifices were only types of Christ. That it was not their blood that could expiate sinne, but it must be Christ's, neither will the Socinians exception avail, that onely the solemn annual Sacrifice for all the people, was only a type of Christ (though that indeed was more illustrious, and if granted is enough to confute their heresie) for all their private Sacrifices were likewise a type of Christ; and therefore 1 Cor.5. Christ is called our Passover, and John Baptist said, \textit{Behold the Lamb that taketh away the sin of the World}: So that Christ being typified both in the publick Sacrifice and private, doth notably teach us, that we are not only in the general to look upon Christ's death as expiatory of the sins of all the elect, but every godly man in particular is to appropriate the benefit of this Sacrifice unto himself.

Above all Sacrifices in the Law, that of the Scape-goat did palpably demonstrate Christ, for then the people in a solemn manner laid their hands on the Goat, thereby signifying, that as he was to perish, so they; only he was in their stead, and thus when their sins were laid on him, he was turned into the vast wilderness, where they could never hear of him more. Though he was not killed, yet hereby he was exposed to death, and this did signifie that the sins of the godly being laid upon Christ, he bore them away even clear out of sight, so that they should never be charged upon the godly. Let then the godly soul believing say, \textit{Oh the depth, the breadth and height of this love of Christ being thus an expiatory Sacrifice}. 
Sacrifice for our sins: You see, this Article founded upon Scripture so firmly, that heaven and earth must sooner pass away than this truth: and them that would take this away from us, say, as Solomon of Adonijah's petition, This is to ask the kingdom also; This is to take away all Religion, heaven and all happiness from us. For it is in this Sacrifice, which is called a sweet savour to God, that he receiveth us; nothing from us can come but unsavoury and abominable, its in Christ alone we are accepted: As in a pure glass we may see loathsome and noisome carrion, but in the glass' representation of it, all the filthiness is taken away. As that Emperor, who in a precious jewel of a great quantity made like a glass, would behold through that, all horrid and deformed objects which through that representation were made delightful and acceptable. Thus in a well understood sense all the filth, the dross, the noisomeness that is in our most holy duties being represented in Christ, hath their filthiness done away: So that though not for our sakes, yet for Christ's sake, God will become reconciled with us; if thou to some unworthy man begging of thee in Christ's name, dost relieve him saying, Its not for thy sake, but for Christ's I do it; think God doth so to thee, its not for any worth in thy duties, in thy obedience, but for Christ's sake.

That this Doctrine may the more clearly be apprehended, I shall add further Propositions, the last running into many particulars.

I. The fourth Proposition is, That God in Christ crucified, with the benefits accruing thereby doth at the same time demonstrate both mercy and justice, grace and righteousness. We are justified freely by his grace, because, there was no antecedent cause, or right in us to justification, and that by the blood of Christ, as appeasing Gods wrath. So then, let not those many places of Scripture, which testify God forgiveth freely, and for his own name sake, make you doubt of Christ's satisfaction, saying with the Socinians, How can it be freely, and yet with satisfaction? Is the love or mercy of a Creditor to be commended for releasing the debt of a debtor, if another hath paid the full summe to him, where is the Creditors kindenesse
How Justification and Salvation are of love and grace, notwithstanding Christ's satisfaction, kindenesse here? But to this its fully answered, That when the mercy and grace of God is commended in the Scripture, it's not with respect to God's justice, or opposition to that, as if a full price were not laid down, but to our works and righteousness. In all those places where Paul doth mention the grace of God that we are justified and saved by his grace: The immediate opposition, is not God's justice, but Not of our selves, not by the works that we have done. Our Justification then is of pure meets grace in respect of us, but in respect of Christ, it is of merit, it is of justice. Although therefore the justice of God be satisfied by Christ's blood, and so spiritual benefits are vouchsafed to us, yet all is of grace and meer love to us, and that in these particulars.

First, It was God's infinite love to his, that made him finde out a way, and procure a Mediator for us. And thus the Scripture attributeth it to God's love, that he sent his only Sonne into the world to die for us; God might have left us in our undone estate, as he did the Angels, but he pitied us, and sent his Son to become a Sacrifice for us.

Secondly, It's the meer grace and love of God not only to procure a Mediator, but to accept of him in our stead. For though Christ's satisfaction was infinite, and could not be rejected by the Father as insufficient, for there was no defect in that, yet God was not rigidly bound in justice to accept of a Surety for us. But as God threatened, The day shall come, thereof thou shalt die; and as the Rule is often mentioned in the Scripture, The soul that sinneth, that shall die: So might God have required this satisfaction in our persons, that we in our own persons must answer his justice, but yet such was his love and grace, that he admitted a Surety in our room, not abrogating his Law, but relaxing of it, as is to be more fully shewed.

Thirdly, It is yet further of grace, because we in this work of reconciliation bring nothing of our own, we were in the state of enemies and adversaries. So that every thing proclaimeth grace to us.

And fourthly, It's of grace, in respect of the application of this satisfaction and merit to our souls: For how many, though Christ thus offered up himself, are yet damned, though Christ:
Of Christ's Sufferings, Merit and Satisfaction.

Christ was crucified, yet most will eternally perish; and why is all this? but because most refuse the benefits of this Mediator, and so make themselves unworthy of his love, so that, if any partake of these glorious benefits, it is because God doth make them differ from others. It is he that by his grace doth open their eyes, and change their hearts, whereby they hunger and thirst after this Redeemer. If therefore, though Christ came into the world, yet his death may be in vain to thee, if thou through thy obstinacy mayest get no more good by Christ crucified, than the devils; then certainly such who are enabled and fitted to make use of Christ, they must acknowledge all is of grace to them.

Hence the fifth Proposition, That there is a difference between man's forgiving another, and God's forgiving us. Indeed we pray, that God would forgive us as we forgive them that trespass against us. And to this purpose our Saviour brings in a Parable, shewing how we ought to forgive others, if we expect God should forgive us. But in this comparison, we must distinguish between mercy, and the manner of mercy. We are to be merciful as God is, but in the manner God takes one way, and we another. This is evident, because we are commanded to forgive our enemies abiding enemies, and although they refuse and reject our love; Whereas the Socinians confess, That it would not stand with the honour of God to forgive all men's sins, even of such who wilfully continue impenitent and obstinate. Again, Man is a private person, and the offended party, and so being bound by the Law of a Superior, it is his duty sometimes to forgive without satisfaction (though in some cases he cannot) but God doth not forgive meerly as offended, nor is he to be considered as a private person, but as the publick Judge and Governor of the world, who is thereby engaged to judge righteously, and to render to every one according to his works: So that there is a vast difference between pecuniary debts and criminal, as you shall hear afterwards.

The sixth Proposition, Christ dying doth not thereby hinder the endeavour after, and exercising of our selves in all holy works. For thus the Adversaries urge.
The Doctrine of Christ's satisfaction sets open a wide door to all impiety (say they) if Christ hath paid the debt and satisfied the Law, then we are not bound to pay it; and so we may live as we list.

But first we see, even the Apostles themselves could not preach the grace of God, but they had this poison sucked from the sweet herbs they planted, Rom. 6. Christ and his benefits do not oppose holiness, but do necessarily inferre it; for Christ's death is not only for remission of sin, but to redeem us a peculiar people unto himself, zealoue of good works. There is not only a moral connexion between Christ's death and an holy life, viz., That a man by beholding Christ's love should be moved to Jove him again; but there is a causal connexion, even as between the Sun & the Sun-beams, between fire and heat: where the benefit of Christ's death is, there is also his Spirit sanctifying and leading into every good way. Indeed the true and proper answer is, That seeing Christ satisfied God, by his death and his obedience. Therefore our obedience and sufferings are not required for that end, he was; we are not by our godliness to think of a compensation to God, ours cannot stand in his presence if God enter into judgement; our tears for sinne are not to the same end his blood was. But though holiness and patience be not required of us to that end, for which it was in Christ, yet there are many other great and necessary reasons of it in the Scripture: And as for the Socinian this objection may be more strongly retorted on him, seeing he holds such a mercy and grace as forgiveth sinne freely, without any satisfaction that God is reconciled with all men; That there is no such attribute of justice in God, whereby he is inclined to punish sin. These notions must needs encourage in all impiety and wickednesse.

The seventh Proposition, In this satisfaction and redemption of ours, the price was truly paid to God. It was God who accepted of the Sacrifice laid down for our sins. This is to be observed, because the enemies of this truth ask,

Object. If we were bought, who received the price? The Scripture faith, we were captives to the devil, and we are redeemed from our vain conversation. Therefore if a price be paid
paid, its paid to the devil and our vain conversation, and how absurd is that to say?

Ans. But the answer is, In our Captivity we are to consider the principal that detaineth us, and the instrumental. The principal is God's Justice, and his wrath, we are prisoners in the first place to that, but then the devil and sin as its a punishment, are the under jaylors, the serjeants to God's wrath, and its not absurd to be redeemed from them, as the instruments of God's vengeance. Neither is that such an absurdity as the Socinians urge, that then God must satifie himself, which is (say they) as if a man should give money out of his purse to another, to bid him satifie him; for the case of a pecuniary debt, and a crime are not alike, as the famous instance of Zalucus witnesseth, who when a Law was made for the putting out of the eyes of an adulterer, and his own sonne, being found in that crime, he found an excellent temperament to satifie the Law, by suffering one of his own eyes, and another of his sons to be put out. Besides in this work of redemption we are to acknowledge the peculiar order, and appropriated works of the Trinity, which the Socinians blaspheming, no wonder they split themselves at this rock, so that the satisfaction was common to all the three persons, being God, Christ the second person, and the Spirit of God the third person required satisfaction as well as the Father, for they have one essential will, and justice; only the execution of this satisfaction, was by that wise temperament of sending the second person to become man, and die for our sakes.

In these things therefore there is infinite occasion to draw out our Faith and our Love, whether the truth or the goodness be more wonderful, its hard to say. Oh the depths of the counsels of God, may faith say! And oh the depths and goodness of God, may love say! If it were only an object to be believed, here was enough to take up the whole man, but being also an object to be loved and imbraced. How wide must our hearts be to receive such things? The truth of them is above thy understanding, and the goodness of them above thy heart. This Ocean cannot be received into thy little shell, they cannot enter into thy heart; do thou therefore enter
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into them; be swallowed up in the faith and love of these things; and certainly Paul was so, when he desired to know nothing but Christ crucified; and when he said, he no longer lived, but Christ in him. Oh remember there are more glorious things to possess thy heart, than earthly vanities: This Sanctum Sanctorum is not to entertain every unclean thing. This precious Cabinet is only for Jewels, and not dung.

Se R M. V I I I.

More Propositions about the Sufferings of Christ for Sinne: Their usefulness, sufficiency, and extent; with Answers to more Objections of the Socinians.

Rom. 3. 26.

To declare (I say) his Righteousness, that he may be Just, and the Justifier of him that believeth in Jesus.

There remain further Propositions to clear this fundamental Doctrine, That the Righteousness of God is declared by Christ's blood shed for the Remission of sin.

VIII. Obj.

As first, Christ's blood was not useless, though God so loved the world, that he gave his only Son to dye for us. For thus some urge, What necessity was there to satisfy God's justice through Christ, seeing of his meer love he gave us Christ? if there-
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Therefore without any wrong to his justice, he could so love his Son to give his only begotten Son. Why could not the same love pardon sinne, and give salvation without any injury unto his justice? This proposition therefore is to shew that there is a great difference between that love to mankinde by which he sent his Son into the world, and that more special and peculiar love, whereby he doth vouchsafe to some all saving privileges. It is true, God without any breach of his justice did pity mankinde, and finde out a way for their pardon, but actually to pardon and save, that could not be without satisfaction, at least supposing the Decree of God, and his revealed will thus to punish sinne, and the reason of the difference between these two kindes of love is from the nature of them, one is a general love, as some call it a love of beneficence, whereby we are propenfe to do good, when a fit or lawfull way is found out: The other is a particular special love, and as some call it, a love of complacency and delight: now this cannot be in God towards a sinner, till his sinne which is so loathsome and abominable be removed: We see the like case amongst men. A Judge who seeth a malefactor condemned by the Law, may for some just and powerfull reasons exceedingely pity the malefactor, and may think of all such waies whereby the Law may be satisfied, that so the condemned person may be released; yet actually he cannot set him at liberty, unless he will be unjust, till the Law be satisfied. Thus the Scripture commends in God a Philanthropy, a love to mankinde, willing their good; but this cannot be actually performed till the justice of God be satisfied. He is mercifull, but he is also just and righteous, and therefore will shew his hatred and displeasure against sinne.

The second Proposition: Christ's death, although the benefit of it doth not extend to all, yet was in itself a sufficient price and satisfaction to God. So that his righteousness is herein manifested, though all be not saved. I shall not enter into that dispute, Whether Christ's death was intentionally a price for all? or Whether considered in itself only, it be sufficient, though not efficacious for all? This is now to be asserted;
That though such a price was laid down sufficiently for all, yet God is not unrighteous, if all be not redeemed, neither may we think that men are unjustly damned, because a price is paid for them, for we must distinguish between the purchase or satisfaction itself, and the application of this, for though Christ's satisfaction depend not on our faith, its not our believing that makes it a satisfaction to God; this it hath from its own inherent worth; yet that this satisfaction may be applied to us, and so become advantageous, there is faith required. Not that faith doth make Christ's death effectual unto us, as if the benefit of that were suspended upon our believing, and our believing upon the uncertain use of our free will, for thus Christ might have died, and no man be saved; no more good might have come to men then the Apostate Angels, but that Christ by his death purchased such benefits for those that should believe and receive him; yea and this very believing and receiving of him is also a fruit of his death, so that Christ's death though it be an absolute price unto God and depends not on the condition of our frail strength, yet it doth not oppose such an order of means, in the use whereof he only will communicate the privileges he purchased, so that if men do wilfully reject this price, they become guilty of their own damnation; as in the year of Jubilee, if a servant would not accept of the liberty offered, he was then to be a perpetual bondsman, and to have his ear bored as a sign thereof. Thus if thou wilt reject Christ offering thee liberty from sin and hell, and that at so dear a rate, thou deservest to have thy ear bored, and to live and die Satan's slave. When Cyrus proclaimed a liberty of returning for every Jew into his own Country, if any loved Babylon better than Canaan, and so would not take the benefit offered, the fault lay upon the man himself, whose will was thus corrupted. Thus it is with the price Christ hath paid, many do not apply the benefit of it, because they are corrupted in their hearts, and love their empty husks; better then the fatted calf in their fathers house. God therefore accepted of the price, yet so that the application of it is to be in the way and order God hath appointed, so that the damned
in hell are not punished unjustly, as if God required satisfaction twice, once of Christ, and then in their own persons.

The third Proposition. **Gods justice is satisfied, although Christ did not endure the eternal torments of death:** For it was impossible for him who was to be our Mediator, that he should be always detained in his sufferings, and not be at last a Conquerour. Though therefore it be objected against Christ's satisfaction, that he did not suffer the everlasting torments of hell, and therefore it could not be a sufficient price to God's justice: Yet it is answered that Christ's sufferings in his soul and body were equivalent to it. Although to speak properly, eternity is not of the essence of death, which is the reward of sin, and threatened by God, but its accidental, because man thus dying is never able to satisfy God; therefore seeing he cannot pay the last farthing, he is for ever kept in prison. As eternal death hath in it eternity and despair; necessarily in all those that so die, so Christ could not suffer; but what was wanting in duration, was supplied partly by the immensity of his sorrows, conflicting with the sense of God's wrath because of our sin imputed to him, so that he suffered more grief, then if the sorrows of all men were put together; and partly by the dignity and worth of him who did suffer. Therefore the Scripture calls it the blood of God, Act. 20. 21. Indeed this is not only rejected by Socinians, but others also have denied the sufferings of Christ in his soul through God's displeasure for our sin imputed unto him, adding many other new doctrines, especially one of late, Pinchin in his Book called *The meritorious price*, &c. But all those new assertions, blaming the common opinion as an universal error, are fitly to be examined, when we consider, What is that righteousness which is imputed to us: for he makes neither the active or passive obedience imputed to us, though he grant Christ by a Mediatorial oblation of his body on the Cross to have satisfied the wrath of God. Therefore we shall deferre the consideration of his Notion till that time, and in the mean while take it for granted, that Isa. 53. 4,5,6. 2 Cor. 5. 21. Gal. 4.13. do prove that God laid our sinnes
sufferings on him, that he bore them by imputation, that he
confifted in his agonies with the wrath of God, though with-
out any sinne: So that although Christ did not suffer the sin-
fulness and the perpetuity of those hellish torments, yet he
did equivalently satisfie the wrath of God, and recompence
them some other way. And for the better understanding of
this, we are to know (as hereafter is to be more largely con-
firmed) that Christ in some respects did, or suffered the idem,
the very same that we should have done; in other respects
tantundem, or that which is equivalent: As for example, It
was necessary that Christ should suffer death, and the same
kinde of death, viz. a cursed death for us. Therefore that
position, though used in antiquity, That one drop of Christ's
blood was sufficient to redeem the whole world: Yea some
Jesuites say, Nervinber de adoratione, that one drop of sweat,
or the least prayer of Christ, was enough to have saved a
thousand worlds, because his person was so infinitely worthy,
is not to be admitted: for his infinite worth is not all, God's
justice required death, and a cursed death, therefore the
same; not a drop of blood, but death itself must be. But
then in respect of some accidents to this death, as the eternity
of it, or for the suffering of every kinde of pain that is the
fruit of sinne, then an equivalent suffering was enough, it
was not required he should suffer every kinde of curse which
is the effect of sinne, but in the general a cursed death: And
thus also it is in the fulfilling of the Law for us, it was not
necessary that he should perform every holy duty, for he
could not perform the obedience which Magistrates or Mar-
ried persons are bound to do; its enough that there was a
fulfilling of it in the general for us, for this was equivalent
to every kinde of particular obedience, as his sufferings were
to every kinde of suffering. Though therefore Christ did
not suffer eternal death for sinners, yet he suffered that which
was equivalent, and therefore the justice of God is by his
death wholly appeased.

The fourth Proposition. Though Christ the second person
did thus voluntarily become a sacrifice for us, yet we are not to
make such absurd conclusions as the Socinians do, That there-
fore
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fore we are beholding to one Person more then the other. By this doctrine (say they) we are more bound to the Son then to the Father, and so are to love one more then another. Thus corrupt reason would make a dissention, where the Scripture affirmeth unspeakable agreement, for the work of reconciliation is to be attributed to the whole Trinity, as satisfaction was given to it, because they have an essential will and justice; only the fulfilling of this was by the second Person, and the assumption of our nature, though it was terminated in the Son, yet the counsel and appointment of it was from the whole Trinity; which the Ancients declared by a similitude of three sisters putting on a coat upon one of them; though no similitude can illustrate this, because of the infinite distance between the Creator and the creature; and indeed the Scripture doth in a very high manner commend both the love of the Father and the Son, in the Sonnes becoming an expiatory sacrifice for us: The Fathers love is declared in sending his only Sonne in the world, that which was dearer to him then many thousand worlds, and whose good was to be preferred above all mankinde; yet God sends him into the world, and upon this work, to die an ignominious death for us; and as God did thus send his Son into the world, so he did also lay this command upon him to dye for his sheep. Therefore John 14.10. he did as he received command of the Father. And by the Psalmist he declared to come and do the will of God, it was written in his heart. So that it was the Fathers will he should be thus bruised for our sinsnes: yea he saith, Therefore the Father loveth him, because he layeth down his life for his sheep, John 10.17. Thus you see the Fathers infinite love manifested, and then the Sons love, that is unquestionable, seeing he was so ready and willing to lay aside the manifestation of his glory, and to become in the reputed the world of men for our sakes. Let us not then prophanely cavil at this glorious mystery, but adore the love of the Father and the Son, in their mutual agreement for this our redemption. Had the Father been against it, then Chrisits sufferings would not have been accepted: Had the Son refused it, then still our condition had been desperate without a Mediator. But oh the depths
of God's wisdom and love in finding out this way for our peace and comfort.

XII. The fifth Proposition. Although God's justice be declared by Christ's death, yet we cannot infer thence, that therefore Christ's death was only in respect of God, and not in reference to us. For thus the adversaries argue, If Christ died to satisfy God's justice, then this work which is so commended in the Scripture as an instance of love and grace to us, would not relate to us, but mainly to God, that he might be satisfied: But the inclusion of one end, doth not exclude the other, yea it necessarily inferreth it; for the chief and ultimate end of Christ's death is the glorifying of God, but then there are other particular ends, as the satisfying of God's justice, and by that all those inestimable benefits of Justification, Adoption and Salvation, which are attributed to Christ's death likewise as the effects of it; so that because he died to appease the wrath of God, therefore he also died for our good: Hence is our reconciliation and peace with God made the fruit of his death: our sinnes provoked justice, and justice made a great gulf between God's mercy and us, but Christ by his death removed all these divisions away.

XIII. The last Proposition. Let it not seem strange that God thus required satisfaction ere he would pardon sinne, when yet man may and is commanded to forgive freely. This hath been the occasion of shipwrack to many, they judge of God's remission of sinnes, after the manner of men forgiving one another, but here is a vast difference:

For first, The disputing of God's absolute power, whether he can forgive without remission, is not here controverted: Its plain by the Scripture that he will not: so that seeing God will not accept of us without satisfaction, it behoveth us to conclude, that this is the wisest way and most honouring of God, seeing God doth all things for his glory.

And yet secondly, Even humane reason cannot but apprehend many dissimilitudes between a private mans forgiving another his trespass, and Gods forgiving us: as thus, Man is by God commanded to forgive his brother, not only humbling himself, but if he do not seek reconciliation: Hence is
that command of requiring evil with good, of blessing those that curse us: But now the adversaries themselves dare not but say, it would be a great dishonour, and unbecoming the holy God, to forgive all sinne whether men repent or no: Who can apprehend that though wicked men do with all malice and obstinacy, blaspheme and reproach God, that his pure eyes can without wrath behold all this? Its certain the Scripture represents God a consuming fire to such: that speaks of no mercy or favour, but the contrary, all wrath and vengeance to such as go on so wickedly.

Again, Even amongst men there are some trespasses that a man is not bound to forgive without satisfaction, neither can the party offended release the wrong, without sinne; as if a man murder another mans wife or childe, it is not in the mans power to release it, but he is bound to prosecute the revenge of it: and thus many cases may be given, wherein its not in a mans power to release his right, especially when it relateth to another, or when the Law of a superiour obligeth him, or the good of the publique doth require it: And although God have no superiour, and so cannot be bound by a Law above him, yet he is a Law to himself, so that he cannot but do wisely and righteously in all his waies.

Lastly, We are alwaies to distinguish between private men and publique persons; as also pecuniary debts, and criminal offences: It is true, a private man may remit a debt to his debtor, he is not bound to take any satisfaction; but a Judge in criminal causes, cannot without injustice forgive them. Now all sinne is committed against God as a publique person, as the Judge of the world; every sinne tends to the destruction of the universe: if it be let go unpunished, then all men will rejoice in their wickedness, and think God is like one of them, as the Psalmist faith. If therefore Justice be so much commended to Magistrates for particular Societies, how much is it required to the whole Universe? The body can no more be compact without nerves and sinews, then the world without righteousness from God. Thus you have heard several Propositions, which, if throughly understood, will confirm us against all those cavils which corrupt reason doth invent; for
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tis from that bitter fountain that all bitter streams do flow; whereas the understanding is to be captivated to the Word of God, we captivate God's Word to our understanding: and as Tertullian in another place, Deus non erit Deus nisi homi

placuerit. Having been thus large in the Doctrinal part, which was a shining light, let us be proportionable in the practical, that it may be also burning.

Use 1.

And first, Doth God thus demonstrate his justice and severity against sinne, by Christ's death? then let us take heed of love and delight in it: Why should that be pleasing to thee which filled Christ with so much bitterness? He was a man of sorrows, and wilt thou be a man of jollities? Was it a light matter that made him sweat drops of blood? Was it for nothing that he cried out, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? Oh say of all sinne which thou hast greedily desired, as Da-

vid of the water of Bethlehem he so longed for, That it was the blood of men, he would not meddle with it; but do thou say, This is the blood of Christ, the price even of Christ's blood, and how then shall I pollute my self with sinne?

Now the aggravation of sinne by Christ's death, doth appear, First, In the infinite evil of it, that it carrieth such guilt with it, that nothing could satisfy God but an infinite price; and this is true not only of gross enormous sinnes, but also of the least sinnes: If all mankinde were but guilty of one sinne, and that the least thought which passeth away, yet there could not be any atonement made for it, but by Christ's blood. Oh how should this make us tremble even at every idle word, idle thought! Oh say, This sinne cannot be accounted little, which is against so great a God, and needs such an infinite price! Let not then the customariness and universalitie of sinne make thee despise it; or do not say, This is but little, there needs not such ado; for the least sin thou art guilty of, can have no other atonement but by the blood of Christ. Little sins and great sinnes agree in this, they need a great Ransom.

2. The aggravation of sinne appeareth, if we consider what Christ was who came to destroy it. All the wonderfull works that ever God did, the Creation of the world, and the pre-

servation
servation of it, are nothing to this, that God should become man, and dye such a cursed ignominious death for us: In this mystery the Wisdom, Mercy, Justice and Power of God are made illustrious; now why was this? Shall we think the Father was unnatural and cruel to his Son to deliver him up to such torments for a matter of no moment? No certainly. This should make us stand astonished at the depth, length, and breadth of our sinfulness, that such an unheard of remedy must be provided for us! Oh cry out, My soul is too narrow, my thoughts are too streightened! I may think and think, but never can think according to the nature of sinne. The remedy provided makes me see the desperateness of the malady.

3. This also may aggravate it, that though a man do truly and bitterly humble himself for his sinnes, and acknowledge his rebellion, yet for all that, God will not pardon, without satisfaction by Christ's blood: So that its not our tears, our prayers, our rendings of heart are able to expiate our iniquities, but it must be a work of infinite dignity to do this. God will have Christ's blood and our tears also, but not for the same purpose. Therefore the Papists obscure this doctrine of Christ's satisfaction, by adding their own. This is to divide the Mediatory Office between Christ and man; neither can all their distinctions deliver them. Let us then be an Evangelical people, who fly to Christ only; mourn, pray and humble ourselves we do, but its Christ's blood only that can wash us clean, Let our eyes and hearts be fixed on him.
Our Justification by Christ a Demonstration not only of God's Mercy, but Righteousness also. Or an instance of that Justice in God, whereby he will punish sinne. Also a Discussion of the proper Nature of Merit and Satisfaction, shewing that Christ's Sufferings had all the Requisites to Satisfaction.

Rom. 3. 26.

To declare his Righteousness, that he might be just, &c.

We have at large considered the final cause of our Justification through Christ's blood, as it is laid down by the Apostle in the general. We now come to the distribution he makes of this final cause, which is

1. The finis cuius, for what sake he thus justifieth, and that is, that he may be just.

2. The finis cui, for whose sake and good this is, and that is,
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is, That he might justify him who believeth in Jesus. We are to treat on the finis cujus, that he might be just, δικαιος. This word, (as the former δικαιον) doth sometimes signify a mercifull one, sometimes one that is true, and sometimes one that is righteous in his works. Therefore there are interpreters, who as they understood the former word of God's goodness and mercy, so they do this also: And indeed it cannot be denied, but that righteousness doth many times signify mercy; because as Dion observes in loc. all the just and righteous acts of God in overcoming the Churches enemies, are a mercy to the Church. Christ's conquering the devil and sinne by his bloud, hereby brought unspeakable mercies to his people; but the former reasons do convince, That just is to be here taken strictly, for that property whereby he is propens to punish sinne; and this is declared in that he will not justify a believer without an atonement or satisfaction through Christ's bloud, and thus you have heard the word is used many times; and I shall add one pregnant place more, because this is so vehemently opposed by Socinians, Rom.2.5. where the day of judgement, called also the day of wrath, is there said to have the revelation of God's righteous judgement; Why righteous? but because he will punish those hardened sinners in the Text with his eternal wrath; hence δικαιος is often for vengeance, Jud.7.2 Thes.1.9. yet we will not limit this justice to his vindicative righteousness onely, but to the righteousness of his words also.

That God in justification of a believer is not only gracious and merciful, but just also. Not in the same respects, but gracious in respect of us, and just in respect of the meritorious cause of it. I am to treat of the righteousness of God, demonstrated therein, and that is discovered in these particulars, The righteousness of his words, and the righteousness of his works.

The righteousness of God's word concerning our Justification by Christ is seen,

First, By all those predictions and promises which were made for Christ's coming into the flesh, and becoming both a Priest and King of peace for us. This was so notably spoken of, that all the
the Jews were in expectation of them, though many of them carnally thought of a temporal Saviour otherwise: The Scripture faith, That both Moses and the Prophets testified of him, Acts 28. 23. Its an unfound opinion, though some of the Ancients were taken with it, That the Fathers in the Old Testament by their holiness did merit the Incarnation of Christ; for this is attributed wholly to the love of God; and certainly if Christ's humane Nature did not merit its hypostatical Union, much lesse could the believers of old, merit Christ's coming into the world; Great are the predictions, and precious are the promises of a Christ in the Old Testament: Therefore the Prophets when the people were in any outward calamities, did then comfort them with the coming of a Messiah, as Esay 9. and Micah 5. partly hereby to assure them, that even their temporal power should not be totally destroyed till Shiloh came; and partly to teach the believers in all their publick straights, that though they had no outward peace, yet there was a spiritual peace procured with God through Christ; and therefore they were to rejoice in Christ, when they had no earthly comfort to be glad of. Thus God shewed the truth of his promises, when in the fulness of time Christ came. Not as if Christ had not any Subsistence before he was incarnated, as the Socinians blaspHEME: for 1 Cor. 10. 4. the Israelites in the wilderness are said to tempt Christ; And Heb. 11. 26. Moses in his days is said to esteem the reproaches of Christ above the treasures of Egypt; And 1 Pet. 1. 11. The Spirit which was in those Prophets of old, is called the Spirit of Christ. Christ then was in respect of his Divine Nature before his Incarnation, and all the godly in the Old Testament had benefit by him as well as in the New, for God had respect to that oblation which Christ was to offer in time.

Secondly, God's righteousness of truth in respect of his words, was also manifested in our justification by Christ's death. For Genes. 3. God made this threatening to Adam, In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt die. This sentence was passed from God's own mouth, its irrevocable: So that whatsoever might be
be said in respect of God's absolute power to do otherwise, yet hypothetically supposing this commination, it would be unjust if death should not be required for sinne. It is true there is a difference between a Threatning and a Promise. In a Promise, God doth, as it were, become a debtor to man, he giveth a man so qualified right to claim such a privilege of him, though in respect that by this Promise man is not alienated, or the thing promised from his dominion, he is not properly a debtor to man, for that is impossible, but to himself, he cannot be unfaithful to himself, yet we acknowledge this fulfilling of his promise is attributed not only to love or faithfulness, but righteousness also; 2 Thess. 1.6. 1 John 1.9. But in a threatening we cannot say properly that the delinquent hath a right to be punished, though he doth deserve it, or that God becomes in any respect a debtor to the sinner to punish him, yet in regard God is truth itself and immutable, no iota or tittle of any threatening shall fall to the ground: Let not the wicked man dream of such a mercy as shall infringe God's truth; let him not fancy such a pardon, as doth contravene any threatening; Seeing therefore God hath peremptorily set down such a Law, that upon sinne there must be death, and this must stand, though heaven and earth should fall, it was altogether becoming the justice of God, that if the sinner himself did not die, yet there must be one in his stead, that so the Law may be satisfied.

But then here is the grand Objection, *If God's justice be required for the fulfilling of that Law, how can that be, seeing the sinner himself doth not die, but an innocent one in his room, the just for the unjust, 1 Pet. 3.18?* which is tragically aggravated by the Socinians, as if the Orthodox attributed unheard of cruelty and injustice to God; And indeed thus farre the Doubt seemeth to have a specious ground, How is God's righteousness seen in the fulfilling of this threatening? Or how is this threatening made good, seeing the person threatened, *If thou eat thou shalt die?* And as in the Hebrew, *Dying thou shalt die, viz. certainly and infallibly, did not, or doth not die;* but an innocent one, who
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knew
knew no sinne, is substituted in his room.

Answ.

But this is easily answered. Though the strict letter of the threatening required the sinner himself to die, yet it did not exclude, or forbid a Surety to come between. God indeed said, the sinner shall die; but not he in his own person onely: So that though another should offer himself in his room, yet I will not accept of him; if God had done this, he had not onely shut man out of the terrestrial Paradise, but from all hopes also of the heavenly one, he had made their condition like that of the devils, and every man begging for pardon, would have had no more hope then Di·ves had for a drop of water in hell. But God made no proviso in that threatening against a Surety, therefore that Law was not directly broken, and yet it was not exactly fulfilled neither. What was it then? Learned men say, That God did not by this accepting of a Surety for us abrogate that Law, for then wicked men who reject Christ, could not be damned in their own personal impieties. We see God in Ezekiel still continuing a Law like this, The soul that sinneth it shall die, Ezek. 18.4. Its not then an abrogation of the Law; nor yet in the second place is it a dispensation of the threatening, for then it is properly a dispensation, when some by special priviledge are exempted from a Law, which otherwise obligeth all: but this could not be, for all mankinde was involved in it, and Christ needed not a priviledge to be exempted from it, for he was never included in it. Nor was it an equitable interpretation of the Law, for that is, when upon the reason of the Law, although not the Letter of the Law, a person is found never at first to be intended by it: but it was a relaxation, or rather a mercifull condescension of the Law-giver by his goodness and wisdome to finde out an expedient, or happy temperament: So that the Law might be satisfied, yet man finde mercy. Thus it was ἀνὰ κατὰ νομὸν καὶ κατὰ νομὸν, but τῷ τοιοῦτῳ, and τῷ τοιούτῳ, it was not exactly according to Law, nor yet properly against it, but it was above it, and yet for it, for thereby death for sinne was brought about.

Thus
Thus you have heard God's righteousness in his word abundantly declared by Christ dying to obtain our justification.

But the main and principal particular is, To shew the righteousness of God's work herein, or that it was an instance of that justice in him, whereby he will punish sinne. For seeing the Scripture describeth his Nature to be such, that he is holy, that he loveth no sinne, that he is displeased with it, and abhorreth it, it was necessary therefore there should be a demonstration of this Attribute of God, but if it were only of justice, then there would be no declaration of his Mercy. The wise God hath therefore ordered it, that there should be eminent demonstrations both of his Mercy and Justice. God's justice therefore in our justification is seen, in that the Lord Christ laid down his life by way of satisfaction to God. He died not only to shew us an example of patience and obedience, but the principal end of his death was to expiate our iniquities, and to be satisfactory to the justice of God. Now that this truth, though full of comfort, yet of difficulty also, may be the better understood, we are to take notice of these things.

First, That in the Lord Christ's work of redemption for us, Divines do speak of Christ's Merit, and his Satisfaction. And although the Scripture doth not expressly use such words, yet it hath that sense and meaning which is intended by them, onely these two words have a different notion; for Merit that doth properly respect the Subject for whom the good thing is Merited; but Satisfaction doth in the first place relate to the good of the person that is satisfied. Thus Christ by his Merit did aim at those heavenly mercies, which we are to enjoy by him; but in his Satisfaction he did in the first place look to God, that his Glory and Honour might be repaired, which was obscured by sinne, yet this is not so to be understood, as if Christ's Satisfaction did not also redound to our good; for in that God is satisfied, there is thereby a way made for our justification and salvation; yea God would have his Ju-
Nice Satisfied, that so a way might be made for the Effects of his Grace. Again, There is this difference between Merit and Satisfaction; Merit doth properly respect the Good that is to be procured, but Satisfaction the Evil that is to be repelled: howsoever, in Christ we are not to make such distinctions, for in his Merit was a Satisfaction, and in his Satisfaction, Merit.

Secondly, Consider this, That the Schoolmen distinguish between Satisfaction and Satispassion. Satisfaction they make a voluntary willing undergoing of such a punishment God will have: And thus Christ's Satisfaction was free and voluntary, when the Psalmist said, Sacrifice and Oblation God would not have, then faith Christ, Loe I come to do thy will, O God, Psal. 40. 8. Loe, I come, that denoteth the willingness and promptness in him, to a task so bitter and dreadful to flesh and blood. But Satispassion is, when the party doth unwillingly suffer such a punishment, as God in his Justice shall inflict on him; hence, they say, that the damned in hell, they do satisfy, but not satisfacere, because all those eternal torments are inflicted on them against their will, which is the cause they rage and gnash their teeth with everlasting howlings and roarings of spirit; yet this is not to be understood so, as if they did suffer enough to recompense God, and make amends for the disobedience they are guilty of. No, if they could do so, then they would at last be acquitted, and set at liberty from those hellish chains of darkness; but because they are never able to satisfy, they are to all Eternity chained up in their misery.

Thirdly, To every true and proper Satisfaction, there are four things required, which were all seen in Christ's Oblation of himself.

1. There is required that it be done to another; for a man cannot properly be said to satisfy himself.

2. That it be amongst equals.

3. That it be in such things as are the parties own that doth satisfy, not any ways freely received from him to whom the Satisfaction is made.

Lastly,
Lastly, *That it be in such things that are not due to him who is satisfied by some other title or consideration.*

I shall not at large treat on these, for I handle the Satisfactory work of Christ in our Redemption one, as thereby is discovered the Justice and Righteousnesse of God, but because some declaration of these particulars, will make you to assent to the whole truth, viz. *That God doth not deliver us from hell and sin by his mere Power, nor by mere Mercy, but of Justice and Mercy conjoin'd together.* I shall touch of them.

For the first, Satisfaction being a part of Justice, and Justice in its very Nature being to another, How could Christ's Oblation of himself be a Satisfaction, seeing Christ was God also? it seemeth absurd for a man to satisfy himself. This difficulty is much discussed by the Schoolmen, and the Socinians they also urge it.

And to answer it, Some say, that whereas Justice is alwaies said to be *ad alterum*, that is taken from Aristotle and other Philosophers, who were altogether ignorant of this Divine Mystery; so that as they would say of Obedience and Submission, it must be alwaies of an Inferior to a Superior, yet we know that Christ, who was God-man, was in a state of Humiliation and Obedience, and that unto himself, as God. But because not onely Philosophers, but even the natural light of reason doth convince, That in Satisfaction there must be two extremas, *The party satisfied, and The party satisfying,* or at least two distinct considerations; Therefore that is rejeeted by some.

Others they say, *It is not absurd to reason, to say, a man satisfied himself,* that is, his Law and Will which he hath appointed. *Its absurd to say, A Magistrate, who having made such a penal Law, and yet willing to spare some Delinquent for just reasons, when he findes out a way to satisfy the Law, in procuring such an expedient, that he satisfieh himself.*

But the best answer is, *That though Christ be God, yet considered as Mediator, as God-man, so there is a distinct respect from him as meerly God.* Now he satisfied as he was God-man, and
and in respect of his Mediatorial Office, he is to be considered, as distinct from the absolute consideration of his person, as God; and this the Apostle intimates, Gal. 3.20. when he saith, 

A Mediator is not a Mediator of one; that is, there must be two parties at distance, where there is a Mediation; and thus God was as absolutely considered, and man as absolutely considered: Therefore Christ he was first mediis, did partake of both Natures; and then a Mediator, did accomplish that Office for us: Even as Aaron, when God's wrath was consuming the offenders, he stood with his Incense between the living and the dead. This did typically represent the atonement by Christ's death; its he alone that stands between the damned and saved. Its true, here are not distinct suppositums in Christ, but the two distinct Natures is enough to cause such a difference that we may discern the offended and him who makes the Satisfaction, and indeed the excellency of Satisfaction lieth in the equality of the compensation, not in the real diversity of the extremities; so that though in Justice amongst men there may in this respect be a more perfect way of Satisfaction, because one man doth quoad supposition differ from another, yet in respect of that compensation, it hath a transcendency above all humane Satisfaction, and its no wonder for a thing to be exceeded by another in its general Nature, but that to exceed the other in its specific Nature: As the heavens in their body, which is a general Nature, doth exceed mans, but mans in its specific exceedeth the heavens. Thus in Christ's Satisfaction, we may consider a difference between the party satisfied, and him that makes the Satisfaction.

2. In true and proper Satisfaction there must be also an equality; for although the party satisfying by his humiliation and submission, doth for a while subject himself as an Inferior, yet unless he had an equal dignity with the party offended, he could not forgive him out of justice, but of grace and liberality. Now thus it was with Christ, if we consider him in respect of his Mediatorial Office, so he is inferior to the Father; and in this respect was in a state of humiliation; and hence it is that he referreth all glory to his Father, that he
of Christ's Sufferings, Merit and Satisfaction.

he faith, he cometh to do his Father's will, and that his Father is greater than he; but then consider him in his Person, as God, so there is an equal dignity with God, and by this means all those acts of his humiliation, and of his most reproachful sufferings, had a Satisfactory power in them, yea the lower he humbled himself, and the more he was despised, the more did his dignity discover itself: for how more noble and worthy the person is who submits himself unto a mean action, the meaner that is, the more dignity is thereby put upon it.

3. In Christ's Satisfaction there was a compensation unto God of his own; he was not bound to suffer that death, neither though he was made man was he bound to be on earth in an obedient way to the moral command, but he might have taken mans nature, and immediately have glorified himself in heaven: Its true, supposing the end, why Christ came into the world, he could not but be in an obedient way to the moral Law: but so also supposing this end it could not be but that he must suffer; Therefore the Scripture puts a necessity upon it; Luk. 24.26. Τὸν Σωτήρα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἔπεσεν αὐτὸν μεταλάβειν ἀπὸ πόλεμον, ἀλλὰ ἐπετίθετο εἰς τὸν θάνατον τοῦ αὐτοῦ γόνης. But more of this hereafter, as being a main point for those who deny Christ's active obedience imputed to us, but yielding that his passive is, say contrary to what he delivered, that Christ was bound as a creature in respect of his humane nature to obey the moral Law, and so fulfilled that for himself, and not for us, and therefore it could not be imputed to us, but the fallhood of this will appear hereafter; for the present we see, that Christ both in respect of his obedience and sufferings was wholly voluntary, and in an absolute sense not due to God any other ways: and so comes in

The fourth particular, That as Christ was our Mediator from that which was his own, so also that which he did in our behalf, he was not bound to do upon any other title to God, for if it had been due otherwise, then in all reason it could not have been for us, but for himself. Its true his humane nature had all it had from God, for being a creature could not obey the will of God, or endure the conflicts of that dreadful death without assistance from God, therefore an Angel was sent to comfort him: but being this humane nature was personally united

N to
to the God-head, and so he was in a most ineffable manner, God and man; hence it is that what he did was of himself, and his own, therefore he said, He had power to lay down his life, and to raise it up again, Joh, 10.18. If then these particulars were by a lively meditation amplified, viz. That Christ so full of dignity and glory in himself, even equal to God, would yet submit himself to the most shameful and terrible torments that could be, to procure our peace and ransom; if (I say) this were powerfully thought on: Oh the astonishment and enlargings of heart it would make in thee! Nothing would grieve thee so much as the naughtinesse of thy heart, coldness and formality in holy duties: How sadly wouldst thou check thy self? saying, Did Christ work out my redemption with no more fervency and diligence then I pray or hear his Word? How impossible would my salvation have been, if he had as unwillingly undertook the Mediator Office for me, as I am many times to do his will? Oh, he could say with all readiness, Loe I come to do thy will, O God! though this will was to be bruised and wounded for my transgressions: but I am cold and drawing back, when I am to do his will, though it bring much joy and peace with it: Oh these dull and heavy hearts of ours! but as the Artificer hath his Engine to screw up the heaviest timber to the top of the house: so though thy heart be earthly, stupid, inclining downward, yet the consideration of Christ dying for us, should be an admirable Engine to draw our hearts upwards.
S E R M.  X.

Of the Fulneß, Perfection, and Infinite Worth of Christ's Satisfaction, as further Demonstrating God's Righteousnesse in our Justification.

Rom. 3. 26.

That he might be just, &c.

The truth to be demonstrated is, That not only God's Mercy, but his Justice is declared in our Justification. That which the Socinians deride as inconsistent, viz. a free Remission of Sinne, and yet a full Satisfaction, wee see the Scripture maintains, not indeed in the same respect, and to the same subject, for its a gracious pardon to us, though it be of justice to Christ who paid the debt.

The last time we shewed, it was a true and proper Satisfaction which Christ made by his Blood for our sins. It was not an improper or metaphorical one, it had all the requisites to Satisfaction.

In the next place we say, it was not onely a true Satisfaction, but it was a copious plentiful one, it was superabundant to our sins. There is not so much evil in them as there is good in Christ. There is not so much offence in them to God, as there is honour to him by Christ, Heb. 7. 25. Christ being there by the Apostle exalted above the legal Priests, and declared

II.

Christ's Satisfaction a copious and plentiful one.
declared to be every way fit and full for our Redeemer, its said, He is able to save us to the uttermost; he hath not left one farthing unpaid; There is not any great sinne or little sinne that will be charged upon thy score: Oh think not, If I had not been so great a sinner, if I had never been defiled with such and such transgressions, then there might have been some hope! This is to undervalue Christ's Redemption, this is to think there is more in sinne to damn, then in Christ's obedience to save. Whereas thy sins are to Christ but as a little Cloud to the glorious Sunne, his obedience exceeds thy transgressions as much as his person doth thy person. Now then, if he being God, all the Nations of the world are but as one drop to him; so also must their sinnes be; if therefore thou hast all the sinnes of all men in the world upon thee, they would be but as a drop to that ocean. This is not spoken to encourage the presumptuous sinner, for alas he hath no part in this Satisfaction, but to comfort the humbled sinner loaden with the sense of his sinnes. Though they are a burden greater then he can bear, yet not then Christ can endure, yea take quite away. Thus John 10.10. Christ came, That his sheep might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly, even more then enough; therefore its so often called, The riches of his grace. There is an infinite treasury, able to satisfy thee and others also. In it self indeed it is a ransom sufficient to redeem all sinners, yea a thousand worlds of sinners, for the price is not the more diminished, though it be extended to never so many. As the Sunne hath fulnesse of light to enlighten all in the world; if the blinde do not see by it, its thine indisposition, not any scarcity of light in the Sunne: Thus it is here; if all men are not acquitted by Christ's death, its not because that was insufficient, as if it had not vertue enough to reach to thee as well as others; but by thy unbelief thou rejectest this soveraign remedy, otherwise there is an overflowing fulnesse in this satisfaction; thy cruft will sooner fail to receive it, then the oil be deficient: Oh then what large room hath faith to expatiate in! Sit down and dive and dive, yet thou canst not come to the bottom of Christ's bloud, but as the Prophet Ezekiel saw still more
more and greater abominations, so mayest thou in the satisfactory Obedience of Christ every day discover more and more fulness: Its like digging where a spring and fountain is, that riseth up higher and higher, even till it come like the waters of Noah, to exceed the highest hills, even the most sublime meditations that can be; and that we may be fully assured of this truth, see what a notable opposition the Apostle makes Rom. 5. 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21. between the first and second Adam, at large proving that Christ doth superabound in the fruits of his grace above the first Adam in the effects of his sin, he calls it grace, and the abundance of grace, and this abundance of grace reigneth to life. So that these Texts should be like so much oil poured in the wounds of every broken-hearted sinner; What can satisfie him if this do not? Is there any thing that can be desired more then this? What though sin by Adam be thus potent, yet righteousness by Christ is more prevailing, so that we give not Christ the honour due unto him, while we are dejected through unbelief, and thy sins seem great, but not Christ's obedience.

Thirdly, It is not only a full and true Redemption, but its a perfect satisfaction, that is, the acceptance of Christ's death did arise from the infinite worth and condignity of it, not from the mere favour of God. Indeed all those Schoolmen called the Nominals, they say, that the ground of Christ's Satisfaction was from the kinde acceptance and benevolence in God, and therefore they make it to be of as much favour that God did accept of Christ's satisfaction, as if it had been of a pure meer man, only they grant there was more congruity in Christ to be accepted, then a meer man, because he was God also. Hence Durand is not afraid to say, that as by Adam we were made sinners; so by the same Adam we might have been made righteous, Distinct. 21. Q. 2. Lib. 3. Thus Vossius while wavering did acknowledge Christ's Satisfaction, but yet placed the ground of it in Gods gracious acceptance and receiving of it, Lubb. Error. 55. which certainly doth much dishonour Christ, in the expiatory Sacrifice, he made for our sins. Indeed the Orthodox do acknowledge in a sound sense the necessity of Gods gracious acceptance of Christ's Satisfaction, not as if that were

III.

Christ's Satisfaction a perfect one.
were not in itself Satisfactory from its worth, but because God was not bound to accept of a Surety in our stead, he might have charged the threatening upon our own persons, and so we ourselves be charged with all the guilt of sinne. There could be no necessity either Natural or Moral, obliging or enforcing of him to receive satisfaction by another: So that in this respect it was God's favour, to accept of Christ's sufferings for us. Again, Christ as a Mediator, is wholly the gift of God. The Scripture makes it God's meer love to send his Sonne into the world, Christ did not merit to be a Mediator, the appointment of him for that office is attributed by Scripture wholly unto the love of God and his grace: So that it cannot be called perfect satisfaction in this sense, as if Christ by his death did so purchase our Reconciliation, that God could not in justice refuse it, for it was wholly of God's favour that Christ was fore-ordained to be our Mediator. But then if we consider the benefits accruing to the godly by Christ's death; these were obtained by a full and perfect satisfaction, that is, God did not by way of grace, supply what was imperfect, or indulge any defect in Christ's work of our Redemption, but there was an inward equality and congruity between the price paid, and the mercy obtained; and this is fully proved, because the Scripture when it speaks of Christ's death, as Heb.10.10,14. and Col.2. and in other places, doth always attribute Gospel-mercies to his death, and not to the grace of God. It makes the ground and cause of mercies not to be the favour of God, but the works that Christ hath wrought; therefore it speaks farre otherwise of Christ, then of the works of a godly man, When it saith the godly are saved, presently it excludes the works we do; and giveth all to God's grace; but when it speaks of Christ, there his righteousness and works are acknowledged. Though Paul would not be found in his own righteousness, yet he is not afraid, but desireth to be in Christ's righteousness; he knoweth no blemish, no fault or insufficiency can be found in that: So that we evidently see Christ's satisfaction, is, 1. A true, proper one. 2. A plentiful and an abundant one. 3. A full and perfect one. It had in the way of Satisfaction all that God could require,
quire; so that there cannot be a more compleat Satisfaction than this.

Hence fourthly, This obedience of Christ's it was more satisfactory to God than all the sins committed by the elect, are displeasing to God. God took more delight in his humiliation, and smelt a sweeter favour in his Sacrifice, then all our sins could offend him. Thus you heard from Rom. 5: the excellency of the gift through Christ in making righteous, did superabound the filthinefsle of sinne in making a sinner: from this it is that God would never have suffered sinne to be, had he not thereby produced a better good then sinne could be evil. This certainly should admirably support the drooping soul: Oh thy sins affright thee! Thou mournest because of the dishonour and unkindenesse that hath been in thy iniquities, thou cryest out, Its not my misery, my destruction troubleth me so much, as that God is offended: Oh every thing within me trembleth, while I consider God is displeased! Let this contrite spirit but turn the eye the other way, and there it may behold Christ giving God as much honour, and satisfying his holy will, as ever thy iniquities had injured him: Oh now (God faith) fury and wrath is not in me, I have no more quarrel and controversy with thee; that Christ is become thus obedient to the Cross, its enough, I have as much as my justice could demand, my frowns are turned into smiles, my rod of iron into a Scepter of grace; certainly the meditation of this should be health in thy bones, and wine to thy heart; What is that thought wherein thou art intangled all the day long, but this? God is offended with my dulness, sloathfulness, and my thousand imperfections. Oh I am loathsome in my own eyes, much more in Gods: If Jacob was afraid of Laban; if Jacob was afraid to meet Esau his brother, when yet he was innocent, and had given no just cause of offence, much rather may I tremble, who provoke God all the day long; but then when I look upon Christ's satisfaction, then I am acquitted: if there be no charge against Christ, no accusation against him, there is none against me. Shall Jacob then so rejoice in seeing Esau's face altered to him? Shall he say, I have seen thy face as the face of God? How
How much rather may the humble and believing sinner be filled with gladness, when through Christ's blood God shall be thus appeased and reconciled with him! if thy unworthiness make thee diffident, so that thou canst not plead God's free grace; yet here is an argument put in thy mouth from Christ's expiatory Sacrifice, that thou mayest say, O Lord, I am unworthy, but it is just and right that Christ obtain what he died for! Its grace to me, but it is righteousnesse to Christ.

V. We are to consider in sinne two things, the malum creaturae, and the malum Dei. The evil of the creature is that noxious and damnable effect of it, whereby it instaketh a man in a condition of all misery; the evil towards God in sinne is that whereby it doth injure and offend him, being nothing but contempt of him, and if it were possible working the very destruction of God: Now Christ by his death doth satisfie God for sinne, principally and in the first place, as it is offensive to God, as it dishonours him; and then secondarily and by redundancy, as its destructive of the creature; for if we remove the cause, we take away the effect; if the dishonour and offence to God be removed, then is the destructive and damnable effects of sinne also taken away; onely by this we should learn, in all our humiliation and debasement for sinne, to be affected with that which is the greatest evil in it. Christ in all those unspreakable agonies of his, did satisfie chiefly for sinne, as it was God's offence, as it was a dishonour to him; so should our hearts be broken and contrite within us, mainly because we have offended him, as David, Psal.51. Against thee, the only have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight, because it was against God, and in his sight, this brake his bones, this pounded his heart to dust. It was not his childes death, nor all the other miseries accompanying his sinne, that did so break and bruise him, as that God was hereby displeased: Oh then that we were such a spiritual people, that could apprehend what is most to be bewailed in our transgressions; if fear of judgements and hell be the onely and alone cause of all thy trouble, thou art not yet so spiritual, as thou oughtest to be:

The
The losse of God's favour should be more unto thee, then all temporal evils.

Sixthly, The righteousness of God and his Justice is seen in Christ's Satisfaction from a threefold respect. There are three grounds of the infinity of worth in Christ's obedience; and therefore it being then infinite upon all those Titles, its plain, that God would not forgive only by grace, but by justice also. The infinite worth of his obedience did arise,

1. From the dignity of his Person, he was God-man; so that all the obedience of Angels and men if put together, could not amount to the excellency of Christ's Satisfaction: Stand amazed at thy happiness, O believer, thou hast gained by thy losse, thou hast lost the obedience of a creature, but the obedience of an infinite person is now made thine; hence its many times called the righteousness of God; among other reasons, because its such as God is satisfied with, he looketh for no better, yea there can be no better. Though God hath infinite treasures of wisdom and omnipotency, yet he cannot provide a better obedience for us then this is: As God cannot love a better object then himself; This is not impotency, but potent perfection, whether this infinite dignity derived from the person of Christ to his actions, be a physical entity affecting the operations, or a moral relation by way of resultanty, though disputed by Schoolmen, yet must necessarily be granted, that its a moral relation, and so derived to every mediatior action: as if the whole value of money were only from the stamp and superscription it beareth; then whether the materials were gold, or silver, or iron, or leather, it would be nothing to the purpose, the stamp would make it to be of like worth; seeing therefore that Christ in all his mediatior actions, was God as well as man, thereby was an infinite dignity communicated to them (I say his mediatior actions) because some question whether Christ did not many humane actions that were either wholly indifferent, or to a meer natural end, and no higher, but that must needs be derogatory to Christ, because To us he was born, to us he was given, to us he lived, and to us he died. All that Christ was, and did, or suffered, did mediatiorly or immediately tend
to our Redemption, and our Saviour intended that in all things.

2. It was infinite, not only in respect of the dignity of the person, but also respectu rei oblatæ, the price offered, which was himself a Sacrifice for our sins; which made the Apostle preferre this thing above that by gold or precious stones; so that if we consider what that price or oblation was, we must needs grant an infinite dignity to it.

3. It was infinite in respect of the manner of the oblation; or the whole mediatory Office of Christ was discharged in that manner, that it did also merit at God's hand. It is true the habitual and actual grace of Christ in his humane nature, was not essentially infinite, for so one God is; but because of the personal union, there was infinite worth redounding to every thing he did: yet seeing the grace and holiness of Christ, which he shewed in all that he did, was not limited, as in creatures (for he received not the Spirit in measure) therefore the holy manner of doing all things God required, was acceptable unto God.

Obj. And if you object, Seeing that the dignity of Christ's person did put such infinite worth upon what Christ did; Why then did not any one action satisfy? Why might not that internal acceptance, which he declared, Behold, I come to do thy will, O God! have been enough without death itself? What need many actions of infinite dignity, seeing there cannot be more than infinite?

Answ. To this it is answered, That infinite worth, simply as so, is not enough, unless it be ordered and proportioned according to the will of him, who is to be satisfied; for if a man should give for a captive prisoner an infinite summe of money, yet if not according to such a way and a condition, as the conqueror prescribeth, though that summe of money were sufficient in itself to redeem a thousand such as that prisoner is, yet because not according to the condition prescribed, it could not be called a Satisfaction. And thus because God's will was, that a sinner should die, though never so many glorious actions, having an infinite dignity, were accomplished; yet they could not be Satisfaction,
as to this matter, unless there be such a death as was threatened.

Seventhly, Because Christ in his Mediatory Office, was thus infinitely worthy: Hence it is that no mere creature, Angel nor man, though endowed with all imaginable perfection, could satisfy for man's sins. Some of the Schoolmen have concluded the contrary, asserting, That a pure creature might have satisfied: but as the Apostle argued, If righteousness come by the Law, then Christ died in vain; So if Salvation and Justification could come any other way, then Christ did needlessly endure all those torments and agonies; and certainly it cannot be thought that Christ should put himself into such a state of humiliation, if any supposed creature could have done it. That is true of Leo, If he had not been man, non praperet exemplum; he could not have given us an example; and if he had not been God, non praperet remedium, he could not have procured a remedy. Therefore they do dangerously erre, who hold Christ a Mediator onely in his humane Nature, as that Itanarius of whom its reported, Andr. Osand. Disput, that he would say, There was more in Peter Lumbard, (who held Christ a Mediator according to his humane nature) then there was in an hundred Luthers, two hundred Melanthonis, or four hundred Calvins. But if Christ were wholly Mediator as man, then man as man might make an atonement to the infinite Justice of God, which is impossible: seeing whatsoever such a supposed creature could do, was wholly from the gift of God; and the more he did, the more he was obliged to God: Now Satisfaction could not be if all were of grace and Gods bounty; and in this sense it is, that Calvin said, lib.2. Instit. cap.17. If we should absolutely and simply oppose Christ to the judgement of God, there could be no place for merit, because in man there could not be found any such worth. This reason doth plainly evince, That Calvin speaks of Christ, as supposed a mere man; so that its a violent perverting of his meaning by the Jesuite Sandaus Hydrus Hollandiicus, when he would from this infer, That by Calvins principles, the Doctrine of Satisfaction cannot
cannot be maintained. Thus virulent also is Montzer the Lutheran from that passage in Calvin and Meisner, who though otherwise a learned Lutheran, from other doctrinal principles of the Calvinists, would lay down this conclusion, He that would avoid Photinianism must eschew Calvinism, Anthrop. Sac. Dec. 3. But all this is maliciously affirmed, for none are more solid maintainers of this truth than they are.

VIII. Eightly, From hence we may see how infinitely we are obliged to God for all the grace we have. There is not the pardon of the least sin, or the least degree of grace, but it came unto thee upon a dear rate; it was more then if God should have created a world only for thee; yea thou art more bound to God for the least spiritual mercy thou hast; then all the Angels in heaven are for all the grace they have; for then God did but will and command, and they were filled with all holiness immediately; but here Christ must die, he must become a Sacrifice, and die a cursed death, ere we could have a drop of mercy: Oh what enlarged hearts should we have upon the discovery of any Gospel-mercy vouchsafed to us! How much was required ere this could be? Every mercy was purchased by the precious blood of Christ; so that our hearts and mouths should be filled with joy and praises: how much did this work on Paul? Because Christ loved him, and gave himself for him, Gal. 3.
SERM. XI.

Why it was necessary our Redemption should be by way of Justice, with Distinctions of natural Necessity. And whether God could have Remitted Sin without Satisfaction, modestly discussed.


To declare his Righteousness, that he might be just, &c.

The final cause of our Justification is in this Text set down generally, and then divided into two particulars, The finis cujus, and the finis cui.

The finis cujus I shall at this time accomplish; and for the other, viz. finis cui, I shall take another Text. The end for the sake whereof God will justifie us through Christ's blood, as a Satisfactory Atonement, is to declare his Justice and Righteousness, that he doth not onely abhorre it, but will punish it, with his severest wrath, and therefore spareth not his Sonne, when he will become Surety for a sinner; That Christ made a true and proper Satisfaction by his bloud to Gods Justice, hath been proved at large.

Let us proceed to shew the grounds of this way, why it was necessary that we should be redeemed in a way of Justice, as well Why it was necessary we should be redeemed in a way of Justice.
Of Christ's Sufferings, Merit and Satisfaction.

well as of Mercy and Power. For some decry this as a most absurd and prophane imagination. Now besides the Scripture Texts, which you have heard plainly declaring God's will to redeem man in this manner, and no other, we may conceive two grounds of it.

And the first is, From the Nature of Sin. It is of an infinite guilt, and hath an infinite evil in the nature of it, and therefore no meer creature, but that person who had an infinite dignity could make Satisfaction for it. It's a Rule received by all, That by how much greater and more noble the person is, to whom the offence is made, by so much the offence is the greater, as Jude vers. 8,9. aggravates some mens sins from the excellency of the object; They speak evil of dignities. When Shimei cursed David, the King and chief Governor of the Land, it was more hainous then if he had done it to one of the meaner sort. Hence in respect of the object, The crucifying of Christ was a crimson sinne, because he was the Sonne of God, and the Lord of glory; The death of all the men in the world was not so much as his: Now seeing the majesty and honour of God is infinite, and there is no proportion between a creatures glory, and Gods glory: Therefore every sinne being injurious to this Majesty, and offensive of his glory, it must have an infinite evil and guilt in it.

Indeed the Schoolmen dispute, Whether sinne can properly be said to be an infinite evil? Some grant, that in some respect it may be called infinite, because it's against an infinite God, whose Majesty is incomprehensible, but this is wholly extrinsecal, for God is not the intrinsecal object of the soul, no not when it enjoyeth him in the most happy manner. Now if this be granted, its enough to us, that seeing sinne hath at least thus farre an infinite demerit in it, because committed against a God of unsearable Glory and Majesty, therefore none can make compensation or satisfie, but such an one, who hath as much honour and worth in him, as sinne brought dishonour; and this can onely be God and man, who though as a man did things humiliter, yet as God they were done sublimiter.
But there are others that say the evil of sinne is infinite intrinsically, because it doth offend God, in quantum est offendibilis, as farre as he can be offended; for that sinne doth not actually hurt God, and destroy him, is from his infinite perfection: if the sinner by his sinne could effect the ruine of the Divine Majesty, he would. Hence by the first Commandment we are forbidden, To make to our selves any other gods but him; Every sinner sets up another God besides him: Now that is to offend God as highly as he can be offended; Every sinner making the object of his sinne another God, provokes God so much as God can be provoked; Those that made their belly their God, Phil.3.19. And covetousnesse being called Idolatry, Col.3.5. as the Poet said,

_Clausum æræ eustodi fovem._

These sinners sitting up creatures in the room of God, offend him infinitely; so that if a creature could love God in quantum est amabilis, that would be infinite love; hence God onely loveth himself; so because sinne is an offence against him, as farre as he can be offended, therefore it may well be said to have an infinite evil and guilt in it. Neither (say the same Authors) will this make every sinne alike, because one infinite cannot be more then another; for although in respect of the aversion from God, and offence to him, all are alike, and therefore all are punished equally pæna damni, with the losse of God; yet in respect of their conversion or turning to the creature, which is the cause of turning from God, so there is a difference: As (say they) darknesse is in itself a total privation of light, yet as there may be causes impeding this light, so one darknesse may be greater then another: Howsoever these things are, yet to be sure the Scripture speaks of sinne, as an offence, rebellion and despising of God; and he being the Jehovah, and fountain of all good and excellency, sinne doth thereby derive such guilt upon the offender, that unless there be a greater good, then all the sins collectively are an evil, there cannot be any true and proper satisfaction. And indeed the wisdom of God would not have suffered evil to be, had he not known thereby to procure a greater good.
The second main ground, why God doth justifie by way of satisfaction, is, from that glorious property of his justice, whereby as he hateth sinne, so he doth propend to punish it. This property we have asserted by many places of Scripture, because the Socinians deny it, making Mercy and Justice (or as they call it anger) no properties in God, but meer voluntary effects of his free will, which being laid down as a foundation, then the superstructure must be, That Christ did not die by way of Satisfaction, at least, there was no necessity of it. But we affirm, That as Mercy, Omnipotency and Wisdom, so Justice also, whereby he enclineth to punish sin, is natural to God.

Indeed even amongst the Orthodox, there is difference of Judgements, at least in this point, whether primitive Justice was so natural to God, supposing sinne to be, that he could not remit it without Satisfaction? But happily by a distinction or two the difference may be reconciled.

1. Concerning Natural, which Pareus Comment. in 2d cap. Gen, & cap. 9. ad Rom. Dub. 12. hath out of Aquinas, that a thing may be said to be natural two ways, either, 1. When it necessarily and meerly floweth from the principles of nature; thus the fire burneth naturally, the stone descends naturally. Or secondly, When it floweth from the principles of nature, but by the mediation and intervention of free will. Thus to understand, to will, to laugh, to speak, are natural actions to man, yet so as the exercise of them is subject unto our free will. Thus when we say its natural to God to punish and correct sinne, we mean in the later sense; not as if God must necessarily punish as soon as ever it is committed, or that he must punish to the utmost every time, as natural Agents work to the utmost they can: but the exercise of this, is subject to his widsome and liberty.

2. When we say God doth necessarily punish sinne, because he is just, in his nature, we must distinguish of necessity.

1. There is an absolute and immutable necessity: Thus God only is necessarily, it being impossible that God should not be.

2. There is a limited and respective necessity, and that sometime
sometimes from the efficient cause, because he is thus or
thus disposed; as when it is said, 1 Cor. 10. There must be
herefore, that is, partly in respect of the efficient cause, be-
cause there will be ignorance and pride always in men, al-
though the Text mentioneth there onely the final cause.

2. From the material cause. Thus death is necessary and
inevitable, because we have principles of corruptibility
within us.

3. From the formal cause, because that is immutable and
unchangeable.

4. From the final cause, supposing such an end. Now its
ture in the former sense, it was not necessary to have Christ's
Satisfaction; for it was not absolutely necessary that man-
kinde should be redeemed: God might have passed it by, as
he did the apostate Angels. Hence Heb. 2, 10. Gods love is ag-
gravated, That he took not the Nature of Angels, but the
seed of Abraham.

But for the later kindes of necessity, some are true here,
as there was a necessity of pardoning sinne by Satisfaction, in
respect of the efficient cause God, seeing by nature he loathes
and hates Sin.

2. From the final cause, seeing he purposed in procuring
our Salvation to glorifie his Mercy and Justice, he would not
punish all sinne with eternal damnation, nor yet let all go
unpunished, but would manifest himself both just and mer-
ciful; supposing this, it was necessary that sin should not be
pardoned without satisfaction.

Thirdly, A thing may be absolute and necessary, either
quoad exercitium actus, in respect of the exercise of the act,
or the specification and manner of it; or rather thus, The
objects of some properties in God, may be said to be neces-
sarily. Or secondly, The objects supposed, then the acts
are necessary. To Gods Omnipotency there is required no
object, because it makes its objects: and to Gods wisdom
there is required no qualification in the object, for he can
order every thing to a glorious end; but to Gods Mercy and
Justice, there are not onely required objects, but objects so
qualified either with grace and sinne. Therefore when we

say,
say, that it is natural to God to punish sinne, we mean not, as if God must naturally create a world, and procure man to be a sinner, but these things were done by God's free-will; only suppose man doth fall and become a sinner, then God's Justice requireth the punishment of it; So that it was free to God whether he would create man or no; yet supposing man is fallen, then it's not free whether he will be just in his actions to the sinner or no.

These distinctions might clear the point, but because even amongst the Orthodox, there are different assertions in this matter; let us discourse it a little more.

There are several learned Authors, that hold God's Justice in correcting and punishing sinne is so natural, that he cannot but punish it, or require Satisfaction, otherwise he should deny himself and his own Nature; and this is not to derogate from his Omnipotency and Perfection, no more then to say, he cannot lie; but it ariseth from his infinite Perfection. Thus hold many excellent Writers, Piscator amica Collati, cum Vorst. Lubbertus 99. Error, Vorst. Parmus, in cap. 2. Genes. & cap. 9. ad Rom. Dub. 12. Brocheu Animad. in Vorst. Martin. de persona Christi, Steg. Photin. pag. 506, 507. and many others.

There are again others that say, If God be considered absolutely in respect of his power, and not upon a supposition of his decree, which is de facto to let no sinne go unpunished, but to punish it either in the person or his surety; In this absolute sense they say, God might freely have remitted sin without any Satisfaction, and that there were other ways of our salvation then by redemption through Christ. Augustine several times affirmeth this, especially Ser. 3. de Sanet. Domini, God saith he, would so repair man, that he would not let sinne go unpunished, because he is just, nor yet let it be incurable, because he is merciful, Potuit alter fieri quantum ad potentiam Medici, &c. If we consider the power of the Phy- sitian, he could have done otherwise: but that place is most notable and urged by all that go this way, lib. 3. de Trin. 13. cap. 10. where he saith, Another way of healing our misery, was possible to God, but there was none more convenient then
then this: Though these places do assert another way possible, yet they do not determine whether that other way would have been without Satisfaction or not: Calvin indeed speaks peremptorily to this purpose, *in cap. 15. John v. 13.* Petriat vel solo verbo, aut mut nos redimere, &c. God might by a mere word or command have redeemed us, but he took this way through his Son, that his love might be made more manifest. And the Schoolmen generally following Lumbard their Master, and he also following Augustine from the forementioned place, do with one consent conclude, God might forgive sinne without any Satisfaction, and that Christ's death is necessary only hypothetically, upon a supposition of God's Decree, to take this way rather then another. Hence Sandius the Jesuite, (Hydrus Holland,) makes the Catholick truth, as he calls it, to be between the Socinians and the Calvinists, determining, that God will not de facto pardon sinne without Satisfaction, against the Socinians; yet absolutely he could have done otherwise, against the Protestants. But his malice deceiveth him in this, for many Orthodox Protestants, yea and Calvin himself acknowledge, God might have redeemed us by his sole Command or word. And of late the learned Doctor Twiss hath a digression on purpose against Piscator and Lubbertus in this very point, *Vind. lib. 1. de elect. Digress. 8.* But seeing both Lubbertus and Dr. Twiss himself do acknowledge that distinction mentioned by Parris about a two-fold naturnality, I see no reason why he should so industriously confute Lubbertus, neither do his Arguments seem pressing.

For my own thoughts I shall declare them in these particulars:

1. It is agreed on by all hands (except the Socinians) that whatsoever God might have done, yet he hath plainly revealed his will, that he will not pardon sin, no not the least sin without a price paid, and an atonement made. God hath decreed this way and no other, he hath revealed himself to be a God that will not acquit the guilty, and that will judge even the least sinnes, though they be but idle thoughts and words: Seeing therefore God hath pitched upon this way, it seemeth superfluous and useless.
useless to dispute about the possibility of another way, and indeed it would be mis-spent time, but that the Socinians necessarily plunge us into it, denying any such Justice of God, as thereby to punish sin, but making it wholly arbitrary to punish or not punish: so that to evidence this truth the more about Gods righteousness requiring Christs Satisfaction, we may soberly and modestly enquire into it.

Yet in the second place, what Doctor is there, though never so subtil, angelical or profound, that can positively determine this? Who knoweth the deep treasuries of Gods power? Who can comprehend his nature? Therefore it cometh either party of the dissentients to deliver their judgement soberly, and not to condemn one another, seeing one pretends a zeal to Gods Justice, that it would be derogatory to suffer the contempt of his Majesty without punishing; and the other they declare a zeal to Gods Omnipotency, that he is not to be bounded as men, but having no Superior above him, may do what he please.

These 2 things premised, I do incline to that opinion, which holdeth, That a corrective or vindicative Justice is natural and essential to God, so that he cannot but punish sin, or have satisfaction and an atonement by a Saviour. Provided that natural be taken in this sense, for that which floweth from nature, yet by the help of free will and reason; as we say, to laugh, to speak, to will, is natural to a man. And there are these Reasons preponderating with me for it.

First, The Scripture when it speaketh of Gods punishing sin, doth not attribute it meerly to his Will and Decree; but to his just nature, because he is a righteous God. Thus Psal. 11.7. when the Psalmist had described the judgements of God upon the ungodly, he inferreth it from the righteousness of his Nature, Because he is a righteous God, he will thus punish them; Also. Rev. 16.15. The judgements which God there executed upon the Churches enemies, are laid to be, because he is a righteous God: Seeing therefore that the Scripture when it speaks of the punishing of sin, doth not attribute it meerly to his free will and power, but because of his just nature, whereby he hateth sin, and as Judge of the world will be avenged
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on it; Therefore we may affirm, such justice as its an attribute, is essential to God, though the effects of it, are subject to his free-will, to punish when, where and how he will.

Secondly, If God punish sin more from his will, then it must follow, that sin or no sin is all one to him. That God in his own nature is not moved with all the blasphemies and impieties of the world, then if there were none at all; For if God by nature doth not encline to punish sin, but its mere will, then it is no more then when God purposed to create the world, or to make it rain: As it was nothing to Gods nature to make a world, or not make it; to cause it to rain, or not to rain; such an indifferent thing sinne must be to God. But how can this stand with those places, that say, God is of purer eyes then to behold iniquity, Hab. 1? And that, God is angry with the wicked every day? And if the Adversaries think it hard to say, That God cannot pardon the least sin without satisfaction, certainly it is more difficult to say, That all the sins of the world may be forgiven, though men never humble themselves, and repent of them.

Thirdly, If God punish sin meerly from his will, and not from his Nature, How is it that all men have implanted in them such principles about God, that he will punish sin? Why is it, that upon the committing of any sinne, there is trembling, and a remorse of conscience? Neither can it be said, This is because God by his Word hath revealed he will punish it; for even Heathens and Pagans they have such implantations upon their conscience, they have been able to say, that a wicked man though he may be securus, yet he is never tenu, that Gods judgement hangs over his head, as a drawn sword. And this the Apostle verifieth of them, Rom. 1. 32. That they know sinqua se the just judgement of God. How came they to know this, but from an ingrained principle of conscience within?

Fourthly, The Scripture speaking of damnation, and the punishment of sin, attributeth it not only to God ordaining such a reward, but to the merit and desert of sin itself. Thus Rom. 1. 32. they that do such things are said to be worthy of death; Why worthy? Or whence doth the desert of hell arise? Is it meer-
ly because God will? Or not rather, because sinne being a dishonour to God doth deserve it? If then sinne do deserve eternal wrath, then its from God's justice, not from his meer will that sin is punished.

Fifthly, This seemeth much to derogate from the Lord Christ, if he came into the world, and to undergo all those agones he did for sin, and yet sin might have been forgiven without it. If sin could have been pardoned without Christ, why was the beloved Son of God made a curse, and died such a reproachful death for us? And certainly, seeing that our Redemption must be by way of Satisfaction, and that requireth a person of infinite dignity, I wonder how any can think any other way was possible, unless we may imagine that the Father or the holy Ghost might have been incarnated, for no meer creature could be a Mediator to reconcile God and man; and certainly, seeing that Austin himself faith, Though other wayes were possible, yet none is so convenient, this is to give up their cause; for who can tell, whether God could not finde out a more convenient way as well as possible? And if not, then certainly we must conclude, that such is the excellency and perfection of God, that he alwayes takes the most excellent and perfect way. And thus much shall suffice for the clearing of this main Article of Religion.

And let the godly soule make this Use of it, to admire the wisdom and knowledge of God, who, when mankinde was utterly lost, and as hopelesse as the Apostate Angels; When Justice stood with a fiery sword to keep man from all happinesse, that then God should provide a way for our salvation. This is that glorious mystery into which the Angels desire to search, though not so much concerned in it; and shall not the godly man much more study it? For now he hath two tenures to hold his pardon and salvation by, Free grace and Justice; Free grace, in respect of himself; Justice, in respect of Christ. If thou think Free grace will not acquit such a wretch as thou art, then know a full price is laid down to discharge thee of all thy sins: So that now when the Prince of the world comes against thee, thou mayest say in some sense as Christ did, He can finde nothing in thee, for how can he accuse
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Thee, seeing Christ is thy Surety? The bond hath been sued upon him, he would not leave one farthing unpaid. Therefore the godly man may live and die without fear, he may well with Paul cry out, Who can lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? Its Christ that died. This answers Law, Devils, Conscience, Justice, and all. As Paul said to Philemon concerning Onesimus, If he have wronged thee, or oweth thee any thing, put it on my account: So doth our Mediator to God, If these owe thee any thing, or have wronged thy Majesty, put it on me. Paul indeed added, I Paul have written it with my own hand, but Christ hath ratified and confirmed it with his own blood.
SECT. III.
Of the Justification of a Sinner.

S E R M. X I I .
Sheweth what Justification is, and what are the Adjuncts, Properties, and Effects of it.

R o m. 8. 33.
It is God that Justifieth.

Hough humane Histories relate the stately pomp and wonderful glory that great Emperours and Conquerours have triumphed in, yet who so readeth from the 31st vers. to the last of this Chapter, must say, that all the Cæsars in their highest glory were not equal to Paul in the heavenly triumph he makes in these verses; so that as Elijah had his fiery chariot carrying him to heaven, So this part of the Chapter may be called Pauls Divine Chariot, whereby he is exalted as high as heaven, with a powerful conquest over all enemies.

The Apostle having in the former part of the Chapter treated
treated of many admirable priviledges God's children do enjoy at vers. 31. he begins to be overwhelmed in his Meditations, and suffers his spiritual deliquiums, as being not able to say any more, What shall we say to these things? As if he had said, My soul suffereth violence within me, I cannot go any further. A sea of eloquence is but a drop to this infinite matter; Like the Queen of Sheba, seeing the glory of Solomon, and beginning to faint within her; thus doth Paul, beholding the excellent glory God puts on his children, and having after this divine extasy, something recovered himself, he instances in three sad temptations which usually afflict and peffundate the godly, giving three strong Antidotes and Cordials against them.

The first temptation is from the external power and force, which the enemies of God's Church use to the crushing and breaking of the godly, though Christ will at last break them with a rod of iron, yet in the mean time they thus break his people. Now to this, faith Paul, If God be for us, Who can be against us? If God be for us, it is not a speech of doubting, but raciocinating; Si is for Quoniam, seeing God is for us, Who can be against us? Is any greater then God? Is any more powerfull then him? Thou maist well oppose God to all enemies; they have earthly power, but I have God; they boast of their Titles and Names, but how glorious are the Titles and Attributes of God?

A second temptation is from the want of these necessary outward comforts. The people of God are sometimes not the Divesses, but the Lazarusses of the world; Though they have an interest in all promises, yet for the present they may be destitute and wanting all things. To this the Apostle giveth a strong Cordial, If he hath given us his Sonne, then whom nothing is dearer or more precious, How shall he not with him give us all things else? What is food and raiment to Christ?

A third temptation, which is the worst of all, is from sin, The Law accusing us, the Devil charging us, and our own hearts and consciences condemning us. Now to this, see what a tri-
a triumphant challenge he makes, Who shall lay any thing to God's elect? Its God that justifieth.

So that in words we have a quick and sharp interrogation, with a vehement and compleat response.

The interrogation is, Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? He doth not say, Who shall condemn them? though he mentioneth that in the next place, But who shall so much as charge them? draw up a bill and indite them? Many may be accused and indited, and yet not condemned, but here the Apostle doth not only deny the later, but the former also, none can condemn them, yea none can charge them or accuse them, for the reason is, It is God that justifieth. Some of old read this also interrogatively, Doth God that justifieth them? Doth he lay to their charge? But it runnes most smoothly without an interrogation.

In the words we have the efficient cause, God; and the action attributed to him, he justifieth, or ἵστησιν, who is justifying. If God justifieth none can accuse, seeing he is the supremum Judge, and all the mullets which issue out of the Courts of conscience go in his name. If therefore they have not God's Name and Authority to warrant them, they are not to be regarded; if God gives an acquittance or discharge, none dare oppose, for the Greek word ἰστήσει I shall speak more in the Explication.

That there is a glorious privilege vouchsafed to the believer, which the Scripture calls Justification. This is the very Marrow of Doctrinal and Practical Divinity, and therefore we are to give the more attendance to it. Luther said, Prefat in Galat. That this Article of Justification did reign in his heart, that night and day his thoughts did flow and reflow about it. Its the Centre wherein all theological truths do meet. Its the Ocean that by its several streams watereth and refresheth the Paradise, the Church of God. Its the Ark of faith, all Religion is kept pure, while this is kept pure. Its accounted one instance of the prophetical spirit in Luther, that he fore-saw this Doctrine would be after his time greatly obscured; and indeed not onely Papiists, but all sorts of Hereticks have thrown many dead flies in this precious ointment; so that the Doctrine

Observe.
Doctrine of it being of such vast consequence, it calls for all able learned men to keep this Spring pure: As every wound in the heart is mortal, so every error about Justification is dangerous: Therefore it is a licentious expression of that Leviathan, Hobs Deceiver, cap. 18. who sports himself in all Political, Ethical and Theological matter, when he saith, the Disputations about justifying faith are meekly Philosophical, and so not essential to Religion; and thus the Remonstrants makes it not a straws matter, whether we say, Fides quae viva, or quae viva justificat, whereas these particulars declare a vast difference; as when we speak of Christ, it would be to say, Christus qui Deus est moritur, and quae Deus est, Christ who is God died, and as he is God he died, the former is a truth, the latter is blasphemy; and besides this Doctrine is very necessary practically, how many thousands are ignorant of it, that know not what Justification is, that which they need more than their daily bread: that which they want as much as their breath, even every moment, of this they are wholly unskilful.

Let us therefore enter into this Land of Canaan that floweth with milk and honey. And

First, Let us be informed what it is, and afterwards what the adjuncts and properties and effects of it. And if the Philosophers assertion be, that by the name of a thing we come to the nature of it; this must hold much more in this point of Justification, whereas the matter and thing it self is peculiar and proper, revealed only by the Word, so is the name and phrase to express it by, for the Greek word δικαιοσύνη and δικαίος, answering the Hebrew word חסדick in Hephil is used in another signification, then commonly it is with humane Authors, for ἡ ὑποθεσίς makes it to signifie μαρτύς and μαρτυρία.

Suidas attributes two significations to it, μαρτυς to punish, and δικαίων νομιζεῖν, to judge that which is just and equal, and for the most part it is used of things and not of persons.

Stephanus, Theol. Ling. Tom. 1. alledged many places out of prophane Authors, where the word is used, and all to this purpose to judge that which is just, or to be as much as ἀξίω or simply to judge, and sometimes from καταδίκαζω to condemn.
demned with Aristotelian δίκαιος is opposed to obtaining our right, which when a man doth not, but is unjustly dealt with, then he is said δίκαιος; but in the Scripture use of the word it is most commonly attributed to persons, and signifies not to punish or condemn, as often with humane Authors; hence their publick places of punishment were called δικαίωσις as Hesychius faith; & Nazianzen calls hell, or the place there of the damned, μέτα τίνα δικαίωσιν, but to justify and absolve, to acquit a person as righteous: And herein the New Testament followeth the Septuagint use of it, although the word be used most frequently by Paul. Now the Septuagint they translate the word Hizdick, or as if used in other conjugations most commonly by δίκαιος or δικαίωμα about twenty-four times, but once by δίκαιον δικαιώνομαι, Job 27.5. we render it, God forbid I should justify you, once δίκαιον κενοί, Prov. 27.5. He that justifieth the wicked, δικαιώνει τον δικαιόν, Should a man fall of talk be justified? καθαρσός ειμι, Job 4.17. Shall a man be more just then his Maker? Dan. 8.14, καθαρσός ἐστιν ὁ θεός, The Sanctuary shall be cleansed, in the Hebrew it is, Shall be justified, but the word is in Niphal. In all other places the Septuagint useth δίκαιος or δικαίωμα, and in all of them, when the word is used in Hiphil, It signifies either the absolving or acquitting of one righteous, or the declaration of a man's righteousness by some outward testimony. This being clear in the Scripture, and asserted as the first Proposition, therefore we lay down a second.

II. Secondly, That to justify in a Scripture sense is to absolve or pronounce a man righteous, not to infuse or put righteousness into a man. Here is the great contest between the Papists and us; We say the word is taken from Courts of Justice, when a person accused is absolved and so used in a juridical sense; They say it signifies to make inherently just and righteous, as calefaction signifies to make inherently hot, and Sanctification to make inherently holy. Now this is not a vain strife of words, for the great Article of our Religion depends upon the right discovery of the use of the word: If to justify signifies to give us an inherent righteousness, then by that we may
may appear before God; in the confidence of that we may live and die; we must still look to something within us; but if to justify signify to acquit us being accused for sinne through the grace of God, and the righteousness of Christ, then we are to go out of our selves to renounce every thing that is ours, we are to look without us, we are with Paul, Phil. 3. Not to be found in our own righteousness, but that which is by faith in Christ. It is the judgement of the Protestants, that the word is constantly used so in the Scripture, and that the adversaries are never yet able to produce any one place to the contrary, insomuch that Bellarmine himself confesseth, this is the most common use of the word. Neither do the Papists only interpret the word justify for justification, or making righteous by habitual and actual righteousness. But the Socinians also, and all their Interpolators. Castelli de Justific, doth industriously set himself to prove, that to justify is to heal a man of his sins by inward sanctification, though he acknowledge the Scripture-use of the word in the sense before-mentioned, neither can he instance in any one place to the contrary.

But when we say its a juridical word, the meaning is not, as if it were applied only to Judges in their judicial acts; for its many times applied to particular persons justifying either themselves or others, only we say, when applied to God, it signifies a judicial absolution, for here in this Text, there are accusations and condemnations supposed, to which justification is opposed; and indeed if to justify were to endow us with holiness and righteousness, then considering how imperfect and weak the best mans graces are, there would be enough to lay to his charge; so that with Cain he would be forced to cry out, My sins are greater then I can bear. Indeed there is a speech of Calvin's questioned by Vorstius, de Justitia Dei, when he faith, That God in justifying of us, doth Quodammodo deponente personam judicis; and the Arminians make two distinct, as it were, Thrones of Gods, a Throne of Grace, and a Throne of Justice (Lubbert. cont. Bertium;) and this they do, that so their credere may be accounted of for an universal righteousness to justification; but as you heard, and shall be manifested.
manifested more (God willing) God doth not pronounce any righteous, but he that hath a perfect righteousness; now seeing no godly man's righteousness, much lesse faith itself, which is but a particular grace, is all the righteousness we ought to have: Therefore we must look out for some more perfect and enduring righteousness then this is; for the present take notice, that most of the places of Scripture speaking of justification, make it a discharging and acquitting from accusations, and so doth legally make just, not qualitatively, Deut. 25.1. Isa. 5.23. Prov. 17.15. And indeed to justify a wicked man could not be an abomination to the Lord, if to justify were to make just and holy, for this would be acceptable to God.

Those two places often instanced in by the Papists, are as often answered by the Orthodox, Dan. 12.3. They that are justifiers of many, or as we render it, That turn many to righteousness, shall be as the stars, for the Ministers of the Word do not justify by infusing holiness into their teachers, but by informing and instructing of them how to attain to this benefit, and by a declarative application of God's grace to the humbled, repenting sinner, in which sense they are said to remit and loose sinne, which is to justify instrumentally, even as they are said to regenerate, 1 Cor. 4.13. and save, 1 Tim. 4.16. instrumentally.

The other place is Rev. 22.11. He that is righteous, let him be righteous, or justified still. Some Divines will indeed grant, that justification taken largely and improperly, may comprehend under it sanctification also, for God never justifieth, but those he sanctifieth, yet there is no necessity to understand it so here, seeing it may only denote, that he who is righteous should abide and continue in the state of justification, For though holy works do not justify, yet by them a man is continued in a state and condition of justification: so that did not the Covenant of Grace interpose, grosse and wicked ways would cut off our justification, and put us in a state of condemnation. Let this then be concluded on, That justification is a legal or juridical word; so that if men guilty of crimes, especially capital, tremble at those Summons which bring them before
before the Judge, How much more should we at those sins for which we shall be arraigned at Gods barre? So that if God did not mercifully absolve us through Christ, we must necessarily undergo that eternal doom, which is due unto our sins.

Thirdly, Justification being thus an absolution of us, and pronouncing of us righteous, there is necessarily implied thereby, that we are indeed made and constituted righteous; For seeing God pronounceth a curse against him that justifieth the wicked, we cannot or must not think, that because God is said to justify the ungodly, Rom. 4. that God doth that which he abhorreth in us; for though the person justified be in himself a sinner, yet at the same time believing in Christ, and putting Christs righteousness upon him, he is made a partaker of a perfect righteousness, by which he is justified. Hence Rom. 5. 19. By one mans obedience shall many be made righteous, whereas by obedience is not meant only Christs death, but his active conformity to the Law of God, neither is that expression to be understood of inherent righteousness, as is more largely to be shewed: God then when he pronounceth us righteous, judgeth according to truth; So that in this we need not contest with the Papist, Whether it signifie to make righteous or no, onely we deny it to make righteous inherently, we are truly and really made righteous, but not by a perfect renovation of the whole man in a full conformity to Gods will. This if duly considered must revive the heart of every true believer: He thinketh, How shall I come with my rags into the presence of so glorious and holy a Majesty? How shall I to full of sin and imperfection, come into Gods presence? Is it not as offensive, as it was for those croaking frogs to creep into Pharaohs chamber? Oh remember that thou art a just and righteous man, not in thy self, but in Christ, in whom is no blemish! When God beholds his Church in Christ, then he faith, Cant. 3. Thou art all fair, my Beloved, there is no spot in thee; yet this doth not degenerate into that Aminomian position, That God feith no sin in his people, nor doth chastise them for it, as is to be shewed.

Fourthly,
Fourthly, Seeing that to justify is to constitute, and to declare or pronounce righteous; therefore in the third place, it signifieth to attribute all those testimonies either real or verbal to a person so justified, as if he were inherently and compleatly righteous. Thus when God is said to be justified, Psal. 51. that is, because he is indeed just and righteous, to acknowledge this in the world, so to speak of him, and so to celebrate all his providences, as one that doth dispense every thing with much wisdom and purity. Thus wisdom is said to be justified of her children; Mat. 11. 19. Although learned men much differ about the sense of that place, and give contrary Interpretations. Some understanding the word to signify reproved and condemned, because Christ was disallowed by the Jews, as the Greek word is used sometime in humane Authors: Howsoever, when a person is made righteous, and so pronounced, then whatsoever promises and privileges are appointed for righteous persons, he may claim and expect: hence the effects of such a Justification, are such, that none can have but righteous persons, as Rom. 5. 1, 2. Being justified we have peace with God; and Eph. 3. We may come boldly to the throne of grace. There is none can lay any thing to our charge: What can be said more of Angels and Saints in Heaven? None can blame them, accuse or condemn them, and this justified persons have in this life; Oh the depth, breadth and length of this glorious mercy! Now the believer, though compassed about with many infirmities, may as boldly walk abroad, and be afraid or ashamed of no nakedness, no more then Adam before his fall: Though it is not upon his doing the Law that he liveth, yet it is upon Christ's fulfilling of it: When Joseph is discharged out of prison, then he feareth no more arrests, yea he is preferred to the greatest glory and honour that can be in the Court: Why is it that men leave not the thoughts of all other things to be inflated in this freedom? Did they so much esteem a freedom in the City of Rome? How much more ought we to be of that City in Heaven? for there neither Law, nor Conscience, or Devils
Devils have any thing to do with us, we are no more under their dominion.

Fifthly, \textit{Justification in the Gospel-way doth always suppose some accusation, some charge, and therefore he must have been a sinner that is thus justified.} Indeed the Apostle speaks of a \textit{Justification by works}, as Rom.2.13. The doers of the Law shall be justified; and Gal.2.16. There he argueth against such a \textit{Justification}, but this is only a supposed and imagined one; The presumptuous Jew being confident in his own righteousness thought to introduce such an one: for now since man fallen all the Justification that is, proceedeth by pardoning our infirmities, and imputing Christ's righteousness unto us. Hence Adam if he had continued would have been justified, and so the confirmed Angels are, but not in that notion or way as the Scripture-justification is declared to be: for Adam and the elect Angels, have no matter or desert of accusation, there was not the least blemish in their natures; Therefore our Justification differs specifically from them; yea our \textit{Justification before God}, differs much from a judicial absolution in the Courts of men, for with them the more faults are pardoned, the leas is he justified; yea a man that is pardoned is not said to be justified, but when crimes are charged upon him, and he proveth himself not guilty, then is the Judge said to justifie him. But it is not thus in God's Court, for there the sinner is arraigned and found guilty, it is too plain he hath transgressed this and that command, he cannot hide it, or cover it: Now then, God by looking upon us through Christ, who made himself an atonement for our sins, doth absolve and pronounce us just: Oh then that believers did understand God's way better! There is nothing more innate and natural to man, then to be his own self-justifier, still to think, that for the goodness of his heart, and the holiness of his works, he shall be accepted of. The Jews Rom 9.1. whatsoever Paul said, yet would go about to establish their own righteousness. Men may sooner be convinced to part with their sins, then with their seeming righteousness in matter of Justification; What was it that made Luther lie in a very hell so long, that he often wished he had never been a man, q
the terrors of sinne were so great upon him? But because he was ignorant of God's way in justifying. Till a man be thoroughly Evangelized, he cannot but think, he must go with his full works to God that he may be justified, and till he hath them, he must crucify and torment himself, as being under daily fears and bondage; so that it is one of the difficultest lessons, and that which Christ's Scholars in his highest form do only learn, to go out of their holiness and duties by faith to Christ for righteousness, as well as by conversion to turn from their sins to God. Indeed men corrupted in their opinions judge otherwise, as Castello lib. de Just. he makes this relying on another's righteousness, viz. Christ's, to be a sweet pleasing thing to flesh and blood, as if men had rather do this then mortifie any one sin; but as the Sun can never be without light; so neither can this righteousness be without true holiness: So that although many men's mouths are like open sepulchres against this way of Justification, yet it being so clearly discovered in the Scripture, and the Saints recorded to tremble at their own righteousness, lest God should enter into judgement with them because of it; Therefore all the godly are to look on this, as the Anchor of their souls, as the only City of Refuge, as that they only can live with and die with, without which what was said of Judas might be true of every one, It had been better he had never been born.

Surm.
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Serm. XIII.

A particular Description of Justification.

Rom. 8. 33.

It is God that Justifieth.

Some Propositions have been already delivered for the clearing of this necessary and precious Doctrine of Justification, of which we are to say, as God of the Land of Israel, Our eyes and our hearts are to be upon it all the day long. We shall at this present add more. And

First, Though Justification be not an infusing of such holiness and righteousness into us, that thereby we are justified, yet this Justification is never without a Sanctification of our natures: So that this Doctrine gives no just ground for those prophane calumnies Papists and others make, as if we held that men, though wallowing in sinne, were justified by God, as if because Christ's righteousness was imputed to them, there needed no other holiness at all. Hence do they so much desire this righteousness as putative; yea Castalia (lib. de Jusstif.) mocketh the Orthodox with their putative modesty and putative learning, but this is an impudent slander; for we profess over and over again, That inherent righteousness, and imputed are inseparably annexed, neither is the Question, Whether God doth renew us by his Spirit, and sanctifie our natures when he justifieth us? But whether this be our Justification? Even the Papists themselves acknowledge, That besides this Justification and infused righteousness they speak of, there is requisite also remission of sinnes, or a judicial absolution, only they make this either previous or concomitant,
or subsequent to our Justification. This then is confessed on all sides, That an inherent godliness and holiness every justified person hath; But the Question is, Whether for this within him he be justified, or for something without him? We say, The righteousness of the most eminent person that is, cannot stand in God's sight, neither can the just God who pronounceth of things as they are, declare that to be a perfect righteousness which is not. Now its plain, That all godly men finde and feel imperfections in their most holy things: One would think that one passage, Psal. 143.2. is enough to satisfie all, where David, though a man after God's own heart, yet prayeth, That God would not enter into judgement with him, because in his sight no man living can be justified. He doth not say, he himself; but no man living; for, faith Augustine, Vidi totam vitam humanam circumlatrari peccatis suis, upon Psal. 130. If thou markest our iniquities, O Lord, who should stand? Our imperfections and sins are like so many dogs barking about us that we cannot stirre this foot or that foot, but one finne or other doth immediately open the mouth against us. Though therefore we are possesed of inherent righteousness, yet we rest not, or put confidence in this. This Contarenus an ingenious Papist of old, acknowledged saying, We had no righteousness on which we might rest, nisi tantaquam re stabili, but only the righteousness of Christ. But of this more in time.

VII. Propos. 2. As the Scripture speaks of a two-fold righteousness and a two-fold rule and covenant: So there is also a two-fold Justification. There is a righteousness of the Law which is universal compleat and final, whereby a man is pronounced by God just in himself, and for his works fake; so that its not of free grace, but debt, that he is so accepted of; and there is a righteousness of faith, or covenant of grace, whereby a sinner believing is pronounced righteous, not in himself, but through Christ his Surety, and thereby Salvation is wholly of grace to him. The former kinde of Justification is now a meer non ens, there is no such thing but in books, no man living is justified thus inherently and subjectively, and therefore the Apostle in those two Epistles to the Romans and Galatians, where
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where Justification is professedly and exactly treated of, doth very powerfully and fervently set himself against that legal Justification, which some corrupt teachers endeavoured to introduce. Now 'tis a very necessary point even for every Christian to know this distinction, for there are but these twoways of Justification possible, the one would have been of Adam had he continued in holiness, then his Justification would not have been a judicial acquaintance by remission of sin, but an accounting of him just for his inherent and acquired righteousness. But this way of Justification is impossible for man fallen, and yet the heart of man is very prone to this way, as appears by the Jews and Pharisees, who laboured to establish their own righteousness; and by the false Apostles even in the very first age of the Church, you read, nothing troubled the Church more, then what that was by which we stood justified before God: The false teachers boldly affirming, That it was by the Law, and the righteousness thereof, and by the works we do; Paul on the other side zealously opposeth, informing, That our Justification is in pardon of sin and imputation of righteousness, and that no kind of works, no not of Abraham, though regenerated, do justify us: If therefore thou art able to distinguish between these two kinde of Justifications, blest be God for this knowledge, and get the spiritual improvement thereof, for they are immediately contrary, and therefore no Subject can be justified both these ways; if it be by works of the Law, then not of faith; if it be by inherency, then not by imputation. Indeed the righteousness of the Law is fulfilled in us, as Paul speaks, Rom. 3:3, but not by us, we are justified by the righteousness of the Law in Christ our Surety, he satisfied that, but because we were not performers of it in our own persons, therefore its wholly of grace to us, because its altogether without us: Insomuch that some Divines say, We have our Justification and Salvation, by a Do this and live, but not in our own persons, but through Christ our Mediator, who did the Law for us. Therefore though our works be every where excluded from Justification, under any notion whatsoever, yet Christ's works are necessarily included: As these two Justifications are directly contrary, so there is no way of compounding
pounding them together by confusion or mixture; they being two kinds consisting in indivisible, and therefore you cannot by any distinction so unite them that a third way of Justification should be produced; and this is especially to be observed, for that hath been the endeavour of many later writers, to make a compound of Justification of faith and works together, to make a mixed thing of these two; That whereas the Apostle doth make them immediately contrary, If of works, then not of faith, and the believer and the works are always opposed as incompatible, and without this immediate opposition, the Apostles arguments would fall to the ground, they will Dare tertium, and finde out some expedient to reconcile those things which the Apostle makes so extremely distant. As the Papists, We are not justified by works, that is, say they, as opposed to Christ's death, and his Spirit, but if they be the works of grace, and the Spirit of God, if sint la sanguine Christi, then so we are justified. The Socinians and others say, though upon different principles, We are not justified by the works of the Law, but by the works of the Gospel, or by works in an Evangelical consideration, so that they be not judged meritorious, or that they obtain Salvation by way of debt, but as conditions required by the Gospel, thus they and faith justifie. But all this mincing and palliating will not hold; The Apostle gives no medium between believing and working, all kind of working quod working, is immediately opposed to believing; so that faith as it is a work is excluded from our Justification. But of this more in time, its enough for the present that we are to apprehend these two kinds of Justification as immediately contrary, and by no subtile distinctions in the world can be united together.

VIII. Prop. 3. That we may understand all the essentials ingredient to this glorious privilege of our Justification, we may take this large and popular description of it, Justification is a gracious and just act of God, whereby through Christ our Mediator and Surety, a sinner but repenting and believing is pronounced just, and hereby put into a state of reconciliation and favour with God, to the praise of God's glorious Attributes, and to the believers
vers eternal Salvation. I shall not examine this description by accurate logical rules, its enough that it is comprehensive of every thing requisite to the knowledge of Justification. And

First, We call it an action, for so God as a just and merciful Judge is considered in this matter, pronouncing of such as are free from all curses, and also just and righteous. Justification is not properly the sentence or judgement whereby we are pronounced righteous, but its God’s action: Now whether it be an immanent action, and so from all eternity, or transient, accomplished in time, I have elsewhere discussed (Treatise of Justif.) and there concluded, That its not immanent nor from eternity, but passing upon a believer in time. Indeed the Schoolmen darken the dispute about immanent and transient actions, that its hard to say from them, what is either so or so; for who would not without al doubt conclude, that the Creation of the world is a transient action, and yet they hotly quarrel about that, some affirming, and some denying at least in some sense.

Let us therefore lay aside the distinction of immanent and transient, and plainly say, God doth not from eternity justifie us, no more then sanctifie or glorifie, but when a man believeth, then, and not before is he justifie, as I have at large proved in the mentioned place. Its an action of God, therefore in the Text its said, God doth justifie, for seeing that sinne is onely committed against him, and its an offence to his Majesty, and a transgression of his Law; therefore the Scripture attributeth it to God only; and indeed though all the men in the world, and our own consciences do acquit us, yet while God doth not justifie we remain unavoidably miserable. Now when we say, God justifietb, that is to be understood of the three Persons in the Godhead; the Father justifieb, and the Son justifieb, so doth the holy Ghost. Though the Scripture observeth the peculiar economy and order, and therefore Justification is attributed to the Father, and the merit of it to the Son, and the application of it to the holy Ghost. The Socinians, they say, Christ justifieb only instrumentally, not principally, even as faith is said to save. Socin. and Steg. p. 510. But this cannot be, because Christ is God as well as man, and therefore cannot be instrumental, but principal. Hence Isa. 53, it is said, Christ even as Gods righteous servant,
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A gracious action of God.

By or through Christ our Mediator or Surety.

...which is in respect of his Mediatorial Office should justify many. Again Rom.5. Christ and the first Adam are compared and opposed, as the two heads, one of condemnation; the other of justification to life; so that as Adam was the principal in reference to death and judgement, so Christ is the fountain of life and righteousness. Furthermore, Christ is the directing and efficient cause of all organical and instrumental causes in our justification, as faith, which is man's instrument, Christ is the cause of it, Luk.17.5. So Christ is the cause of the Ministry, and the spiritual success of it, Eph.4.11,12. And hence it is that he is called, The Sun of righteousness, Mal.5.2. The true light, Joh.1.9. The King of righteousness; Heb.7.2. All which comparisons do plainly demonstrate, That Christ is principal, and not instrumental.

In the description we say, its the gracious action of God, for there is nothing did move God, but his own mere favour; therefore its said, Rom.3. freely by his grace; Gods mercy and mans misery do illustrate one another, though it were of justice to Christ, yet wholly of grace to us; and therefore if thou art justified, when many thousands lie in a wretched, condemned estate: Oh what enlargements of heart should there be to free grace! Shall the malefactor freed from his prison and condemnation so rejoice? how much then should justified persons glorifie God, who are thereby delivered from the curse of the Law, and not only so, but advanced to all honour and glory! Abhor all Popish doctrines of Satisfaction or compensations to God; flie from all presumptuous doctrines that advance free-will, or affirm preparatory merits to our justification! Sooner may we finde stars in the bottom of the earth, than any merit in us of our acceptance with God.

Further in the description it followeth[ By or through Christ our Mediator and Surety.] This is the meritorious cause of Justification; for Christ's obedience and death, is both the meritorious and material cause of our justification, meritorious as antecedent to our application, and the material cause as applied and received by us. Justification then, though it be free and of mere grace, yet it is also of Justice, and therefore the throne of God's grace, and of his justice, while he justifieth us, is all one,
SERM. XIV.

More Propositions tending to clear the Nature of Justification, especially shewing how it answers all Accusations.

ROM. 8. 33.

It is God that Justifieth.

What the Scripture faith, Deut. 24. 15, of the poor man, That his hire is not to be detainted from him, no not for a day, because his heart is set on it; Its all he hath to live upon; The same is much more to be applied of that person, who is spiritually poor and sensible of his great debt through sinne: The Doctrine of Justification is not for a day, or an hour to slip out of his minde, for his heart is set on it. Its all the comfort, and all the hope he hath, if that go all goeth: So that the excellency and necessity of the point being so great, I shall not withhold any thing that may serve for the clear discovery of it. I shall therefore adde more Propositions to the former. And

Th' first is, That though Justification be properly attributed to a sinner believing, yet the Scripture speaks of Christ's Justification, not as if Christ repented for us, or believed for us, as some have absurdly affirmed. Saltmarsh. For as Christ had no personal sinne, so neither could he have such a personal repentance, or justifying faith. Besides, by this Assertion...
Christ should have relied upon himself, as a Mediatour, and so have been justified by faith in his own bloud. But the Scripture speaks of Christ's Justification to another purpose, 1 Tim. 3. 16, where it's called a great mystery, God manifested in the flesh, justified in the Spirit; yea this expression in the Text, Its God that justifieth, seemeth to be taken from Isa. 50. 8. He is near that justifieth me, who will contend with me? So that what is there said of Christ, the Apostle doth apply to every believer. Now there are learned men speak of Christ's Justification two ways: Some say, That as Christ took our sins upon him, and so was under God's displeasure, bearing the wrath due unto us; so likewise it was necessary he should have a Justification, not for any sin of his own, but as a common person, and our Surety and Head: Insomuch that Christ upon his Resurrection (they say) having consummated the work of our Redemption, was then justified by the Father, and absolved from all the sins of the elect, which were charged upon him; and thus they grant a virtual Justification in Christ, as we are said to be risen with him, and to sit in heavenly places with him, before there be an actual Justification by faith; and this they make the reason, why that which the Prophet spake of Christ, the Apostle applieth to every believer, because Christ is the common person, they are looked upon in him, and none may accuse them, but he must accuse Christ first; but the Scripture seemeth not to be clear for this, unless we mean that Christ merited our Justification, and so we were virtually justified in him, because he obtained the right of our Justification, which was in time to be applied to us: Neither is there any ground to fasten such a Justification upon Christ, because our sins were not so laid upon him, or imputed to him, as to denominate him a sinner. Its true, his righteousness is made over to us, so as that thereby we are constituted and accounted as as righteous, but our sins are not in the same manner laid upon him; and the reason of this difference is, because our sins were imputed to him, for him to bear away, to take away the guilt of them, they were not to abide on him. But Christ's righteousness is made ours, to abide and continue ours, and therefore we
are denominated righteous, but not Christ a sinner, though its true in a large sense. Luther said, Christ was the greatest of all sinners, but his meaning not his words must be regarded. If therefore there was not such an imputation of sin unto Christ, as our Surety, in the sense mentioned, then there needed not such a justification of him, as a common person. And as for that Text, 1 Tim. 3.16. Justified in the Spirit, by the Spirit, is meant, as most Divines acknowledge, the Divine Nature of Christ, whereby he raised up himself, as Heb. 9.14. he is said to have offered up himself by the eternal Spirit, which was his Divine Nature; so that he was justified by raising up himself; that whereas his enemies had accused him for an impostor, for a false prophet, for one that wrought by the devil, and therefore justly suffered such an ignominious end, now he being raised again by his own power, he was justified against all those calumnies that were cast on him, and this seemeth to be the most genuine exposition.

Propos. 2. This justification of the believer extends as far as his accusation and condemnation might have reached. I make justification to oppose both accusation and condemnation, not mattering Stapleton's cavil on this Text, quarrelling with Calvin and Beza, because its opposed onely to accusation, and that in the next verse Christ's death is opposed to our condemnation, for one is but the antecedent, the other the consequent, and justification taking away the former, must needs remove the later; wherefore ever then any accusation may be made against a sinner believing, there we are to conceive our justification freeing of us. Now our accusation may arise several ways:

1. There is the justice of God accusing and arraigning of us, because we have not in the least manner perfectly observed his Law. Therefore that calls for the due punishment belonging to us; for to every sinner we may say the clean contrary in the Text, before he doth believe, Who shall say any thing to free or excuse him that is ungodly? Its God that accuseth and its God that condemneth. Our justification therefore in the first place doth absolve us from all that God the Judge

X.

Justification extends as far as accusation and condemnation.

Accusations.

1. From God.
of the world hath against us. Hence Justification doth still respect to God's sight, and to God's account, *Psal. 143.2. In thy sight shall no man living be justified. The world may justify us, our own hearts may absolve us, but God who is greater than our hearts, he may condemn us. Thus *Rom. 5.1. Being justified, we have peace with God; so that the primary and chief thing in Justification; is to remove that enmity between God and us; we were stubble and he a consuming fire; we were darkness, and he light: Now by Justification all this contrariety and distance is taken away; this then is the original and source of all happiness, our reconciliation begins with God first: As the waters of the Sea can never lie still while the windes blow upon them; so the heart of man can never have any true quietness, while God doth frown on him. If the anger of a King be like the roaring of a Lion, how dreadful is the anger of God? The fene of this made David so often pray for the light of God's countenance, as without which no kingdoms, no success or earthly greatness can make him happy.

In the second place; *The Law, that doth accuse him for cursed is every one that fulfillleth not that to every iota. The Apostle in his Epistle to the Galatians at large sheweth, there cannot come any Justification by the Law; there is nothing but a curse and execration by that. Therefore *Rom. 7. though of it self it were appointed for life, yet accidentally through our corruption it is made a killing and a damning Law; sinne hath a sharp and bitter sting, but its the Law that puts this into it. Now when we are justified, the Scriptures in many places deny us to be under the Law, *Rom. 6.14, *Rom. 7.6. Not that they are exempted from the regulating power of the Law, God himself cannot free them from obedience to that, no more then he can make them not to be his servants or creatures, or then he can deny himself the just titles and rights which belong to him, as God, but only from the malediction and curse of the Law; *The Law cannot now implead us for the breach of it, because we are found in the righteousness of Christ, *The impossibility of the Law as to us, is fulfilled in Christ, our Justification then freeth us in this Court.
3. Our accusation may be from the Devil, for he is called, The Accuser of the Brethren to God, as we see he complained of the high Priests garments, Zech.3.1,2. Satan stood at God's right hand to resist him, and had we not a constant accuser of us to God, what need would there be of an Advocate with the Father in heaven to plead our cause? 1 John 2.2. The Devil then he inditeth thee for all those sins and infirmities thou art guilty of, he requireth thee as his own, he challengeth thee as a fire-brand for hell: But our Justification that absolveth us here also, that stops his mouth. Being in Christ he can no more accuse us, then Christ himself: Therefore Christ died to judge the Devil, who was the Prince of the World, to cast him out, and to dissolve his works, John 12.31. John 16.11. 1 John 3.8. Insomuch that when the Devil comes he cannot finde any condemnation for thee, who art in Jesus Christ.

4. A man is accused from his own Conscience, as Rom.7.you see Paul from the sense of sinne within him, crying our, Oh miserable man that I am! Who shall deliver me? And David, Psal.19. Who can understand his errors? He hath more corruption in him then he can finde out. This is that which is as good as a thousand witnesses, yea an whole world against us, and our Justification doth remove this indictment also, strengtheneth and quieteth the conscience; so that Ro.5. We have peace with God, and rejoice with joy unspeakable: Insomuch that some Divines make Justification properly to lie in this, when the heart of a man being terrified and broken for sinne doth receive this Justification, and by the sense or perswasion thereof, is filled with much joy and peace, but though eminent Divines say thus, yet its hard to affirm it as truth, for there is a great deal of difference between our Justification and the sense of it. Many may be justified, and yet not think so, or know so. Justification and the certain perswasion of it are separable; we see David, though a childe of light, yet walking sometimes in darkness. Therefore our Justification doth not consist in our apprehension of it, for that doth necessarily suppose it to antecede, and the act doth follow the object, except when its causative and constitutive of it. But it is not so here,
our Justification is received by faith, but then the reflex act, or the soul's knowledge, that it is justified, followeth after, and that differently; in some it followeth immediately, in others its detained a long while; yea a godly man, though greatly in the favour of God, may (for ought I know) live and die in the sense of the want of it; for the persuasion and inward sense of our Justification is not essential to Salvation; neither doth the Scripture require it as a necessary ingredient to our happiness. Indeed to believe is necessary to Justification and Salvation, but to know, or to be assured that we do believe, is not. But though our Justification doth not necessarily and inseparably cause such peace and consolation in the soul, yet in its nature it doth encline to it: As the Sunne doth to cast its beams abroad, though an eclipse may obstruct and hinder it: and no wonder these emanations of Justification may be intercepted, since in Christ himself, who was truly God, the sense of consolation was for a while stopped, and did not diffuse itself from the Divine Nature to the humane. That Spirit of God spoken of Rom. 8.15. Gal. 4.6. which is sent forth in our hearts, whereby we cry Abba, Father, is not in the act of our Justification, but consequent upon it, for God must be our Father, and reconciled with us before we can call him Father. By all this it appears, that our Justification is not only in foro Dei, but in foro conscientia also; and indeed our consolation floweth from the later. Though God justifieth us, yet till we feel and know this, we may walk as uncomfortably, as if not justified at all. Mary Magdalen had her sins forgiven her, before Christ particularly spake to her, Be of good comfort thy sins be forgiven; but when this was particularly applied to her, then she did rejoice with all fulness of joy.

5. Our Justification doth extend even to all those accusations that we have from Men. Great are the calumnies that are laid upon the godly, as hypocrites, deceivers, and the worst of men. Now when God justifieth, he cancelleth all these accusations. Grotius on the Text, following the Remonstrants, speaks as if the accusation and condemnation here spoken of, to which Justification is opposed, did consist in this only: for
he mentioneth no other. Who shall accuse and lay any thing to their charge, when God justifieth? But though this be included, yet its the least considerable in our Justification. Therefore when the children of God are flandered, reproached, and men speak all manner of evil of them without cause; they may comfort themselves from their Justification, God layeth no such thing to their charge, God looks not upon them as thus and thus, but they are through Christ accepted and beloved. Thus you see that Justification doth reach as far as our acculation. Its not a covering too narrow for all thy nakedness, Christ's robes will hide thee when fig leaves cannot.

Its asserted, That Justification call'd in title, or virtual, is nothing but the grant of it in the Gospel; but I see not how that can be called our Justification, its the sign or instrument declaring of it, not Justification itself, as the grant or promise of our Sanctification is not our Sanctification; and as on the contrary our condemnation while we abide in sin, or God's anger against the sinner is not the threatening promulgled, but that which comes from God himself; neither then could we say, that we are justified by Christ given unto us, but by the Proposition laid down in the Scripture, whereas all say, that the objectam quod of our faith is ens incomplexum, not the promise of Christ, but Christ himself promised. Besides Abraham was justified, and he is made the pattern of all that shall be justified, yet there was no Scripture grant, or deed of gift in writing, declaring this; God then communicating himself to belevers in an immediate manner; Therefore to call this grant or conditional promise in the Scripture [Whoever shall believe shall be justified] a transient act of God, is very improper, unless in such a sense, as we say, Such a man's writing is his hand, and that is wholly impertinent to our purpose.

Thirdly, This Justification of us is not necessary at first only, while we are coming out of our sinne, but in the whole progress of our Sanctification. Its true, some Divines say, that Justification is compleated and perfected at one instant, when we first believed. Others, they say, its a continued action, and happily both may be reconciled: for take Justification as it con-

Whether God's act of justifying be only his grant of it in the Gospel.
noteth a state we are put into, so its not iterated, but done once; neither are we put again and again, or daily in the state of Justification, no more then God doth daily create the world. But if we take Justification for the particular acts of it, remitting of sin, and imputing of Christs righteousness, then these are daily and continually performed: Even as in our natural life, though we be not daily created, yet we need a constant preservation in that life we were created in. Thus it is here, God out of his meer grace did upon our believing put us into a state of Justification, from which favour we should fall every moment, did not God continue us therein. Hence in the Text its & we are God that is continually justifying of us; if we speak of Sanctification as a state, we cannot say that is reiterated, that the godly are frequently sanctified in that sense; but if Sanctification be taken for the particular acts of Gods grace, exciting, corroborating, quickning, and the like; these are as daily necessary as our daily bread; thus it is in our Justification, we need a constant remission, we want a perpetual imputation, because our sins and imperfections are renewed daily.

XII. Fourthly, Our Justification is full and adequate to every purpose in this life. The Scripture speaks of it as a priviledge, that we are now made partakers thereof; for while we consider how great and glorious an honour and happiness it is, we may think this is too great to be had in this life, Angels and glorified Saints can have no more: but be not discouraged, God even in this life, though full of rags and ulcers, doth pronounce us just through Christ, and deal with us as just, Rom. 3.24. Being justified freely by his grace; we have it already, we may for the present make a comfortable improvement of it, and Rom. 5.9. Being now justified by his blood; Now its already done for us, and so 1 Cor. 6.11. Ye are justified, ye are sanctified, the one was then done for them as well as the other. Hence Rom 4.5. Its God that justifieth the ungodly in the present tense. If therefore we walk not as justified persons, its our ignorance and unskillfulness in these great things. Its true at the day of judgement there will be a solemn and more compleat justifying of us, as I have elsewhere shewed, yet that Justification spoken
spoken of so much by Paul in his Epistles, doth belong to this life; and indeed we cannot then be said to be justified by faith, for justifying faith in that act, as well as repentance will then cease, every thing that implieth an imperfection in the subject being then abolished; or if we be then justified, i.e. declare justified in an Evangelical sense, it will be, because we did in this life believe in Christ, because we once had justifying faith. Hence this kind of Justification will cease in heaven, though the praise and glory for it will ever redound to Christ. It is thought that the Union between Christ and his Church shall never cease, but the manner of application of it on our part, and communication of it on God's part by Ordinances shall not then continue. Though therefore at the day of judgement, we shall have a more publick and solemn Justification before God, Angels and men, in which sense it may be said, We are not complestly and perfectly justified till then; yet that relateth most to what was in our lives past, not to what we shall be then, seeing at that time the Spirits of just men are made perfect, and their bodies crowned with immortality and glory.

Propos. 5. In a well explained sense, that Proposition is true of our Divines, that all believers are justified alike. The meanest woman believing, though the greatest sinner, a Mary Magdalen, as much as the Virgin Mary. This indeed is thought blasphemous Doctrine in Popery, because they confound Justification and Sanctification, and therefore are necessitated to admit of Degrees, one being more holy then another: but with the Orthodox, Justification is without us, and consists in the favour of God, who looking upon us through Christ, doth justifie from great sins as well as little sins, one sinner is as easily justified as another, and alike justified: yet understand this in a sound sense; for though there be no difficulty with God in pardoning great sins as well as little, and Justification like the sea can drown the tallest Egyptian, as well as a little child; yet more is required of a greater sinner then of a lesser in the way to Justification. Crimson sins must have greater sorrow; sins of daily incursion require not such a solemn repentance, as those that waste the conscience; though when
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sincerely repenting, the believer is not to doubt of the pardon of great sins, because great. Though to God Justification from all sins be as easie as from one, and from great sins as well as lesse, yet the repentance is to be drawn out according to the nature of our sins, although it must be acknowledged, that the least sinne being against such an infinite Majesty, deserteth our most intensive sorrow, and could we be melted into rivers of tears, yet they could not wash away the least spot of sinne. Again, Though all are equally justified, that is to be understood intensive, as they say, not extensive, that is, though all justified persons have those priviledges which accompany Justification, they have peace with God, they have a right to heaven and happiness; yet he that hath more sins pardoned than another, and so hath Chrift's righteousness to cover more imperfections than another, he may be said extensively to be justified more than another is, though he hath not the full and compleat mercy of Justification, more then he that hath sinned lesse. As a Giant that hath six fingers and six toes, and is vaster in body, hath not a bigger soul (for according to some Philosophers, All souls are essentially equal) then a lesse man, only the operation and virtue of it may diffuse it self more extensively.

XIV. Lastly, This is not to be understood so, as if faith, which is the applying means of our Justification, may not be firmer in some then in others. For no doubt some have a strong faith, some have a weak faith, and so some apprehend their Justification more folidly then others, yet because the worth and merit of our Justification is not in the degree of our faith, but in Chrift's righteousness apprehended by it; therefore the weak Christian is as compleatly and perfectly justified as the stronger. This, if duly considered, may establish and revive the drooping Christian, who because he hath lesse grace, therefore thinketh he hath lesse Justification: No, this is to say, thou hast a lesse Chrift then Paul or David had. Though there be difference in your Sanctification, yet not in your Justification.
Serm. XV.

The several Distinctions of Learned Men in the Point of Justification.

Rom. 8. 35.

It is God that Justifieth.

There remain two Propositions more that will clear this fundamental Doctrine of Justification.

The first is, That there is no absurdity or inconvenience in granting that the form or nature of our Justification is two-fold, or consists in two things. Bellarmine lib. 1. de Justific. endeavours to fasten it upon the Protestants, that they make Justification to have a two-fold form, viz. Remission of sinne and imputation of righteousness, although at the same time he reckons up four different opinions (as he calls them) amongst the Protestants. Our Divines generally in their answer strive to make Justification to consist in one simple form, and so endeavour a reconciliation between those four opinions, making them to be only different expressions, especially Palsam, Castigat. Bellar. and Vorstius Antibellar. de Justif. with others, make remission of sinne and imputation of righteousness to be the same thing, expressed only from different terms or extremas: Even as the expulsion of darkness, and introduction of light, are the same motion. I shall not here consider the truth of this Assertion, only I may affirm, That there is no error or
inconvenience, to make Justification to consist in two distinct benefits, which may be called a double form, for pardon of sinne, and imputation of Christ's righteousness, are (as is to be shewed) two real distinct mercies, both compleating our Justification. Indeed to assert a two-fold form of Justification that is heretogenean and opposite to one another, as our learned Writers charge the Council of Trent with, though that speaks ambiguously and subtilly, viz. in remission of sin and infusion of righteousness; this we say is very absurd and erroneous; for how can the righteousness inherent in us, be a form of Justification, which is an action of God? Its irrational to affirm any such thing; but if the two-fold form be homogeneous, of the same kinde, both actions of God without us, then I see no cause so much to strive against such a doctrine, and the Scripture doth plainly speak of both these parts, remission of sinne, and imputation of righteousness, and that not as the same thing, but of one as the ground of the other: sinne is pardoned, because righteousness is imputed, and certainly imputation of righteousness is the more noble part of Justification, and that which is more immediately constitutive of it: Insomuch that some learned Divines make remission of sinne not of the formal nature of Justification, but an effect or consequent of it: but that seemeth not so consonant to Scripture. Now the ground why its no absurdity to make Justification to consist in two distinct mercies, is Because this is wholly a gracious favour of God, and therefore takes in as many ingredients as he pleaseth to appoint: So that the form of Justification, is not like the forms of natural things, that consist in indivisibili, but like any moral or civil forms, which by Law many times require several actions to the constitution of them: So that if we would judge of the nature of Justification, we must not examine it by natural motions, such as the expulsion of darkness or coldness, and the introduction of light or heat, but rather compare it with civil grants of liberty and favour, that the suprem Magistrate sometimes bestoweth, which may consist of several branches, and many particular priviledges, whereof one is really distinct from the other.
Propos. 2. This privilege of Justification is a real, efficacious privilege in all those effects it is appointed for. Let the Adversary calumniate never so boldly, yet in this truth nihil habeit. This viper cannot fasten on this Doctrine, That Justification is nothing according to the Protestant Doctrine, but a mere putative signment, that it is a meer Chimera. For first, Its remission of sinne, which they themselves acknowledge to be by the Satisfaction of Christ, Is that a meer signment? Is it such a meer fancy and notion to say, Christ's death and his sufferings are imputed to us, so that God's justice is satisfied more then if we had suffered in our own persons? If then this be no signment or putative fancy, Why is the righteousness of Christ imputed to us? Besides, to call this a meer signment, is likewise to destroy many civil Covenants and acceptations in Law; Do not the civil Laws of a Magistrate give a real being for many actions which are meerly by imputation? As when a Surety bound for a debtor discharged the debt, Is not the debtor by Law acquitted, as if he had done it in his own person? Yea private men may by their imputation give a reality to some actions: When Paul wrote to Philemon, that he should charge Onesimus his wrongs and debts upon him, if Philemon voluntarily did this, and for Paul's sake accounted all as discharged, had not here been a real discharge of Onesimus? How much more then must this hold between God and us, through Christ our Surety and Mediator. For

1. Here is a real giving of Christ with all his benefits to us: As Christ really died, really fulfilled the Law, and suffered the punishment of sin due to us, so this as really given to us and made ours, unless we will say, that justifying faith is but a meer fancy, or a non-entity.

2. There is God's judging and accounting this Obedience and Satisfaction for us as ours. Now God's judgement is always according to truth, what he accounts to another must needs be so. Hence is the phrase Rom. 4. of imputing righteousness; God's judgement, and imputing of this as ours, makes it a real thing. Hence by this God is said to be reconciled, to forgive, to be well-pleased, all which argue reality.

3. There is a real grace on our part, Which doth receive this righteousness.
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righteousness offered, and that is often said to be by faith in his blood; Now this faith is a most real thing, for Heb. II. 1. its called ἡπατία, The substance of things hoped for; its called hungring and thirsting, its called coming to Christ, yea its said to be eating of his flesh, and drinking of his blood: So that even the whole life of a godly man is attributed to this faith; yea Paul, Gal. 2. makes his natural life to be nothing to this, I no longer live, but Christ in me, and the life I live is by faith in Christ. Therefore we are sooner to conclude, that our eating, our drinking, our natural life, are non-entities, then this receiving of Christ's righteousness.

Lastly, The effects of this Justification are real, and they are the choicest food or refreshment of a Christian, for hereby we have peace with God, we are made blessed, we have boldness at the throne of grace, we can glory in all tribulations. Although therefore Logicians say, That relation is the least degree of entity, yet this relative change by our Justification is of admirable virtue and efficacy, yea we are to rejoice in it, as if it were the most physical or natural transmutation that can be imagined; It is a relative change, which hath a real fundamentum, and a real terminus, as Chemnittus well sheweth, though Bellarmin very superciliously derideth it, as ridiculous Logick.

Having thus laid down the most material things that clear this truth, let us consider what Distinctions found or unsound that are given by learned men in this point, that so we may receive the gold, and reject the dross, separating the precious from the vile.

And first, Some speak of a Justification active, and a Justification passive, not that they are two species or kindes of Justification, but onely the same the same thing considered as coming from God, is called active Justification; and the same as received or applied by the believer, is passive Justification. As the Schoolmen distinguish of a Creatio activa and passiva, making Creatio passiva to be the creature it self: now this distinction hath its use, for when we say, Faith is an instrument of our Justification, it is not as Justification is actively considered, or as it is an action of God, How can any action of man

The distinctions of learned men about justification.
man be an instrument to God's action? but as we are passively justified, we are justified by believing; its not our faith that doth produce our Justification properly: Therefore, though in Divinity it's often said, Sola fides justificat, Only faith justifieth, yet that is to be resolved passively in this sense, By faith only we are justified. Thus all those Arguments, If we are justified by faith, then by our own work, and that this is to give too much to faith, yet more then some say they do to works, which they hold a condition of our Justification. All these and the like Objections vanish, because we are not justified by faith, as Justification is considered actively, but passively. Its true, God doth never justify any actively, but the same person is passively justified: Therefore though God did will from eternity to justify, yet he did not actually justify till in time. Neither may this make it any difficulty how to affirm Justification a transient action, when the knowledge or will of God accepting are immanent; for in all the undoubted transient actions which are, as Sanitification, Preservation, Gods will and knowledge about these are immanent only; the willing of the existence or being of such a thing in such a time, is that which makes it transient; I do not here dispute, Whether we are to conceive in God, besides his knowledge and will, an executive power: that would be too tedious, and not very pertinent in this place.

Secondly, The Scripture speaks of a lawful and good Justification, as also of an unlawful and sinnful one, which men are many times guilty of, for Justification is attributed to man as well as God. Thus Prov.17.15. He that justifieth the wicked is an abomination to the Lord. This is very frequent amongst men, those that will accuse and condemn the generation of the just, as hypocrites and false, yet will justify and applaud the wicked, as the best men on earth. Its a very sinnful thing to justify any wicked cause or action, and to this may be reduced all those that abet or maintain false doctrines and errors. Its an abomination to the Lord to call evil, good, and falsehood, truth; there is also a sinnfull justification, when men approve themselves and acquit themselves from sinne, as if they had good hearts, and a good life, though at the same time,
time, not only the Law accuseth them, but they are abomina-
table to God: Oh this false justification is the grand enemy
to this Evangelical Justification! Why is it that most who
hear this Doctrine are no more affected with it? are not ravish-
ed with it? It is because they have a false righteousness; they
look upon a justification of their own by the works they have
done, and therefore they never desire or pant after this. This
is the desperate disease of those who are formal, civil persons,
preserved from gross notorious sins, commonly none are more
stupid under this precious Doctrine then they. The Pharisees they were plunged all over in this self-justification, Luke
16.15. This is the sinne our Saviour chargeth upon them, Ye
are they which justifie your selves; and Luke 18.14. by an in-
stance of a Pharisee and a Publican, is excellently representa-
ed, that many times they are justified before God, who have
no such thoughts of themselves, thinking the clean contrary,
at least knowing they have deserved it; and again, there are
others who are very confident, and presuming in their own
goodness, and yet are wholly abhorred by God: Oh that
this mother-sinne, this root of all evil were expelled your
hearts! Oh that every one were brought to see this, and to
cry out, I have no righteousness of my own, I look upon
my self and tremble, How shall I come into Gods presence?
Oh that upon the discovery of the loss of Gods Image, thou
couldst go out with defloured Tamar, thinking thy self undone,
saying, And I, poor, sinfull, wretched I, whither shall I go? Prophaneness is not so great an enemy to Evangelical
Justification, as pharisaical righteousness. The Jews, be-
cause they endeavoured to establish their own righteousness,
were wholly ignorant of the true righteousness. Paul
would have thought it blasphemy to speak of all his religious
duties while a Pharisee, which he doth afterwards, when a
believer, that they were a losse to him, that they were as
dung and drosse, such a thought would have been rejected
with great disdain: Oh this is it that undoeth most! You
cannot, you dare not begin to think, I am in a condemned
estate, all my righteousness I presume in, is nothing worth:
Oh miserable and wretched man that I am, What shall I do?
The heart of man is so full of itself, that it darest not admit such thoughts. But there is a good Justification, and that is when God justifieth the sinner believing in and through Christ. God doth not here pronounce a man righteous without a righteousness, or that hath no righteousness, but because clothed with the righteousness of Christ, therefore is the believer's nakedness covered from the eyes of God.

Thirdly, There is an absolute Justification (if we speak in the general nature of it) and a comparative Justification. An absolute Justification is, when a crime charged upon such a man, is proved to be false, and the party accused prevails over his adversary, so that his innocence may be more cleared. This is ordinary amongst men. There is also a comparative Justification, when men, though guilty of sins, yet compared with others more hainous, seem to have a kind of innocency, Minoravitia virtutes vocamus, Ezek. 16. 51. Thus Jerusalem is said to justify Sodom and Samaria, though places full of great pollution, because they had not committed half of the abominations of Jerusalem. And this comparative Justification is very frequent in the world; How many are there, who therefore justify themselves, because they are not so bad as others, they runne not into the same excess of riot, neither are they so prophan and opposite to what is holy, as many in the world are? Thus they think God will justify them, because lesser wicked then others, seeing they do justify themselves: Oh but how little is their ground of comfort in this respect! for thou art to live answerably to God's Word, thou art to make that the rule to walk by. Though others are worse than thee, yet the Scripture makes thy life and conversation a state of gall and wormwood, and though to greater sinners there be greater torments provided, yet even to lesser sinnes no lesse then everlasting flames are appointed. A comparative Justification is not available without a positive and absolute one from God.

4. There is a Justification in foro Dei, in God's Court, and there is a Justification in foro Conscientiae, in the Court of Conscience. Then are we justified before God, when he no longer charge-
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...eth our sins upon us, when he removeth the guilt we are obnoxious unto; Some have thought it hard to conceive of a tribunal God hath in heaven, where before himself and the holy Angels he doth arraign us. And certainly we are not to limit this barre of God to heaven, but so farre, and where God doth demonstrate his anger against sinne so farre, and there may we say God doth erect his tribunal; when God afflicts a man for his sins, either with inward troubles of conscience, or outward calamities; this may be called a summoning of the sinner before his tribunal; then is the offender to apply himself to God for reconciliation, so that this forum Caeli is not so to be understood, as if Gods anger were included there, but as manifesting itself either to the conscience, or otherwise. Therefore this second kind of Justification in the Court of Conscience is opposed only to the Court of heaven in this respect, because many times those whom God justifieth in heaven, feel not, or are not persuaded of his Justification in their hearts: Therefore it is that though partakers of unspeakable privileges, yet they walk in darkness, as having no comfort at all belonging to them. Although (as was declared formerly) this is not Justification, but the sense of it. Luther represented this two-fold Justification by those two passages of Christ concerning Mary Magdalen, for Christ spake concerning her, first, when she did not hear him, That her sins were forgiven her, and afterwards he spake particularly to her, Be of good comfort, thy sins are forgiven thee; God then may justify in heaven, and this by a direct act of faith be applied, but the reflex act or certain knowledge of thy Justification be separated from it: God hath his wise ends, why he sometimes bestoweth this privilege, and doth not give the sense of it, sometimes it is his action alone to separate these two; but at other times, and that falls out too often, the people of God through their carelesse, unfruitfull and unprofitable walking raise up a great gulf between the light of Gods favour, and their own souls; so that though he is indeed blessed that hath his sins pardoned, that hath a righteousnesse imputed to him, the Scripture calls this man a blessed man, and no other, yet this blessed man may be: in his own sense
sense miserable and wretched, yea a man appointed for de-
struction; therefore be earnest in prayer to God, not only to
justify thee in heaven, but in thy own heart and spirit: this
will make thee walk thankfully, cheerfully and fruitfully.
This will be like Ezekiel's spirit in the wheels. This will be
oil to thy bones, and wine to thy heart. It was the sense of
this made Paul in this Chapter thus victoriously triumph over
all opposition: especially take heed of such a life, which
though it doth not make a total intercision of, yet it makes a
sad interruption in our Justification; when the intercourse of
this is stopped, it is like a besieged City that hath all the pipes
of water cut off, that have no way of refreshment to come
to them, then they would like Dives be glad of a drop of
water.

Fifthly, Some learned men speak of an universal Justification,
and of a particular one. An universal Justification they call
that, when a man at his first believing, is received into God's
favour, then there is an universal pardon of all his sins com-
mitted, God leaveth not out the least farthing, but it is all
discharged: And then a particular Justification they call that,
which is daily iterated in our lives; for as we daily renew
particular sins, so we need daily remission of them: Now al-
though, as I have shewed, Justification denoteth a state of
man, and so is universal and unutterable; yet being they call
it a particular Justification, and mean thereby onely the re-
newed pardon of particular sins daily committed, I would
not much contend in the matter; we cannot call remission of
sins a state, as we call Justification; for although when a
sin is remitted, we have God's favour as to that particular,
yet we commit more sins daily, which would endanger us,
were we not in a state of Justification, whereby God's grace
will so watch over us, that no sins shall drive us out of this
heavenly Paradise.

Sixthly, There is a Justification of the cause, and a Justifica-
tion of the person, and these are always to be distinguished.
Job did justify himself against his friends, and would not let
go his integrity; this was a Justification of the cause, or mat-
ter of fact. And thus David oftentimes in his particular
quarrel between his adversaries and him, doth often appeal to God, and plead his innocency, and prays to God to regard his righteousness; but this was not in the righteousness of his person; then he renounceth his own righteousness, and intreats God would not enter into judgement with him. To this may be reduced that act of Phineas, Psal. 106. 31. executing Justice, and it was imputed to him for righteousness, not for the righteousness of his person, but of that act or cause. Therefore there is a vast difference between this phrase, and that Rom. 4. quoted out of Genesis, Abraham believed, and it was imputed to him for righteousness, as is to be shewed.

Lastly, There is a justification before God and before men. A justification before God is, when God himself doth acquit us from our iniquities, and against this no men or devils can put a barre. A justification before men, is when we walk so holily and exactly according to the principles of faith, that thereby we declare our selves to be true believers, and justified before God. This justification is necessary against all those that glory in the title and name of Christianity, as if a bare faith separated from holiness was enough. It was one of Simon Magus his blasphemies, as History reports, affirming, that faith did make a man free to do what we would, and that it is a slavery to be obliged by Gods command to any holy duties. The Gnostiques also tumbled in this mire; and the Eunomians, who delivered, That if a man did hold that faith they taught, the committing of no grosse vices would hinder their salvation. This justification before men by holy works, is that which James pleads for in his Epistle, as some Divines conclude; and certainly it is part of the meaning, as in time is to be shewed. Therefore that men may not deceive themselves, through their self-love, saying, They are justified, when God condemneth, the Scripture speaks of a justification by holy works before men, that so the hypocrite may be excluded, and the good tree known by its good fruit.
Serm. XVI.

An Examination of some Distinctions about Justification, much controverted by several Authors.

Rom. 8. 33.

It is God that Justifieth.

I shall now conclude this Text, from which we have been informed about the Nature of Justification.

There remain two or three distinctions that are controverted by several Authors, and these are at present to be examined. And

First, Some distinguish of a baptismal Justification, and a Justification of persons grown up. This of late hath been agitated, especially Dr. Ward for the affirmative, maintaining a Baptismal Justification of all children baptized, De Baptis. Infant. disceptat. And the learned Mr. Gataker, who is for the negative; and indeed it would be a very hard task to prove the Justification of all Infants baptized out of Scripture. For

1. Hereby must necessarily be established a two-fold Justification, and that of a different nature, one of Infants in Baptism, from which there will be often a total and final Apostasy.

2. Of grown persons, which (according to the fore-mentioned
tioned Authours opinion, (for I speak not of Thompson, Bertius, or others of that mettall) is perpetual, and from it can be no falling away. Those learned men therefore Dave

naut and Ward, who introduce a Baptismal Justification, are forced to make this different to to genus, from that of grown persons; the one (they say) is amissable, the other can never be loft. But by Scripture direction we cannot walk boldly in these paths. Though indeed the Scripture speaks not directly of Infants Justification, yet by consequence it doth plainly and fully demonstrate it. Not that they are justified by actual faith, as the Lutherans contend, but this gracious privilege is applied to them, surely, though not expressibly by us; some difference then must be granted between an Infants Justification, and a person grown up, but not specifically, or in the nature of it, as if the Justification of the one might be totally intercided, and not the other, for Rom. 5. the Apostle chaineth them inseparably together, Whom he hath predestinat be hath justified, and whom he hath justified be hath glorified.

Secondly, This opinion is not so wary as that of others; for some limit this baptismal Justification only to elect Infants, but these extend it to all baptized Infants, because they hold the Sacrament of Baptism exhibitive of grace, which is always effectual in the subject receiving, unless there be some o
er impediment put by the Suscipient, which (say they) cannot be in Infants: But to make such an universal Justification of all visible members of a Church, is a great Paradox.

And thirdly, If it be granted, that the Sacrament of Baptism is not onely obisgnative, but exhibitive of grace, yet that doth not follow, that it must be in all, and at that time of Baptism, but it may be exhibitive of grace in its due time, when it shall please God by the word preached to work it, and the original corruption every one is born in, is obex enough, seeing by that every Infant is a child of wrath. This doctrinal asserstion hath too much influence in the hearts of all, for do not most rest on their Baptism as the ground of their Justification and Salvation, never attending unto those qualifications
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qualifications of an holy life, and renouncing the wayes of sinne and Satan to which our Baptism doth ingage us. Indeed the Sacraments are usually called the organical means of our Justification on Gods part; but this is not to be understood, as if they had some inward, latent, physical virtue in them, as natural causes or medicinal pills have, to produce real effects: No they are moral causes only instituted by God; and although he hath promised to go along with his own institutions, yet they do not ex opere operato, merely by receiving of them convey grace, unless faith in the receiver make them effectual, as digestion in the stomack makes meat to nourish; therefore to a dead man food would do no good, neither do the Sacraments, where spiritual life is not laid as a foundation. In Popery this Justification by the opus operatum of Sacraments is much advanced. The Church (faith Beccanus) hath two Baths to wash away its filth, the one of Baptism for original sinne, the other of Penance for actual; and for the former he alledged a place out of Gregory, He that doth not beleve all his sins are washed away in Baptism, doth beleve not Pharaoh and the Egyptian host were drowned in the red Sea. But although the Sacraments God hath appointed be not empty mockeries, yet they are effectual onely, where there is due preparation. As the Jews did generally rest upon their Circumcision for Justification; and we may perceive by Pauls zealous disputes in his Epistles to the Galatians and Romans, that works of the Ceremonial Law, as well as of the Moral, were pleaded for by false teachers, as the causes of Justification; so still the same corrupt opinion, as so much sweet poison is received by most men, that they were justified in their Baptism, and therefore they need not trouble themselves with any more fears in this point. But if thou were justified then, thou wast also sanctified then, for these always go together as light and heat in the fire, and if sanctified, then surely it would have been demonstrated in an holy and heavenly life. Are they not the manifest signes of the contrary? Do not therefore delude thy self, and think to mock God: if there were baptismal Justification, there was also baptismal Regeneration, and he that is born of God sinneth
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Sinneth not, neither can he (viz. so as wholly to give himself up to the service of it, 1 John 3.) because he is born of God, and his seed abideth in him.

Secondly, Another controverted Distinction is, of an actual Justification from all eternity, and a declarative Justification in time. This is the great Diana of the Antinomians, which hath been at large confuted in my former Treatise. Indeed such a distinction hath unhappily fallen from the pen of some eminent and orthodox Writers, though not improved to such foolish and absurd consequences as the Antinomists do. Howsoever such a distinction hath no foundation in the Scripture which restraineth Justification to the believer, and describes the godly man to be for the present justified, so that formerly he was under the wrath of God, God's purpose to justify is not Justification, no more than his purpose to glorifie is glorification. Neither doth this argue any change in God, but in the creature, for he did immutably from all Eternity, will such a change upon the sinner believing; God therefore is not properly said to be altered, but man is. Besides its wholly irrational to make our Justification in this life, to be only declarative, as if God did not indeed, pardon sinner, but did only manifest that he had done it already from all Eternity; How then can promises of pardon be made good, or well interpreted, which are upon the supposition of our believing and turning to God, that then he will turn away his anger, which by the fore-said position was never upon any elect person, all the while he was in an unregenerate estate, and in the height of his impiety? But enough hath been said to this already.

Thirdly, The Arminians, and all those who hold a total Apostasy from Justification once received, must distinguish of Justification as they do of Election, an absolute Justification, and a conditionate. An absolute is, when God foreseeeth that a man will persevere and continue to the last in his faith and obedience, upon which provision God doth then absolutely justify him. A conditionate is, of every man believing and repenting, provided, that he persever in the same: So that as by their Doctrine no man can be absolutely elected till he die, so neither
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other absolutely justified, for he may fall into such sinnes, as that though formerly justified, yet now condemned, yes to
day he may be justified, and to morrow thrown out of that
estate. This false and uncomfortable position is maintained
by Thompson in his Diatribe, against whom Bishop Abbot hath
solidly written. Those that are once justified are never again
cast out of his favour, they may want the sense of it; The
Sune may be in an eclipse, but not removed out of its orb;
and as Hooker observeth well in his Discourse of Justification,
added to his Ecclesiastical Policy; As Christ once died, but
rose again never to die more, death hath no more power
over him; so a justified man once allied to God through Je-
sus Christ, doth from that time forward as necessarily live,
as Christ himself by whom it is that he doth live. In his
judgement therefore, which is also consonant to the Scri-
pure, a justified man can no more cease to live in this state
of Justification, then Christ can cease to live in heaven; and
the reason is, because of that immortal and indissoluble uni-
on which is between Christ the Head, and every believer a
member unto him. Thy Justification therefore doth not de-
depend in the continuance of it upon thy strength and thy pow-
er: woe be to us, if we had no other support; but it is built
on Christ himself, who is the same yesterday, and to day, and
forever: So thy Justification also will alwayes be the same,
though thou art many times changed with uncertain fears
and doubts.

Fourthly, The great and famous distinction which hath
made so much noise in the books of late Writers, is that fig-
ment and new invention of the Papists, of a first and second
justification. The first Justification they call that, when a
wicked man is at first made holy and righteous, having a su-
pernatural principle of grace infused in him, which doth in-
herently justify him. A second Justification they call that,
whereby a man being already just, doth increase and grow
in his righteousness, and so is more justified. For the first
Justification, they would perswade us, that they hold it to
be only of grace, when yet they hold such preparatory di-
positions that are merits of congruity to obtain it. For the se-
cond
cond Justification, they plainly acknowledge, that is obtained by our merits, and the good use of grace already received. By this distinction they think Paul and James may be reconciled. A great difficulty they grant it to be, how to accord both those Apostle, but they think this distinction reconcileth all; Paul (say they) speaks of the first Justification, for that is of an ungodly man, and it is by grace freely. But James speaks of a second Justification, and that is by the works we do. Indeed Becanus Tom. 1. and Tapper Art. 8. speak of a two-fold first Justification; the first Tapper calls, per modum simplicis generationis, or as Becanus, when one is made first that was neither first, or unjust before. Thus, they say, Angels and Adam were justified, there Justification was not of a person ungodly before, but were created in this purity. The second kind of first Justification, they make to be by way of a qualitative alteration, as when that is made hot which was formerly cold; so a wicked and ungodly man, he by the grace of God is made just and holy. This, they call, the first Justification. But this distinction, as they explain it, is full of falsity and reproach to the righteousness of Christ; for both these Justifications are built upon a false foundation, viz. That our inherent righteousness habitual or actual, is that which doth justify us in God's sight. This (as is to be shewed) is against all those places of Scripture, which proclaim imperfection and defilements adhering to the best works we do. Its contrary to the frame of all the godly mens hearts that ever lived, who prayed against God's severe entring into judgement with them, knowing Justification in the sight of God, by anything they can do, is wholly impossible.

2. This distinction of first and second cannot hold, because a man is justified in the same manner and way in the whole progress of his life, as at first. Hence Abraham Rom. 4. when yet he did abound with many fruitful works of righteousness, was said to be justified by faith. The Adversaries do acknowledge Paul speaks there of the first Justification, and yet Abraham in whom the Apostle instanceth, was not then made righteous of wicked, for a long while before he had served God in all holiness.
3. There cannot be a first and second Justification in the Popish sense, because the first is said to live by faith, Hab. 2. which is three times alluded to in the New Testament, and is applied to our Justification, as well as to dependance upon God in outward calamities; yea living by faith in respect of Justification, is the foundation of the other life by faith. Till by faith we live, receiving the favour of God through Christ, we are not able in other conditions to exercise the believing acts of dependance; seeing therefore that the first mans life (his life, not only his first conversion) is by faith, and that in respect of Justification, therefore in the whole progresse of his life, he is justified but one way. After thou hast been many years a proficient in the way of godliness, thou art to put forth acts of faith for Justification, as humbly and as feelingly of thy own unworthinesse, as at thy very entrance into godliness. Did not Paul when he had ranne very farre in the race of Christianity, yet forget all that was behinde, and desire to be found only in the righteousness which is by faith. So that whereas the Doctrine of Justification is reproached for a Doctrine that breedeth security, pride and negligence in holy duties, There is no Doctrine like that so naturally inclining to increase humility, an holy fear and self emptinesse, for by this we are taught even in the highest degree of our Sanctification, to look out of our selves for a better righteousness; we look upon our selves in the best of our spiritual glory, as so many Jobs on the dunghill, or Lazarusses begging at the rich mans gate; for how can the soul but be filled with great shame and confusion, that seeth nothing but deformity in it self, that dare not by any works he hath done, approach into Gods presence? By Sanctification he hath righteousness indeed inherent, but not perfect: by Justification he hath righteousness perfect, but not inherent. Let this then be settled upon thee, as at first thou wast justified freely by the grace of God: Thou sawest thy by-past sinnes compassing thee about, and therefore didst look out of thy self to Christ. Thus it is to be always, though thou halt not the same sinns, yea though now thou aboundest with many graces, and hast a large increase in holinesse, yet such are the de-
feats and failings accompanying thee in all thou dost, that thou canst not but cry out; Oh let me be covered with a better righteousness then that of mine own.

4. There cannot be a first and second Justification in the mentioned sense, Because even those who are already reconciled to God, are yet daily to endeavour reconciliation with him. All new sinnes are apt to make new breaches, and these make, though not new total, yet partial reconciliations. Thus Paul, 2 Cor. 5. 19, 20. when he said, God was in Christ reconciling of men to himself, he addresseth his speech even to those that were reconciled, that they would be reconciled to God, that is, they would not onely abide, and continue in that state, but as often as any failings and imperfections did break forth, they would by repentance turn to God, and entreat his favour toward them; an after-reconciliation then is not by any merits or good works of ours, but by the same gracious foundation it was at first wrought. Hence David, Psal. 32. pronounceth it as an universal Proposition, of every man at every time, whether at the first or at the last, Blessed is he, whose iniquities are covered, and his sinnes not imputed to him. Know then for thy direction (for its a great matter to be rightly enformed herein) that all the day, all the year, all thy life long, thou art to be by faith receiving a righteousness without them, as thou dost every moment take in breath. Some have urged that phrase, Put on the Lord Jesus Christ, Rom. 12. 14. implying, that as every day we are to put on our garments to cover our nakedness, so we are to put on Christ for the covering of all our imperfections. This is the difference between man and beast, man comes naked into the world, Peccata de propriis vestiis, (faith Augustine) and thus it is with man Theologically considered, he comes naked and destitute of all righteousness, and hath no covering of his own, but must be found in the Lord Christ, whose righteousness God judgeth as ours; neither is God deceived at that time, or judgeth otherwise then according to truth; for Christ's righteousness is truly ours, though
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not inherently. When our Divines delight to express this by Jacobs getting the blessing in his elder brothers cloathes, Papists reply, That we make God like old Isaac, that through blindness cannot discern what is truth; but to say, the hands are indeed the hands of Christ, but the voice the voice of a sinner. This is wilfully to mistake our words, for we all say, God judgeth as the truth is, neither doth he justify us without a righteousness, onely this is not inherent in us.

Thus we have discovered the falshood of that distinction of a first and second Justification, which they may multiply to the hundredth and thousandth Justification as well as the second.

But there are some learned and Orthodox Writers, that do admit of a first and second Justification, but not in the Popish sense; they utterly abhorre that, yet they affirm a first and second Justification. Ludovic. De Dieu in Rom. cap. 8. v. 4, a very learned man, is large in asserting this. The first Justification is that acknowledged by the Orthodox, whereby, though sinners in our selves, yet believing are justified before God. The second, whereby thus justified out of our selves, we are justified before God in our selves. The first Justification is the cause of the second, the second is the effect and demonstration of the first. The first is by faith, the second by works, and both are necessary; and if it should be objected, That then we are justified by the works of the Law; he answers, That these works of Sanctification are not the works of the Law ratione originis, for the Spirit of God doth work them, but ratione normae, in respect of the rule by which they are prescribed: And further then (faith he) are we justified by the works of the Law, when they are performed, as the condition of that Covenant: But this opinion looketh not on the Law so, but as its now altered; for the Law is deprived of that dominion it once had, and being, subjected to Christ, cannot but praise and approve those works which flow from faith, and are wrought by Gods Spirit, though they be not satisfactorily answerable to the rigorous commands of it: So that by this opinion, when we are first justified.
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Of the justified righteousness of Christ, then afterwards our works are accounted also unto us for righteousness. God justifieth us, as being free from prophaneness and hypocrisy, walking sincerely in obedience to his commands; so that though an inherent righteousness be made the foundation of this second Justification, yet it is not from any worth or dignity, proportioned to the rule of holiness, but from the worth of that imputed righteousness from which it floweth, and through whose dignity it is accepted of, and of this latter Justification he makes James to speak, and so reconcileth him with Paul. Its true, other learned men speak something to this purpose; Not only Bucer, who is known to place Justification both in imputed righteousness and inherent, thereby endeavouring a reconciliation with the Papists, for for which Parmus blameth him as too facil. But Calvin, lib.3. cap.17. Sec.8. It is one thing, faith he, to dispute, what works avail of themselves, another thing: What after the righteousness of faith is established, premise remission of sinne and Christ's perfection, whereby what is imperfect is covered, and then the good works done by beleevers, justa sensetur, vel (quod idem est) in justitiam imputantur, are accounted unto righteousness. To this purpose also Zanchy, Tom.1. de Justif. Thef. when a man is first reconciled to God by faith, then a beleever is afterwards accepted of by God, for his good works. Although this be thus asserted, and all the Orthodox do readily grant, That our good works are pleasing to God through Christ, yet that this should be called a second Justification, and that before God, there seemeth to be no ground from the Scripture; for (as you heard) Abraham and David after their first Justification are still said in the same manner to be justified, viz. by faith, not by works. Its true, God doth accept of beleevers as sincere, that they are not hypocrites, but they are not justified by this; for David crieth out, Psal.19. Who can understand the errors of his heart? so that there is hypocrisy in the heart of the most upright man for which God might justly condemn him.

Let the Use then of all this be, to pray to God, that thy minde be kept sound in this main Doctrine: Oh let not any subtil
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Subtil distinctions poison thee! This truth hath an influence into all thy comforts, and into all thy holiness, therefore admit not the least corruption here. How many ways have the corrupt hearts and heads of men invented for Justification? The Turk hath his way to justify himself before God. The Jew his. The Papist his. The formal Protestant his, and all agree in establishing some righteousness of their own, which can no more stand before God's judgement then stubble before the fire: such a righteousness may have greater applause in the world, but bring it to God it is abominable. As the eye can endure to look upon a Candle or the stars, but is not able to endure the glorious beams of the Sun.
SECT. IV.

Setteth forth what is not that Righteousness whereby a man is Justified.

S E R M. XVII.

Sheweth, That every Man is prone to set up a Righteousness of his own, to be Justified by it, and whence it proceeds.

R O M. 10. 3.

For they being ignorant of God's Righteousness, and going about to establish their own, have not submitted themselves unto the Righteousness of God.

Aving discussed the nature of Justification in the general, I shall proceed further in this manner: First, To handle negatively what is not that Righteousnesse, whereby a man is justified, because there are many false righteousnesses exalted for Justification,
cation, and shall from this Text in the general, inform how prone we are to seek for a righteousness to justify us, otherwise than God hath appointed.

The Apostle in the Chapter preceding charged the Jews with heavy and sad things, but that they might not think this spoken from hatred, but love unto them, he doth very passionately insinuate himself into their affections in the beginning of this Chapter, which is expressed quoad affectum, and quoad effectum: in respect of his inward affection, he tells them his hearts desire is toward them, εὐθυνα, which is very emphatical, and as Hierom faith, cannot be translated by one word, unless a man should say Placentia. It was not then every kinde of affection, but the top and highest he had towards them.

Again quoad effectum, his love is seen in his prayer to God for them that they might be saved: Spiritual love is the most active and vigorous. To love a man to his salvation, is more than temporal beneficence whatsoever.

In the second verse he giveth a reason of these strong desires towards them, he gives them good testimonial Letters, onely he corrects them with a diminution, I bear them record, that they have a zeal, but not according to knowledge. Zeal though never so fervent in matters of Religion, yet if preposterous, if not regulated by Gods Word, is like the strange fire offered upon Gods Altar. Its better, faith Augustine, Claudicare in via, then strenue currere extra viam. The Jews did runne, but it was out of the way; They were like a fertile piece of ground, but overgrown with weeds: Had their zeal been right both in respect of its original, and its manner, and its object, and its end; Then Paul would have delighted to have sown his spiritual seed in such prepared ground.

In the third verse, he instanceth, wherein their blinde zeal did hurry them into destruction, and that was in the main point and hinge of their salvation, viz. about their justification, they set up a righteousness to be justified by, which was directly contrary to the righteousness of God; so that their dangerous miscarriage is expressed in the sinne it self,
self, and in the causes of it, the sinne it self is not to submit or subject themselves to the righteousnesse of God; The righteousnesse by which we are justified, is called God's righteousness, both because he causeth and procurith it, as also, because its adequately answerable unto his will, and accepted by him, and because it is a righteousnes not of a man meerly, but of God also, as in time is to be shewed. Now to this righteousnesse, which with all their hearts and open souls, they should have received, because nothing else could commend them to God, they did not submit themselves, or they were not submitted, such was the rebellion and selffulness within them, that they would not rest wholly upon this righteousnesse. Here not the full stomack, but even the empty loaths the honey-comb, though they had a conceited fulnesse. This righteousnesse as its called twice in the Text God's righteousness, so its illustrated by the opposite τῳδὲς ἰνεικυοντι, their own righteousness. Its called their own righteousness, both in respect of the principle from which it did flow, they did those works by the strength of nature without the grace of God, and their own righteousness in respect of the subject and inherencie; for suppose any of the Jews had been with Paul converted, yet they would not with him be found in their own righteousness, but in that which is by faith, Phil.3. so that the works of grace may be called our own righteousness, when we seek to be justified by them, although in respect of their original they are not ours; as a mans soul is his own soul, though at first infused by God alone. Thus you have their sin.

The Causes are, first, their ignorance, ἀνωτέρω; this was not ignorance of the fact, but of the right, neither was it invincible, but willfull and affected, for they had excellent means to know to the contrary.

2. There was their pride and willfulness in this way; they did ὑπὲρ earnestly seek and labour to set up their own righteousness, εὑρεῖσθαι from sick and weak persons, who would stand, but through their imbecility fall down immediately, or as a man that would set up an Image, but for want of life it tumbleth down presently; as he said, ἦς τι ἀν, it wants some-
something within; as the Philistines endeavoured to set up their Dagon before the Ark, though that tumbled down before it. Thus these Jews endeavoured to establish their poor, weak and cadaverous righteousness in the presence of Gods glorious, just and holy Majesty, which yet was no more able to stand before him, then stubble before the fire.

3. There is their rebellion added to their pride, they would not submit themselves; a man naturally is as disobedient to a promise to receive the righteousness offered by faith, as he is to a Command to fulfill the duty thereof. This is good to be observed, thy heart was not once more averse and untoward against the holy commands of God, then now since broken for sinne, it is opposite to Gods promises for a righteousness; Not only our Sanctification, but our Justification also finds strong rebellion against it in all our hearts.

That every man naturally is very prone to set up a righteousness of his own to be justified by it, contrary to that Which God hath appointed. Publicans and grosse sinners do not more oppose the way of practical godliness, then Pharisaical men do the way of Evangelical righteousness. Not only righteousness inherent, but imputed also, is extremly contrary to man's corrupt nature; we say, Christ shall not reign over us in respect of his Priestly Office, purchasing a righteousness for us, as well as in his Kingly power enjoining holy Laws to walk by.

To set this truth before you, I shall discover the 37 of this Doctrine, that it is so, and then bring the demonstration of the 38, why it is so, and the diligent attending to this will not only make you know Justification by Books and by Sermons, but you will feel the power and sweetness of it upon your own heart; for I write not only to the intellectual part, but the affective also. A Ministers Motto should be, Nusquam doceo ubi non moveo, nusquam moveo ubi non doceo.

First therefore, That its imbred in all to seek after another righteousness for Justification, then what is Evangelical, appeareth, In the corrupt Doctrines and Opinions of all men.
men almost about it. As there were but eight persons preserved in the Ark, when the whole world was drowned, so there are some few preserved in the sound and true Doctrine of Justification, when almost the whole world erreth dangerously, if not damnably about it. As for those that are without the Church, its no wonder, if they, as they reject a Christ, so also the righteousness which comes by him. The few, the Turk, the Pagan, all of them approach to God as absolutely considered, and to expect acceptance by those works they do. No wonder if the Jews do so now, for they did of old so, when yet they had the Prophets discovering Gospel-righteousness to them, and all their Sacrifices might abundantly convince them, that they had nothing of their own to put any confidence in. Hence God by the Prophet Isaiah threatens, Chap. 51. 12. I will declare thy righteousness and thy works, for they shall not profit thee; God will make them ashamed of their righteousness, as well as their sins; Oh this is excellent, when a man is amazed and in an holy manner confounded even at his holiness, as well as at his offences! Therefore he addeth vers. 13. He that putteth his trust in me (viz. renouncing his righteousness) shall possess the Land; and vers. 15. The high and lofty one that dwells in the high and holy place, doth also dwell with the humble and contrite spirit to revive that. Now, who is this humble and contrite spirit? Even that which goeth out not only of his sinnes, but of all his duties and graces, and being ashamed and cast down in himself, is revived only by the grace of God without him. Come we to those within the Church that profess their faith in Christ, and you would think there was an universal consent in this great privilege of Justification. But nothing is more controverted, How much unjustified is the Scripture-Justification of most? What accusations and condemnations of one another about Justification? Infomuch that set some few, even a remnant, aside, comparatively, the whole Christian world, both Doctors and people, learned and unlearned, fasten on a Justification by works; and that which the Apostle doth industriously oppose they labour to bring in, but with many subtil distinctions, and fair disguises: the Papist, the
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the Arminian, the Socinian, the Castellian, the Sminckfeldian, with divers others, all conspire in this, That our righteousness is inherent by which we are justified; most of them make faith and works, some few faith only, as its a gracious act; so that to credere, the very believing is accounted of by God, as a full, complete, legal righteousness. Now, whence cometh it, that all do so readily joy in this falsehood? but because Justification by something in us is so pleasing and connatural to flesh and blood: Its a Doctrine that naturally breedeth in our hearts; and therefore all men grant the fire to burn, and the Sunne to shine, because this is evident to sense: No lefse do all conspire in this, that we must do some thing, work some thing, that by that we may be accepted of by God. So that the universality of such corrupt Doctrines, shew what is the root in our heart. These Frogs could not breed but from such noisome spawn.

A second Discovery of our proneness to a Justification that is not Evangelical, is, From the confidence and cordial trust men put in the religious duties they perform. So that what ought to be given to Christ and his righteousness, they attribute to their duties. That look as the Idolater gives that worship and honour to wood and stone, which is due to the wife and holy God only: Thus such hope and confidence do men generally put in the good works they do, which belongs only unto Christ. Our Saviour represents this in the Pharisee, Luke 18, though he giveth God thanks that he is not this and thus, that he doth pray and fast; yet it is by this working he looks to be accepted. There is not a word of his famine, of his millions of imperfections in every duty he did: But as high as he was in his own thoughts, so low and abominable he was in the sight of God. That is a remarkable expression, Phil. 3.3. We are the Circumcised, who rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh, that do renounce all duties and privileges, making the glory and joy of our souls to be in Christ only: Oh take heed then of this deadly poison, to have a secret trust and rest of soul in the good things thou dost. The stone is not more enclining to fall.
fall downward, then thou art to take up thy rest here, and though thou art no prophane or ungodly sinner; This heart-confidence in duties performed, is millstone heavy enough to drown thee in the sea. This leprosie did spread it self over the Jewish Nation; this made them set up the works of the Law against Christ; and the generality of Christians are as much formalized, and made Injustities as ever they were. This sinne devourreth secretly without a noise, as the moth doth cloath, it doth not as grosse sinnes consume like a roaring Lion.

Thirdly, Men are averse to Evangelical righteousness, in that they are so apt to self-justification, and clearing of themselves, all is clean and good in their eyes. They have good hearts, good works, God is their good God; there is nothing (as they judge) but good in them, when their hearts, if transfused into by Gods word, is a noisome dunghill; This was the Pharisaical righteousness, Luke 18. Ye are they which justify your selves. And so the Jews of old, though under Gods grievous judgements, yet would plead with God, as if they were not guilty; they thought Gods wayes were hard and inequal: So hard a matter is it to acknowledge sinne, and to be willing to be ashamed because of it, whereas the Publican that went away justified, he humbled himself, he bewailed himself a sinner; and certainly then is a man in an hopeful way for Justification, when with Job he abhorreth himself, because of the spiritual sore and ulcers that are all over him, then he is nearest to God, when he sets himself afarre off, as not being worthy to come into Gods presence; when, as our Saviour directs, thou setst thy self at the lower end, then will Christ bid thee come up higher: But oh the self-love and self-flatte-ry which reigneth in every man: who is willing to be convinced a sinner, to accuse and arraign himself, as a sinner, to judge and abhorre himself, as guilty of all the wrath God threatens in his Word! Oh how hardly is he brought to think himself undone, to see his nakedness and poverty, to acknowledge he is a beast and a devil! No, this will never be done, till God break and soften the heart, and therefore how many are admiring the vertuous and in-
nocent life they have lived, as he did the glorious Babel he had built, and even then, when (as he was) they are near utter confusion?

Fourthly, Our proneness to a contrary way of justification, then God hath appointed, is seen in that want of an appetite, and heavenly relish, which a gracious heart useth to have in the Doctrine of justification. Were people spiritualized, sensible of the burden of sinne, of the infinite imperfections that cleave to them, of their inability to answer God in any particular; There is no truth in the world would be so acceptable to them as this; for this they would say, The word of God is sweeter then the honey-comb; Why is the Gospel commended by so many admirable Titles, The precious Gospel, the glorious Gospel? but because of the admirable excellency an Evangelical spirit finds in these things. At the first Reformation out of Popery, when this pearl of Justification lay all over covered with dirt and mire, the superstitious Doctrines of Popery, but by the means of those excellent Worthies God raised up, discovered and purified; How many humble, precious and contrite hearts did God also fashion by his grace, that for that truth, above all, in Reformation, did bless and praise God for? For as Calvin well urgeth, What foundation can be laid either for true piety, or sound comfort, if a man in the first place be not satisfied in what relation he stands to God, upon what terms God and he are? Oh but now this manna is loathed! Now many Sermons may be preached, and the auditors very few whose hearts melt, and are ravished within them, while they hear of it, I tell thee, Thou canst not discover a more carnal, dead heart, destitute of God's Spirit, then to sit like a stock or a stone under the preaching of this truth. Thou wouldst (if heavenly) finde all thy bowels move within thee at the approach of this Doctrine unto thee; As they received Christ corporally, crying Hosanna, and saying, Blessed is he that cometh in the Name of the Lord; Thus wouldst thou do concerning this Gospel-truth: But thy heart like Nabal is a stone in this case, and thou findest no heavenly excellency in this pearl, because thou art of a swinish nature, and so preferrest thy base lusts before it.

Fifthly,
Fifthly, Our averseness to a Gospel-justification is discovered by the want of an hunger and thirst after Christ. We have not an high and inestimable value that we put on him; Paul is sick always while he hath not Christ: The Church in the Canticles is not more ravished with her Spouse, then Paul with Christ. 1 Cor. 3. 2, 3. He determineth to know nothing but Christ crucified; and Phil. 3. 8. He counts all things dung and dross for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ; and whence hath Paul this high esteem of Christ? Even because of the spiritual hunger and thirst that is in him. Never did hungry man long for a morsel of bread, never did Samson long for water through thirst, more then he doth after Christ, because of the spiritual need and want he findes of him. Christ as a Mediatour pronounced in the Scripture, is like the brazen Serpent to a stinging and pained beholder. But the generality of Christians, though they name Christ, and speak of him, yet they do not with the Church runne after him in the sweetness of his ointment, Cant. 1. 3.

Thus we have heard this truth discovered by the sign, the signs or effects thereof. Let us now consider it in the causes thereof. And

First, A doctrinal ignorance of some main points in Religion, is that which makes many to mistake in justification. This you see is the cause in my Text, named as the first of all. Their ignorance in these ensuing particulars, makes men not acquainted with, or carresfull of a Gospel-justification.

1. An ignorance of the pure, holy and just nature of God, that he is a God of such absolute purity, that nothing but absolute holinesse can consist before him; that those things which may even dazzle the eyes of men, are yet but as dung in Gods account, Hab. 1. Thou art of purer eyes then to behold iniquity; See the glorious purity and Majesty of God expressed notably, and mans contemptible vanity respectively, Job 25. 5, 6. Job 4. 17, 18, 19. Job 15. 15, 16. There we see the heavens and Angels themselves are not clean in his eyes, how much lesse weak and sinful men? He doth not there speak of Apostate Angels, but those that continue in their purity. Now even the Angels themselves are ashamed, though not having the

Why it is so, Whence it is that men are so prone to set up a righteousness of their own.

1. A doctrinal Ignorance of some points in Religion.
least blemish, they cover their faces, even the noblest part of
them, because God is of such infinite Majesty: would not
this then debase the most holy man that is, if he did consider
what a God he hath to do with? And though men may proud-
ly and vainly dispute about the condignity of their works to
Justification, yet when they come to die, and shall think of
appearing before so holy a God, they will quickly pull down
their top; and if it were possible with Adam to hide them-
selves from the presence of God, when they shall see their
nakedness; certainly if Angels be thus debased, what shall
poor, weak, sinful man do?

2. Ignorance of the purity of the Law, and the exact, strict
obligation thereof. Did men consider what that holiness is,
which the Law requireth, that it pronounce a curse to all
that fail but in the least particular, that it will admit of
no obedience but what is perfect; then every man must cry
out, That they are but dead men, and damned men by the
Law: This makes the Apostle so vehemently dispute against
those presumptuous conceits of righteousness by the Law;
if it be so, then Christ died in vain, and if Christ died in
vain, then are we yet in our sins; if therefore men make godli-
ness of such a size and measure as they please, thinking that
is all God requireth which they do, no wonder if they go
boldly and demand a crown of glory as the reward of their
labour; no marvel if they say with that wretched Friar, Red-
demibi vitam aernam, quam mihi debes, sine velis, sine nolis;
Give me that eternal life thou ow'st me, whether thou wilt or
no: Oh pestilent mouth to utter such blasphemy that infecteth
the very air! How contrary is this to the humble spirit of
believers, which hath always in forma pauperis, begged for
the glory of heaven? That say spiritually, what Job spake
corporally, Naked (of all merits, unleas of hell and damna-
tion) came I into the world, and naked (of all merits of glory)
shall I go out of the world. Its not then every righteousness,
though applauded and admired by men, that the Law doth
approve; Was any righteousness more glorious then that of
the Pharisees, yet Matth 5. our Saviour pronounceth, That
unlesse ours exceed that, we cannot enter into the kingdom of hea-

whereby a man is Justified.
ven; and Rom. 7. Paul there proclaimeth what high and puffed thoughts he once had, while a Pharisee, he thought to have life by the Law; whereas Augustine said, De Domine quod jubes, & jube quad vis; Lord, give me to do what thou commandest, and then command what thou wilt: he can bid the Law command what it will, he is ready to obey: Oh but how ashamed and confounded is this Paul, when once he understands what this spiritual and holy Law is, Then the Law revived, and he died, then he was undone, he could not hold up his head any more; then he looked on himself as a Judas, as a Cain, then he seeth every thing prepared to undo him; Then as Paul said in the contrary Rom. 8. The whole Creation groaned for the liberty of the sons of God, So might he say, All the creatures groaned to bear such a wretched sinner, and longed for his perdition: Go then and look into the pure Glass of the Law, as James exhorts, Chap. 1. 25: and there thou wilt see such spots and blemishes, such deformities upon thee, that thou wilt be a monster in thy own eyes, and not able to endure thy self.

3. Ignorance of the relics of corruption abiding in us, and conflicting with us, makes us not esteem this Gospel Justification: For a man might think, and thus many write in their Books, Though while a man lived in his sins, he needed a Justification by grace that must deliver him, yet when once he hath a supernatural principle, and a divine nature within him, then certainly he needs not such a Gospel Justification: but all this is, because they know not the combat of the flesh and the Spirit; they feel not the struglings of those two twins within them; if they did, they would easily believe there was no appearing but in the wedding garment of Christ's righteousness; Then they would consider how truly the Prophet Isaiah said, that not their unrighteousness, but their very righteousness was like a menstrual rag, Isa. 64.6. What are our unrighteousnesses and our sins, if our holy things be thus compared to what is most abominable?

Serm.
Serm. XVIII.

Another great cause of men trusting in their own righteousness, viz. A Practicall Ignorance or Inconsideration of some Necessary Things relating to our Actions.

Rom. 10. 3.

For they being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, &c.

We mentioned three doctrinal points, the ignorance whereof made men Narcissus-like, fall in love with themselves, wholly rejecting the grace of God without them. I now add some more.

Therefore in the fourth place, Ignorance, or a not attending to Christ both in his person and office, is that which makes them lay a dead childe in the room of a living one, a dead and empty righteousness in stead of that which is efficacious and powerful. Did we truly consider of this great and unspeakable mystery, That God should become Man, and be as a Surety for us, suffering and doing what we should, it would immediately make us abandon our own works, and fly to him only. The Scripture speaks of his Person and Office: of his Person,
5. Another cause of self-justification, and refusing Christ's righteousness

Person, that he is both God and Man; and without either of these he could not have been a Mediator: And for his Office, the Scripture is plentiful in informing of us, That he was not made man, or became obedient to the Cross for his own self, but wholly for us, 2 Cor. 5. 21. He was made sinne for us, that we might become the righteousness of God. 1 Cor. 1. 30. Who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption: So Col. 1. 19. It pleased the Father that in him all fulnesse should dwell; where the Apostle sheweth at large, that he is the Head of the Church, so that we are compleat in him, Chap. 2. 10. Why then is it that the Scripture doth represent Christ in a far greater glory then ever Solomon had? Why doth it make him the Ocean of all our joy and hope, the fulnesse that filleth all our emptiness; but because we should not look for any fulnesse or compleatnesse in our selves, but in Christ alone: So that whatsoever in Justification is attributed to thy self, so much is taken from Christ. The Scripture calls Christ often Our Righteousness, it mentioneth nothing for our righteousness but him. All the children of God have renounced themselves, and would be found onely in Christ: Why then art thou such an enemy to thy true consolation, as to seek for a righteousness by thy own working? Though the people of God have works of righteousness, yet they have not righteousness of works. If then at any time thy heart be lifted up within thee, humble thy self with the thoughts of Christ; If this be so, then Christ was a Mediator in vain, he was made man in vain; & died in vain: Can we think that Christ came into the world to share the glory of our salvation between man and himself? No, but as the Moral Law is, We are to have no other gods beside him; so the Gospel faith, We are to have no other Mediator but him: Oh then! is thou didst study Christ more, and convince thy self thorowly of the fulnesse and sufficiency that is in him, thou wouldst be restless and disquieted within thee, till thou were centred on Christ; Thou wouldst be as Noah's Dove, that found no settling place, when the waters covered the earth, till she got into the Ark.
righteousness, is, The deceit of subtil and crafty distinctions, which corrupt minds have brought in, so that whereas they dared not immediately and grossly contradict Paul, who doth so professedly dispute against Justification by works, they invent many plausible and specious distinctions, hiding deformed and ugly errors under fair disguises: So that what the Scripture faith of Absolom's battle with David, The wood devoured more then the sword that day, the same may we say, The crooked windings and labyrinths of distinctions loose more souls then open grosse errors: Insomuch that they have so many glosses and fair colours, that the simple are easily deceived, thinking all is well; but the Snake lieth hid under these sweet flowers; for when we do urge, That Paul excludes all works from Justification, and makes an immediate opposition between believing and working, so that he doth not admit of any medium; The Adversaries like Jezabel paint their faces, and look very boldly. Its true, say some, works are excluded, but such as are done by the meer power of nature, such are granted to be wilde grapes, and to have no sweetnesse in them, but the works that are done through grace they are not shut out. Others, Works are excluded, but not the works of the Moral Law, but the Ceremonial onely; they were not to seek Justification by Sacrifices and Circumcision, for now Christ was come, these were antiquated. Others they draw a smaller line, and they say, Works are excluded, yea even the works of grace, but not as works, onely as merits; so that the working is not disputed against, but the merit of working, as if thereby heaven and glory might be demanded by way of debt. Again, Others they say, Works are excluded, but such works as are perfect and fully commenurated to the Law; by such no man can be justified, but through grace and a mercifull condescension, our imperfect works are accepted of to our Justification. Thus you see by all these subtil distinctions, men would be thought not to thwart Scripture; Every one faith, Paul is not against me, the Scripture doth mean works in the sense as I mean, I say as the Scripture faith, and grant what that affirmerh. Now by these subtil insinuations, the simple is enticed, as Solomon speaks of the
the adulterous woman, into dangerous nets, and is undone before 
he thinketh anything. Take heed then of subtil and ground-
lesse distinctions, think not to put off the great Judge of the 
world with them. Its as if a man should cover himself with 
cobwebs in the midst of a batterl, thinking they will serve for 
a strong harness to defend him against all dangers.

A fifth cause of this pronenessse to our own righteousness 
rather then to Christ's, is, From the sublimity and super-
naturality of that way of Justification, which the Gospel 
bath revealed: So that it being several wayes supernatural, 
its no wonder if our hearts naturally do not close with 
it. As

1. Its supernatural in the revelation of the truth of it. Had 
not God revealed such a way of Justification, we should no 
more have thought of it, then of any other mystery in the 
Christian Religion: So that as from the Scriptures onely we 
come to know that there is a Trinity, that God became man, 
that our bodies shall rise again; Thus from them only we come 
to know, that we are justified, not by working, though by 
the most admirable and choice works that can be, but by be-
lieving in Christ. Hence Rom.i.17. The righteousness of God 
is said to be revealed from faith to faith; Revealed] Therefore 
all the Aristotes and Platos in the world never thought of 
such a way. This then is the cause so many look after a false 
Justification, and rest their souls upon an unsound and rott-
ten righteousness. The Gospel-righteousness, as it is whol-
ly of God's procuring, so its also of his revealing; and 
therefore as the other Doctrines of Christian Religion are 
above our reason, so is this also; we are as hardly perswaded 
of such a righteousness by Christ, as we are of Christ himself 
being God and man.

2. The supernaturality of it is in the contrariety of it to flesh 
and blood. The truth of it is not only above our understand-
ings, but the practice of it is against our hearts. Adam in 
the state of integrity looked for Justification by works; so 
that this Gospel-justification is not onely opposite to man 
fallen, but man standing also. It was never in mans nature 
to seek for a Justification by a righteousness without us:

Now
Now this contrariety of God’s Justification to our self-justification, is, because in God’s way we are emptied of all things, we are discovered to be beggars, to be undone and damned in ourselves; and the heart of man will never yield to this, till it be broken and contrite, in pieces, losing all its former fashion and figure. This Gospel-Justification being then both for the nature of it, and truth of it, wholly supernatural, its no wonder so few have any discerning of it; they must be Eagle-eyed that can look into this Sunne. The Apostle Heb. 5. 13. sheweth, that even a godly man while a babe, one that is in the beginnings of Christianity, is unskilful in the word of righteousness, i.e. the Gospel, which declareth true righteousness; Therefore this is called strong meat, and fit for those who by reason of use, or an habit and perfection in holiness have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil: Oh what a long while is it, ere the new convert is directed to this way of Justification! What perplexities? What troubles of heart? What sad temptations do befall him, and all because he is unskilful in this subject, and its the grown Christian who comes to have a discerning spirit in it!

Seventhly, A practical Ignorance or Inconsideration of some necessary things relating to our actions, is the cause of pronestesse to a false Justification, as well as a speculative ignorance of the fore-mentioned dogmatical points. If therefore a man did seriously attend to some such practical truths, as are to be mentioned, he would be as much afraid to abide in his own righteousness, as Lot in Sodom, when fire and brimstone were ready to devour. For let him consider how great his omission is of the good things he should have done. Oh, who is able to abide, when he shall consider what this command and that required! What duty here and there he ought to have done, and yet failed many times? And certainly, if upon a supposition of doing all, we are commanded, to say, That we are unprofitable servants; God is not bettered, or made more happy by us, how much more when we neglect so many things we ought to do? Hence therefore when the Scripture speaks of the good works the godly,
godly have done, yea when they are mentioned to their praise, yet mercy and forgivenessee is at the same time desired. Thus when Nehemiah reckoned up the great acts of service he did for God, yet faith, Chap. 13. 22; Remember me, O my God, and spare me, according to the greatness of thy mercy. So concerning Onesiphorus, who was truly according to his name Onesiphorus to Paul, 2 Tim. 1. 16. 18. for he oft refreshed him, was not ashamed of Paul's chain, yet fought him out very diligently, yet what hast thou? The Lord grant he may render mercy of the Lord, in that day. You would think Paul had spoken of some great fines of Onesiphorus before, No, but he speaks of his eminent and admirable graces, and yet prayer thus heartily for mercy which always supposeth misery. If therefore at any time thy heart begins to be lifted up within thee, because thus and thus thou hast done, Oh check thy self with the omission of many thou oughtest to have done; Who is able to hold up his head if God remember the neglect of this and that duty against thee? This consideration will make us to mention God's righteousness only, and that with great vehemency and assurance of soul, as you have it notably expressed, Isa. 45. 25: In the Lord shall all the seed of Israel be justified, and shall glory; The seed of Israel is there the spiritual seed, the chosen ones of God, these shall be justified in the Lord, not in their own graces or works they do, and there is the consequent of this, They shall glory, which could never be, if justification were to be by our own works, for then we had matter rather of shame and confusion within our selves. And further observe, whereas at vers. 23, its said, Every knee should bow unto God, and tongue swear by him, The main matter wherein his worship is seen, is, Surely shall one say, in the Lord have I righteousness. This truth of having righteousness only in the Lord, hath such a powerful influence upon every godly man, that he shall swear it, and in his worship of God (which is Synecdochically expressed by swearing.) This will be the great stay and comfort of his soul, that in God only consists all his righteousness.

A second thing in our practical miscarriage, whereby we
idolize our own righteousness, is. The not considering that
if we do any good at any time, is not by our own power, or own
strength, but wholly by the grace of God: So that we cannot
be justified by this, but rather thereby our own impotency
is the more discovered, as is well observed by Mr. Bradshaw
in his little Treatise of Justification, That the more we are
enabled by grace to do any thing, the more supernatural
help we have, the lefle are we justified in our selves.
Hence the Scripture when it speaks of our Justification
always expresseth it passively; we are justified never ac-
tively, unless in an ill sense, as Luke 16. when the Pha-
risees are said to justify themselves. Thus Durand of old
well argued, That by no works of Grace could we me-
rit, because the more Grace we had, there was the
more obligation of thankfulness to God, we received more
gifts from God; So that in the very doing of any good,
we ought to be humbled; For from whom comes this
power? Who giveth thee this assistance? Let not then a-
ny pride, like a dead flie in the box of ointment spoil
all: It was the expression of an ancient Writer, As those
that draw up pure water, sometimes have frogs come up
with the water that make it loathsome: Thus many that
are employed in heavenly and great works of God, as
the Spirit of God is working in them, so their own hu-
mane spirit, and corrupt principles co-operate therewith,
and thus the comfort of a duty is lost: As the Pharisees
did all to be seen of men, and so they had their reward,
that was their punishment and their judgement, to have
that glory from men, which they wholly looked after:
If therefore at any time thou art enabled to believe or
repent, know in this thou dost not give to God, but
God gives thee: So that its a pernicious Doctrine which
Socinus teacheth, Tract. de Jusftife. That in Justification,
the main thing is to look to those things that are with-
in us, not without us. If this were so, then Paul was
fouly mistaken, Philip. 3. who would not be found in
his own righteousness, but that which is through faith in
Christ. Certainly, the clean contrary is most true, That
What is not that Righteousness

in Justification we are to look more to that which is without us then within us; we are to live spiritually, as we do naturally, as naturally we live by receiving in breath from without; So we spiritually live by receiving in righteousness through Christ: If then all be of Grace, then Justification is not from or by any thing we do.

Thirdly, We do not practically attend to this also; That when we are enabled by Grace to do anything that is good, yet as this gracious Action cometh through our hands, it admits of much soul and imperfection. Some have thought it blasphemy to say, The gracious Actions we are enabled unto by Gods Spirit, are imperfect; As if (say they) Gods Spirit did any thing imperfectly, not considering that Paul (Philip. 3.) though he had the Spirit of God dwelling in him, yet accounts all that he did, as dung and drosse comparatively to Christs righteousness. Besides, Though the Spirit of God worketh these things in us, yet it is not made one person with us; it doth onely efficiently produce them, not vitally and formally. The Spirit of God doth not believe or repent, though it enableth us to those things; as naturally its not God that eateth, or drinketh, or moveth in us, though by his assistance we are enabled to do all. Further, its a known Rule, That *Quicquid recipitur, recipitur ad modum recipientis*; Pure water running thorough a foul Pipe, getteth some soil upon it; Excellent Wine will taste of the Cask, if it be not sweet: So that, although the same Action as it cometh from God be perfect, yet as it floweth from us, is vitiated and made imperfect several wayes.

Fourthly, Men do not practically attend to this, Suppose, That by the Grace of God thou dost that which is truly good, yea that is absolutely and perfectly so, yet this is not enough to the Law, because that requireth the universal frame of all good works commanded. As the Apostle James saith, He that breakes one is guilty of all. Its an usual saying, The Law of God is copulative, that is, it requi-
whereby a man is Justified.

The connexion and chaining of all duties together; so that if a man were able to perform one or two good duties in a most absolute manner, yet unless he did persevere in all, he had not the righteousness of the Law. Socinus ("Tract de Justification") grants that the Apostle Rom. 4. excluded works of Justification, not only as merits, but as they are works; onely he faith, the Apostle means by workes the whole congeries or order of all good duties required by the Law, and thus none is justified; but then, he faith, the Apostle James, when he attributeth Justification to works, he doth not take works for the universal observance of all God's commands, but but for the frequent and constant use of them, though accompanied with several failings and omissions: But this will not heal the wound he hath made. Although we grant, That if a man could perfectly and compleatly fulfill the Law of God in some particular command, yet unless there were a general observation of all, there could not be any justification before God: Attend not then to some few particular duties done, though never so eminently and exactly, for unless thou art able to say, Thou hast kept all, and failed not in any one particular, here cannot be any justification by works.

Fifthly, If men did practically consider not onely the omission of many good things, but the commision of many sinnes daily, this would make them fly out of their selves to a Justification by Christ. For if there be but one sinne that may be laid to thy charge, though all thy other life for the future were as perfect as that of the Saints and Angels in Heaven, it could not avail to Justification, because that one sinne in the guilt of it would preponderate and weigh down all thy duties; one sinne would be more to condemn then all thy holinesse to save thee; and this is the ground why it behoved us to have such an High Priest, that was altogether without spot, or blemish, because if he had sinnes of his own, he could not have satisfied for another: What madness then and
blindenesse doth possess men, that they should endeavour to set up that for a covering, which will indeed be like so many sparks of fire to consume them, like so many briers to tear and rend them? They do in this matter of Justification, as the Jews in their calamities, run from one refuge to another, from a Serpent to a wall covering that would fall upon them.

Lastly, Men do not consider, That when they have abstained from sinne, that it hath been many times not out of love to God, or hatred to sinne, but either because the opportunity hath not been, or else outward fear and shame, and if so, thou art farre from a Justification by this. The Israelites many times in their afflictions were kept from sinne, but it was something without kept them, as the bounds of the Sea keep in the waters, it was not from any true sanctified principle within: So that if any one do but think of all these particulars, they will quickly melt within, and be afraid of themselves, they will cry out, Woe be unto me in my best condition: What the Psalmist said, Every man at his best is but vanity; The same they will lay even of their spiritual condition; and what the Prophet said, All flesh is grass, and the flower thereof fadeth away, The same in some sense, with reference to Justification, they may speak: Even their spiritual Graces are as grosse, and fade away, when the scorching beams of the glorious Sunne of Righteousnesse shall appear, More causes may be discovered of our prone-nesse to be our own Justifiers and Saviours, but they will come in opportuneely hereafter.

And therefore let it be of Exhortation to you, to bewail that self-righteousnesse in you, that aversnesse to a Gospel-Justification, Why is it that the oil of the Gospel is no more precious to you? Is it not because you are not wounded with the sense of sinne? The poor man esteemeth wealth, the pained man eafe, the sick man health. Its want and pinching necessaries that make men prize mercies: And thus it is here, till our hearers are spiritu-
spiritual, even fainting under spirituall languishing, because of the heavy load of sinne, they put no due esteeme upon the Lord Christ.

But thou wilt say, I am well enough, I doe not finde my self in such an undone estate, I am full and want nothing.

I answer, Even therefore thou needest all things, therefore thou needest a Justification without thee, because thou thinkest it is within thee: Oh man to be pitied and wept over! Christ wept over Jerusalem, because she was not sensible of her temporall destruction; But oh how few are apprehensive of their spiritual damnation! Let them be brought into temporall wants, they do nothing but think of them, and speak of them; but when in spiritual wants of a righteousness to cloathe them, then they are not affected.

Let not then this truth leave thee, till it hath had its proper operation upon thee, till thou art in thy sense as wretched as that exposed Infant the Prophet Ezekiel speaks of, Ezekiel, wallowing in thy bloud, full of noisomenesse, and no wayes able to make thy self comely, for such ornament God onely puts on thee.
SERM. XIX.

The Necessity of a perfect Righteousness: And how destitute all men naturally are of it: With the Grounds thereof.

Rom. 3:10.

As it is written, There is none Righteous, no not one.

We are pursuing the Negative part, or, What is that Righteousness whereby we are not justified. For this general introductory hath been dispatched, That men are very propense to establish their own righteousness in opposition to that which God hath procured: And here in the Text we see a peremptory and universal exclusion of all men in the world, if considered in their natural estate from such a righteousness, as may justify them before God. For whereas the Apostle distributeth all mankind into Jew and Gentile, he sheweth they are both alike impotent and wretched in the matter of Justification: For although at vers. 1, 2. he saith, The Jews advantage is much every way, in respect of the Gentile, yet he doth not at vers. 9. contradict himself, when he saith, the Jew is in no wise better than the Gentile; for in the former verses he speaks of Church privileges and visible Prerogatives, wherein the Jew highly transcended the Gentile,
whereby a man is justified.

Gentile; but at the 9th verse, he compareth them together in the great business of Justification, and then the Jew with all his worship and knowledge of the Law, is no better then an ignorant unbelieving Gentile. As mountains and high hills may seem great, if compared to the valleys, but if with the heavens, then the hills and valleys are but as a punctum, and all is nothing to them: Even the profligate man that is accounted of as a dunghill; and a formal Justiciary, that is admired as a Saint, yet in respect of Justification are both naked and miserable alike, for in Gods sight no man is justified by any works he doth.

Now that both Jew and Gentile are both alike in respect of Justification, the divine Apostle faith, v. 9. That he had proved it before. The word is observed by the learned never to signify to prove a thing, but rather to accuse and charge, to make complaint, and thus it best agreeth here; and the Indictment drawn up against the whole world, even all men of all sorts, is, That they are under sinne, both in the condemning power of it, and also the reigning power of it; Under it, which denoteth the weight or load of sinne; Under it, which signifieth sinnes dominion, and their slavery unto it; Under it, so that they are unable to shake off the tyranny of it: Oh that as the Israelites could humble themselves and mourn, when they were under their oppressours, and servants ruled over them; So we could as spiritually prostrate our selves before God, because of the yoke sinne hath put upon us! for we cannot say of sinnes yoke, as Christ of his, that it is easie and light: Or if it be so for a while, yet at last the burden will be intolerable, making thee to tremble and cry out with Cain, My sinnes are greater then I can bear. This charge which the Apostle laid upon all mankinde, he doth again in the verses following at large prove; for there is nothing so necessary to the diseased person, as to see the danger of his disease: Its the beginning of our heavenly cure, to be strongly convinced of our undone estate: And that the Apostle may not seem to speak out of particular malice, or as if he were some churlift Misanthropos, he brings Scripture for what he faith, As it is written. Now you must know that
the verses allledged are from many places in Scripture, Psal. 14, Psal. 53, Psal. 51, Psal. 14, Psal. 36. & Isa. 59. For although in the vulgar Edition all these are added in Psal. 14, yet by the Papists themselves, Pererius and Sprace, its confessed they are not in the Hebrew, nor in the Septuagint, and Pererius in loc. doth well reprove Lindanius that would from hence prove the Hebrew corrupted by the Jews, for why should they do it in this place, when it related not to Christ? it being only moral matter, and that which is in other places of Scripture. From all these places joyned together, we may see what a loathsome leper all mankinde is, that the whole world is an hospittall of Lazarus' of diseased ulcerous persons. It's good for every one to meditate on them, for none is excluded. Their corruption is set down, first, Universally, then particularly, or by induction of parts, and that negatively and positively: negatively, by denying the graces of the soul, of the minde, none understands God; of the heart and will, there is none that seeketh after God; of the body, They all turnedaside, which universal sentence is ampliified by sinnes of words, expressed by their instruments, of throat, tongue, lips and mouths. Their sinnes of works are expressed Synecdochically by the Ministry and service of their feet, with the effects of them; all which sinnes are illustarted by a two-fold cause, the fountain of all, want of love to their neighbour, The way of peace, they have not known, and want of fear to God, There is no fear of God before their eyes: So that here you have a most admirable and lively description of man by nature; you see what a beast, what a toad, what a devil he is. Where are they that will advance free-will, plead for the purity of nature, and deny original sinne? This is a true faithfull looking-glass to represent every one in, for the words are universal and emphatical, There is none righteous, no not one. Let no man plead an exemption, and think he is not within the compasse of this charge, one by the difficulty is, in what sense to explain this; and some there are that take these expressions in an hyperbolical sense, not that every one was thus unrighteous, but because the generality was corrupted. But this cannot stand with the Apollos
Apostles (cope, which is to shew, that all mankind was under sinne, and could not be justified by works; Therefore if any were excluded from such an indictment, these persons would be justified by works, and so the Apostles inference would not hold zeta neutos. Others they say, None is righteous, i.e. to such a perfect, absolute righteousness, as the Law requireth. Others, None is righteous, i.e. so as not to commit some sinne or other sometimes. But that which is most genuine is, that the Apostle here speaketh of what every man is by nature, that he is thus positively and negatively miserable, as soon as he hath a being; for although the Apostle reckons up actual sinnes, and such as every one doth not commit, yet because the inclination and propensity of all are to such wickednesse, and it's not because they are born with lefe defilement then others, or have more innocent natures then others, but because God puts bounds to mans sins, and he restraineth even where he doth not sanctifie. Therefore the expression is universal; As we say, All Toads and Serpents are poisonous, though actually they have not poisoned any. The sense therefore is, That none is righteous, both in respect of Sanctification, because by nature full of sinne, and in respect of Justification, and so are not able to endure before the consuming presence of an holy God. To clear this truth, consider

First. That God made man righteous, he was created like the glorious heavens, there was no spot or blemish in him. Had mankind continued in that integrity, then the contrary would have been true, There is none unrighteous, no not one. The Image of God is said to be in righteousness and true holiness, Eccles. 7.29. God made man upright, but he hath sought out many inventions. As therefore now since man is fallen, the Apostle shutteth out the righteousness of works; so if he had stood, the righteousness of faith had been excluded. The condition then we were created in, was as full of righteousness as the heavens of staires, then man approached to God as absolutely considered, there was no necessity of a Mediator, or an atonement: yet though this was so happy an estate, Divines conclude, that our estate of reparation

whereby a man is justified.
is more blessed then that of integrity; not only in respect of duration, for Adam totally lost his happiness, but so shall not the believer; but also in respect of that righteousness, whereby he stands justified before God, for though Adam's righteousness was inherent and perfect, not stained with the least sin, yet it was a creature-righteousness: But ours, though imputed, and not in ourselves, feeling many imperfections, yet its the righteousness of Christ, God and man. Our Justification then is as full of solidity, comfort and joy, as Adam's in integrity, yea it far transcends it.

2. Secondly, Though God created man with a righteousness, yet he presently lost it, both for himself, and for all his posterity, so that there is not a righteousness to be had by any man living. There is not naturally any such thing in the world: What thunder and lightning should this be in our ears? Every man by nature is in an unjustified estate by God, and that includeth all misery, as Justification doth all happiness: if not justified, God is angry with thee all the day long. Thou hast no peace with God or thy own conscience; thy chamber, thy bed must always be an hell to thee; thou art cursed with all the curses of the Law: Therefore though for the present thou wastest in thy pleasures and lusts; Thou eatest, and drinkest, and runnest into all excess of riot. Yet there is nothing but condemnation belongs to thee: Oh that men had hearts to consider and tremble at this! How canst thou live a day, yea moment without Justification? Thou art naked and exposed to all the vengeance of God, will not this make thee eat the bread of trembling, and drink the water of astonishment? This righteousness is lost; Thou hast nothing but rags and filth upon thee. God and thy soul are at a vast distance, yea and direct contrariety: Oh that men should not think all other miseries, though never so extream, to be but small in respect of this want of a righteousness! Yet we can complain under the want of food to nourish us, of cloaths to cover us; but who goeth wringing the hands, and bowed down with the head, crying out, I have no righteousness to stand with before God?

Thirdly,
Thirdly, Though man hath lost a righteousness to be justified by, yet there is an absolute necessity of having one. God cannot love or delight in any thing but righteousness: You have heard how holy, pure and righteous God is, and therefore loveth only such as are righteous, if our prayers and duties be not the performances of righteous persons, God loathes them, whosoever is not according to his holy will, he utterly rejects it, he turneth his eyes from it: Oh that people would meditate on this more! They say, Let us go to the Ordinances, let us pray and hear; but they never think, Where is the righteousness that I must put on to make me accepted? Like the man in the Parable, they venture to come to the feast, though they have not a wedding garment: Men naturally think their holy duties are their righteousness, & they come to do these, expecting thereby to be justified, but oh thy vain and deceived heart! Thy duties are not thy righteousness; but thou needest a righteousness to cover the deformities of them, and to make them accepted. Abel's person must first be accepted before his offering can be: So that the Sunne is not more necessary for the eye to discern objects, or the air for men to live by, then a righteousness is to do all holy duties acceptably in God's sight. So that this righteousness is to be sought in the first place, without this we build without a foundation, we cannot proceed one step in Christianity without this covering. But as the hand full of earth or dross cannot receive gold; so a man filled with the thoughts and apprehensions of his own righteousness, cannot look out for the true righteousness: All our conditions are like the Church of Laodicea, Rev. 3. 17, 18. Who thought her self rich and needed nothing, when indeed she was poor and miserable: Therefore she is counselled to buy eye-salve, and to get raiments to cloathe her nakedness with. This is all our conditions, we think our selves full, when we are empty; we judge all well, when if we knew what we are, we should neither sleep nor eat, for the wretchedness we feel in our selves in.

In the next place, consider the grounds why by nature none have a righteousness to be justified by.

Yet there is an absolute necessity of having a righteousness.
And the first obvious clear cause of this, is, That original pollution everyone is plunged into; so that from the head to the sole of the foot, there is nothing but filth and corruption. Hence Ephes. 2. 2. by nature we are said to be children of wrath. That is directly contrary to justification; Howsoever the doctrine of natural pollution hath been questioned by many, yet to every true believer the Scripture and experience makes it of undoubted truth, so that he is as sure he is born full of sinne, and a child of wrath, as that he is born at all: And indeed all the misery he is environed with naturally, doth evidently proclaim his birth-pollution. Cælestius the Pelagian being unwilling to deny original sinne, yet made it to be res questionis, not fidei, a meer controversy, and no Article of faith, against which Augustine did with all his might oppose himself. Erasmus also, though he would not be thought to Pelagianize in this point, yet in his Exposition on Rom. 5. doth labour to enervate those choice and eminent Texts for it, affirming, That Divines in their Theological matters, have done like the Astronomers, who when they were not able to answer many difficulties, invented their Epicycles and eccentrical motions, &c. Thus he thinketh they did about original sinne. But who will regard him much, of whom Gerard writeth, that he was bold to affirm, That such was the Authority of the Church to him, that if it should determine Pelagianism or Arianism to be the truth, he would beleive it! and indeed had Erasmus been more humbled under the power of original sinne, his Discourse would not have been so meerly moral as it is, in all his writings little surpassing a Seneca or Plutarch. Here then is the foundation to be laid, He that denieth or extenuateth original sinne, must also deny or extenuate Christ's righteousness; Not that Christ came onely to wast away the guilt of original sinne, as some have absurdly taught, but because this is the fountain of all our calamity. By this we are children of wrath, though we had never committed any actual transgression. By this it is, that God is justifid in the damnation of Heathens, yea and their Infants also, though they never heard of Christ, or enjoyed the means of grace; How then
then can they by nature have a righteousness to justify, who are full of sinne to condemn? How can they be children of grace who are children of wrath? And truly, he onely will build upon the rock, who diggeth thus deep, even to the bottom of nature defilement; and because this is spiritually discovered, as you see by Paul, Rom. 7. hence the number of those is very few that are able to put a due price upon the Lord Christ and his righteousness. He that would make the way plain for Christ, must beginne with the true sense of the depth, breadth and length of original sinne; here it is true, That one deep calls upon another; The depth of original sin for the depth of Christ's righteousness.

Secondly, As men are thus wholly become leproous and abominable, so by this defilement they are obnoxious to God's wrath. There is no more in them then in devils, why they should be justified; See what the Apostle inferreth from this large description of their natural pollution, v. 19. That every mouth may be stopped, and all the world become guilty before God. All the world is guilty, ζώος. They all lie at God's mercy, they are all dead and damned men; and because of this every mouth is stopped, it hath nothing to boast of, yea nothing to plead or say for itself: So that with the man in the Parable, no sooner shall God say to us, How came ye in hither? but we must be speechlesse: Oh how little is this bewailed by us! We think not that we came into the world so many condemned persons, that every hour all the sentence of wrath may passe upon us. To be born lame, blinde or deformed, is judged an heavy calamity; but to come into the world an enemy to God, and God an enemy to us, is not at all regarded.

Thirdly, No man naturally hath a righteousness to be justified by, because if he abstain from committing any sinne, it is not from right and holy grounds, and if he do that which is for the substance good, yet it is not from pure ends. We suppose, that if a man by nature have a righteousness to be justified by, it must be from something within him; it must be either innate or acquired. Now if we look over all men by nature, we can-
not finde not one man, no not doing one action, thereby to be accepted of by God: so that if God should make a more condescending profer in this case, then he did in the matter of Sodome to Abraham, it could not obtain an effect. Should God say, If among all mankinde considered in and of themselves, you can finde fifty righteous actions, I will pardon all mankinde for them, fifty could not be found; yes if the Lord should descend from fifty to ten, yet mankinde could not be helped. Nay, should we go further, then Abraham thought fit, If amongst all mankinde can be found one righteous action, it shall be justified; yet in this case, though all mankinde did lie at the Stake, there could not be any help found for it; for if sinne be not committed, no man naturally can do it from principles of faith and love, or from the renewed Image of God within; its because he wants the opportunity, or some outward restraint is upon him. Was Je-roboam the lefse guilty, because when he stretched out the arm to hurt the Prophet, that immediately withered, and so he could not accomplish his wicked design? Thus it is with all men naturally, they have the seed of all wickednesse in them; every one would be a Judas, a Cain, only God that bounds the Sea that it doth not overflow the banks, doth also limit and bound the wickednesse of natural men. Thus also if they do what is good, the Lord doth not account it to them for righteousnesse, because they never can do any thing to its true and ultimate end, as Augustine often. It was vain glory which made them perform most of their noble imploiments, and if they did any good action for its particular end, as relieve the necessitous from a compassionatenesse to mans misery, yet they come short of the universal end, which is Gods glory; so that whatsoever doth not ascend as high as this, is to be judged but splendidum peccatum, a glittering sinne, and so cannot justifie before God.

Fourthly, No man can naturally be justifised before God, because he is born destitute of the knowledge of God, and faith in Christ. Now John 17. 2. Its eternal life to know God, and Christ sent as the Mediatour; and Heb. 11. 1. Without faith its impossible
impossible to please God. Insomuch that the Scripture every where ascribeth our Justification to Faith. Now take a man as he cometh naturally in the world, let him not hear of the Scriptures, or know of Christ. What would his own natural abilities avail thereunto? And certainly, if though the Gospel be preached, yet so many remain without faith, as Christ complaineth, who hath believed our Report? What faith would be found amongst men, if there were no Revelation of the Gospel? Man then is born devoid of Justification, and faith to receive it, and that not as he is born destitute of the Arts, no Philosopher, no Physician, for these things he can attain by Education, through the help of those common principles of reason that are in him, whereas for our Justification, and the way thereunto, we have nothing that can co-operate in the least degree of activity.
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Rom. 3:10.

Serm. XX.

I shall demonstrate, that none comes into the world with a righteous nature, but in the direct contrary with unrighteousness, and all manner of enmity against God, being the children of wrath, passively and actively, hating and hated of God. And what hath been said, we may add this further discovery: That every man's nature is spiritually impure and unclean, both in his person, and in all his actions. And therefore is like the leprous person that was to stand aloof from, and to cry, He is unclean, unclean. In these two things, the impurity of his person, and of all his actions, is principally comprehended.
hended all the filth and pollution of mankinde. Now that
the person must first be reconciled and made acceptable in
God's sight before any thing he doth can be approved of, is
plain from Abel, to whose person God had first respect, and
then to his offering. And to our Saviour, *Matth. 7. 18. affir-
meth, That a corrupt tree cannot bring forth good fruit, and that
therefore the tree must first be good before any fruit can be good.
Now it's plain, all men by nature are corrupted Trees, they
are bitter fountains, they are a wilde flock, till ingraffed in-
to Christ: yea Tit. 1. 14. They are all over impure and unclean,
and thereby every thing becomes unclean to them: Oh then,
Where are they that admire and plead for mans righteousness by nature, when the Scripture represents him thus loath-
some and abominable! But this defilement is not onely on
his person, it redounds and overfloweth to all that he doth;
so that a dung-hill may as well cleanse, or pitch may make
white, as a man by nature be justified; and from hence it is,
that Augustine of old; and our Protestant Writers of late
maintain against Papists. That all the works of Heathens,
yea of unbelievers, and unregenerate men, are sinnes; There
is not one good action to be found amongst them, which
though it may seem a cruel and bloody opinion thus at one
blow to make the condition of all mankinde with the most
glorious actions, to be hopeless; yet it is no more then
what the Scripture is plain for, *Heb. 1. Without faith it is im-
possible to please God, so that all men naturally being destitute
of faith, are not able to please God in any thing; If they
eat, if they drink, yea if they pray, if they come to the
Ordinances, in none of these things are they pleasing to God.
That fore-mentioned place, Tit. 1. 15. doth evince this, Un-
to the defiled and unbelieving nothing is pure; All their natural,
civil and religious actions are made unclean to them; for
their civil actions of their calling, even that which is thought
to be most innocent and harmless, ye't that is said to be a sin,
*Prov. 21. 4. The plowing of the wicked is sinne; he doth not
say, his merchandizing, his buying and selling, wherein may
be much fraud and injustice, but his plowing that is sinne,
How so? It cannot be from the matter of the action, for that

A mans person
must be acce-
pied before his
works be ap-
proved of.
is good and lawful, but from the condition that the natural person is in; he being corrupted, there cometh also a corruption to all his actions; As the plague and pestilence may be conveyed in the fent or smell, though even to the very gold and silver that infected persons have. Oh what confusion should be upon thee, to consider that all the day long, thy works, thy imployments have been so much constant sinning against God! Nor only thy prophaneness, thy oaths, thy curses, but thy sowing, thy mowing, thy buying, thy selling; Thus the number of thy sinses ariseth higher and wider, then ever thou thoughtst of. So true is that of An- selm, Omnis vita infidelium peccatum est, & nihil bonum sine summo bono, yea their religious actions in which they are apt to put all their confidence, and rest on them as the sure ground of their salvation, they are all so many sinses as flowing from them, Prov. 21. 27. The Sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination to the Lord. See here how God accounts of the religious duties of unregenerate men, they are an abomination; This word is used to shew the highest disdain and displeasure God can have, and therefore commonly in the Scripture Idols are called Abominations. Thus even the choicest and most excellent religious duties of any unbeliever, are an abomination to God, and can that which is an abomination justify? Can that which God hateth, as Isa. 1. with the like hatred he doth all the grossest sinses that are? Can these reconcile God? Oh be at last convinced! Thy religious duties do not sanctifie thy defiled person, but thy defiled person polluteth thy religious duties. This truth was lively represented under the Old Testament, by the legal uncleanness: if a person so guilty medled with any holy things, they did not take away his uncleanness, but he defiled them; And to this purpose the Prophet Haggie doth notably speak, Chap. 2. 12, 13, 14. If a man that was unclean did touch holy things, those holy things were made unclean by him. There is not scarce any truth more fundamentally necessary to make way for Christ, and highly to esteem Justification, then this; when thou shalt consider, that all the day long thou art damning thy self, and whatsoever thou doest, eat or drink, work or pray, all is unclean to thee,
whereby a man is Justified.

there; for what will amaze and astonish thee if this do not? Thou wilt see thy self like Peter's sheet, full of unclean things, and if any thing, this surely will make thee afraid of thy self, and seek out for spiritual relief through Christ. I am unwilling to leave this truth, till every one be practically and cordially convinced of it: Till this foundation be laid, in vain do we build up any thing of Gospel-justification, only take some salt to season the former truth. When we say, That no men by nature are able to do the least righteous or good action, though the salvation of all mankind doth depend on it.

This is not to be understood, as if we put no difference between the actions unbelievers do, that it is all one whether an unregenerate man did pray or commit adultery, whether he did outward acts of justice, or be full of violence and rapine; No such matter is intended: only we say, Their actions may be divided into two kinds; some of them are in their nature vicious and sinful, as to lie, steal, &c. Others are for the matter and substance of them good, only in respect of circumstances, and other requisite conditions, they become sinnes. As if an unregenerate man walk justly and righteously to his neighbour, relieve a man in necessity, honour his parents, or preserve the publick good before his private, as many Romans did. These actions for the nature of them were good and commanded, but because they failed in many other things, therefore they were sinnes as to them; for the old Rule is, Malum esse quolibet defectum, any defect makes an action so farre sinful, but Bonum eff ex integritatis, good must be of all its causes: Goodness is like harmonious musick, if any one string jarre the harmony is marred; Its like beauty compleated of the symmetry of all the parts, if any one part be deformed, the beauty is vitiated, and thus it is in all good actions; let any thing be never so admirable for the nature of it, To give thy body to be burnt, or to suffer Martyrdom, if there be any failing or crack either in the principle, manner or end; Thou halt lost the comfort and the reward of the duty. And thus all men natural, they cannot but be defective in these things,
Wherein the defect of the actions of all men merely natural lies.

III. In the principle from which; till the Tree is made good, the fruit is not good, till a man be regenerated and renewed in the image of God he doth nothing supernaturally, so operari sequitur esse.

2. They are not ingrafted in Christ from whom onely we have power to do what is holy, John 15.1. unless we are branches in him we cannot do any thing.

3. There is a defect in the manner, which yet is the form and life of all moral actions. Its not enough to do that which is good, unless we do it well; it must be bene as well as bonum.

And then lastly, they notoriously misse of the glorious end, to which every action ought ultimately to relate, and that is God himself: So that from these particulars it is, that no man improved to the utmost in his natural abilities can procure a righteousness to be justified by.

Yea I shall adde a third Proposition or demonstration of mans utter impotency in respect of Justification, That he is so farre from having a righteousness out of his own bowels to cloath himself with, as the Silk worm makes her curious web, that he cannot in the least manner dispose or prepare himself thereunto. He cannot do any thing, whereby either to merit or to oblige God to bestow Justification upon him, which must needs stop every mans mouth. It cannot be denied but that there are ordinarily preparatory works upon the soul in order to Justification, such as conviction of sinne, sense and feeling of the burden of it, general desires to have some ease; but yet these are neither preparations of mans own strength or power; Neither are they so much as meritorious de congruo of Justification; yea they are not necessary antecedants, for how many have such works upon their souls, have many troubles and anxieties of heart, and yet never obtain this glorious privilidge of Justification: So that its plain, no man by his natural strength can any wayes prepare or fit himself for this mercy. Howsoever the Council of Trent judged this Doctrine to be worthy of an Anathema, yet they might as well have condemned the Scripture itself. Its true they suppose an Heathen improving his naturals well, fo whil
which God will reveal supernaturals and wonderfully make known Christ and Salvation to him, but when they are desired to produce any such one Heathen, they can do it no more then the Chymist his Philosophers stone; so that Justification always finds a man unworthy of that favour, yea it meeteth with him in a state wholly opposite to it; and whereas the sinner might justly have looked for damnation, he obtaineth Salvation: So that every justified person hath greater cause to melt under the favour of God, then Saul under Davids had, when yet that wretched man could not but weep to see David spare him, though his great enemy, when he had the opportunity to cut him off: Oh how justly may the soul melt with thankfulneffe I saying, Oh Lord! Shall all this goodnesse of thine be shewed to me an enemy? What, not only delivered from hell and all punishment, but admitted also to those eternal joyes in heaven? Who can but be amazed at this? Hence the Scripture always attributeth our Justification to the free grace of God, diligently excluding any works we can do; and certainly if in the continuance of our Justification, that be always retained by meer grace, so that no works of ours, though regenerated, and endowed with an heavenly principle within, are causal of it, How much rather are men impotent and undeserving, while abiding under the power of sinne, and nowayses able, but to do every thing in a sinful manner?

These things may suffice to witness this truth against all mankinde, and let the Scripture be true, though every man be a sinner; yet though Gods word doth thus plainly debase man, as to the point of Justification, There are many that cannot digest this; They will never be persuade that they are thus all overs plunged into sin; What, do nothing, and that all the day long, but treasure up wrath against the day of wrath? Who can bear this Doctrine? Yes there are those that revile this Doctrine, as making God very unmerciful and cruel, damning the farre greater part of mankinde with their little Infants also in eternal flames, because they believe not in a Christ, of whom many never heard. There are therefore those that have stood up, and pleaded the Heathens.
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thens case, and said, That they may be justified and saved only by the knowledge of God as a Creator, if so be they walk honestly according to that light they have. Hence they have asserted a Judicial and Ethical piety, as well as a Christian, and grant a Justification and a Salvation even without a visible Church.

Not to speak of the Heretics Rhetoriani of old, to which many of late have joined themselves, who dogmatized, That everyone might be saved in any one way of Religion, though never so opposite to another.

There are those of greater repute, who have pleaded for the Heathens salvation, although they are divided amongst themselves; for some have said, The just and wise Heathen is justified and saved, but by Christ, though they have no knowledge of him; Even as Infants are saved by Christ, though they do not believe in him. Others, they have said, Reason hath been enough to their Justification, if they obeyed the dictates thereof, and asserted, That man is called righteous, because he followeth Christ, (who (say they) is called Logos, because he enlightens every man with reason that cometh into the world.

Others they grant, Such as are saved have some knowledge of Christ, but an implicit not explicit; They have a readiness of heart to believe whatsoever God shall make known to them, though as yet nothing of Christ is expressly manifested to them.

In Antiquity, the two that are most famously instanced in for this opinion, are Clemens Alexandrinus and Chrysostome; The former affirming, That Philosophy did by its self justify the Heathens, and that what the Law was to the Jews, the Gospel to Christians, the same Philosophy was to the Gentiles. And as for Chrysostom he saith, To know God, was once enough to salvation, but now its necessary to believe in Christ.

Concerning the opinion of these Ancients, we may read Causabon Ex. 1st in Baron, who is positive, That they did hold salvation to the Gentiles without the knowledge of Christ. But the learned Voghtius Theside vict Gentilis, and makes a moderate
moderate construction of their words; So also doth Sixtus Senensis (lib.6. Annot.51.) a learned Papist concerning Chrysostom. Howsoever this be, its certain that we are naturally very prone to think of the mercy of God so illimited as to reach to the Gentiles also.

Augustine speaks the heart of every man in this point, Ep. 99. Virtutes Gentilium, quadam indole animi ita defelecta, ut eis in quibus hae fuerunt vellemus praeipue ab inferni cruciati bus liberari, nisi aliter se habet sensus humanus aliter justitia Creatoris. The virtues of the Gentiles do so naturally delight us, that with all our hearts we would they might be preserved from hell torments, did not an humane sense judge one thing, and the justice of a Creator another. In this point therefore we are to lay aside all humane reason and natural affections, attending to Gods word onely.

The Remonstrants in this Question would suspend, as thinking man might hold the affirmative from a principle of commieration to mankinde. Vives and Erasmus are propense to this. Hence Erasmus Praef. ad Tull. Offic. placeth Tullly in heaven, a place so full of glory, that neither Papists or Protestants have dared to see Erasmus himself there. Andradyes the Papist did with great animosity plead for the Justification and Salvation of Heathens, whom Chemnitus solidly refuteth. So also Barleus, against whom Vedelius wrote that Book, stiled De Deo Synagoga. Now although the Apostle say, What have we to do to judge those that are without? yet that doth not hinder, but that we may positively determine, that by Scripture, there is no Justification or Salvation without the Church. And therefore, though some Heathens have shamed Christians by their morality, and have transcended in many practical perfections, yet we cannot say, That thereby they are justified, which hath been already abundantly proved, partly from original sinne, and partly from that spiritual impurity thereby cleaving to their persons and actions, as also, because they are without faith, without which there cannot be any acceptation. We grant indeed that many who were not of the visible Church, have been justified, as Job, Melchisedech, the Egyptian midwives, and Rahab; with many
many others. But we say, these had the means of grace one way or other vouchsafed to them, and so were instructed in the true knowledge of God, and thereby were made of the Church. Again, We grant a different degree in the knowledge of God and Christ. Some have more explicit knowledge than others, and God requireth of some a greater measure of knowledge than others, according to the means of grace they do enjoy; yet we say, That none can be justified or saved without the knowledge of God and Christ in some measure or degree; And to the former Arguments, we may add these Texts, Rom. 10:13, 14. Where first it is said, 

Whosoever shall call on the Name of the Lord, shall be saved. Now left it might be thought Heathens and Pagans, they can pray to God, they can call on him, he addeth, this is not acceptable praying. For how shall they call on him, if they do not believe? And how shall they believe in him, of whom they have not heard? &c. Where you see plainly a connexion between acceptable prayers and faith, as also between faith and the Ministry. Another pregnant Text is, Acts 4:12. There is no other way of salvation, or name under heaven by which we can be saved, but by the name of Christ. The name of Christ is Christ known and believed, and there is no other way: So that Heathens cannot be justified one way, and Christians another; For as they that hold the contrary say, The knowledge of God as a Creator is necessary to Justification, otherwise they could not walk thankfully, or consider their duty, the same is to be said concerning Christ also; and certainly if righteousness could have come to the Gentiles by nature, Christ died in vain, was a Mediator in vain, as also the Scripture and Ministry is in vain, seeing absolutely Justification might have been had without them. There is one place much instanced in for the contrary, Acts 10. concerning Cornelius a Centurion, an Heathen Soldier; now before he believed in Christ as the Messiah, God faith of him, ver. 4. Thy prayers and thine alms are come up for a memorial before God. And Peter v. 35. faith, In every Nation, he that feareth God and worketh righteousness, is accepted of him. But the answer is, That this Cornelius, as also the Ethiopian Eunuch, they were not abso-
lute Heathens, they had heard of Christ, and so had the
initials of faith already begun in them, although they were
directed where to have more full and clearer knowledge; and
none can fear God or work righteousness, but he that hath
the seminals of faith, and the principles of regeneration within
him. Although we also adde, That there is a two-fold
acceptation, 1. General, whereby God as a Creator doth
accept of his creature, and mercifully provide many favours
for them, and upon their humiliations, though not truly
sanctified, release temporal punishments, as we see in
Abub, and many others. And secondly, There is a gracious accep-
tance, thereby to ordain to eternal life, to justify and to
become reconciled with their persons; This is onely within
the Church, and to thosse therein that truly fear God.

The Use is deeply to humble us, and to make us lie low
before God. Never did the poor cripple lie with more earn-
estnesse and vehemency, expecting the Angels descent into
the pool, then thou art to wait for the grace of God to ju-
stiifie thee: Oh consider how dreadful it is, to stay a day, a
night, a moment in an unjustified condition: for while so,
thou hast no peace with God, go from one place to another,
still the sentence of condemnation is upon thee! As the Egy-
ptians found all their waters turned into blood, they could
not go to brooks, or rivers, or cisterns, but still all was blood:
So it is here, all is damnable matter, whether thou eatest or
drinkest, whether thou labourest or sleepest, all turns to hell:
Oh that men would believe this! How restlesse and unquiet
would they be till being justified they had peace with God?
Serm. XXI.

That none can be justified by the Works of the Law, though they are done by the Grace of God.

Gal. 3.11.

But that no man is justified by the Law in the sight of God, it is evident: For the Just shall live by Faith.

In this Epistle the Apostle vindicateth two things:

1. His Office and Ministry.
2. The true Doctrine about justification against that corrupt error broached by false teachers; that the Law, or the works of it, were either in part or in whole requisite to justification, that Christ himself was not sufficient to justification without this additament. In the confuting of which dangerous error, he is full of strong Arguments, and with-all observed to be more severe and sharp in his words, then in any other Epistle.

Tertullian (as Grotius relateth, Prologi in Epist. Gal.) thought this to be the first Epistle he wrote, and that immediately upon his conversion, and therefore thinketh it to be attributed to that fervency and heat which usually accompanieth new converts. But it is rather to be attributed to the greatness and dangerousnesse of the error, and their pertinacy therein, for he makes the consequent of such opinions, to out the main-
maintainers of them from grace, yea and to make Christ's death in vain.

This error was the more intolerable in the Galatians, because they were not Jews, (to whom happily something might be indulged, because of their education in the Law, and the high esteem of it) but Gentiles newly converted to the faith from their Paganism, and so had not the temptation to dote on the Jewish way, to which they were wholly strangers.

Now, what is the righteousness of the Law? or to be justified by the works of it? And what was the true and proper state of the Question between the Apostle and false teachers, will hereafter be more largely declared? In the mean time you may take notice, That among many other choice Arguments, this Text hath one against justification by the Law.

So that in the words you have the Proposition to be proved, and the Medium by which he argueth.

The Proposition hath these parts in it:

1. The Subject, with the note of universality in a negative way, No man. So that Abraham, David, and the holiest that are, are included in this Subject; in other places, it is no flesh, Rom.3. which is to shew the frailty and weakness of all, and that in every respect; for that phrase, All flesh is grasse, doth not only reach to our bodily infirmities and mortality, but even to all the righteousness we have; and therefore John Baptist is to cry this Doctrine above all, as being most preparatory to Christ and his righteousness: yea by David its said, None living is justified, which is so extensive, that some have thought it reached even to Angels themselves, that they are not justified absolutely by their own righteousness, but the context seemeth to restrain it to man.

2. There is the predicate or attribute [Justified] of which enough hath been spoken.

3. By what, or the cause of it, and that is by the Law. Law is taken sometimes largely for any Doctrine revealed by God, answering the Hebrew word Torah, in which sense
our Saviour often quoteeth it; or else more particularly for that preceptive part of the Scripture delivered by God unto the Jews, and is usually divided into the Moral, Ceremonial and Judicial Law. Now Law in the Text containeth all these kinds, and is not to be limited to the Ceremonial only, as some would have it.

Lastly, There is the person before whom this justification is to be supposed, and that in God's sight, implying, that though before men they may be justified, by walking very unblameably, yet not before God.

The second part is the Argument to confirm the Proposition, and that is drawn a repugnantibus, or contrariis; if we are justified by faith, then not by the Law; but we are justified by faith, as he proveth out of Habakkuk, The just shall live by faith. The strength of this Argument is to be considered in its time. The Observation is,

None are justified by the Law; or, None can attain unto a righteousness by the works of the Law in God's sight.

As we have already demonstrated, That none by nature have a righteousness to be justified by: So now we proceed higher, and shall evince, That none by the knowledge of, or obedience unto the Law of God, can be justified: For the Jew he easily thought the Heathen and uncircumcised person had nothing whereby to be accepted of by God; but for himself, he thought the Law, and the works thereof to be so glorious, that in and through them he expected reconciliation with God.

To discover this truth, which men of corrupt mindes have greatly clouded; consider these things,

First, That the Scripture useth several synonymous words or expressions, when it denieth justification by the Law. Sometimes the Scripture calleth the Law of works, Rom. 3. 27. oppositely to the Law of Faith, which is called a Law largely, for no more then doctrine: Now its called the Law of works, because it promiseth life and favour upon no other terms then working or doing; and then of works, not of one or some works, but collectively, all works that are commanded. Therefore the Apostle, immediately before in this Chapter.
whereby a man is justified.

Therefore the Apostle doth emphatically call such as seek for a Justification in this way ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀνθρώπου τιμής, They have nothing else to stand upon, they build only on this foundation, they took wholly to what they do; sometimes its expressed absolutely and simply, as here in the Text [By the Law] sometimes by the Law of Moses, Acts 13:39. Sometimes by the righteousness of the Law, Gal. 3:21. Sometimes the Law of righteousness, Rom. 9:31. The Jew is there reproved for following the way of righteousness, sometimes a man's own righteousness, Rom. 10:3. And the Apostle addeth, My own righteousness which is of the Law, Phil. 3:9. Sometimes its said works simply, not works of the Law, but works in the general, therby excluding all, Rom. 4:2. Tit. 3:5. It is therefore good to take notice of the several expressions God's word useth, when it denieth Justification by the Law, and the rather because every one of these expressions may obviate some subtil distinction or other that Justitiaries have brought in.

Therefore in the second place, that is a vain and empty distinction, which the Papists alluding Augustine for it, do maintain. They distinguish between justitia legis, and ex lege, or per legem. The righteousness of the Law, and a righteousness from or by the Law; Righteousness of the Law is that which the Law requireth and commandeth; Righteousness by the Law, is that which a man doth by the sole direction and command of the Law without any assistance and help of grace by Christ. By this distinction Bellarmine, Prierius, and others think to save all the Objections that are brought against their Justification by inherent righteousness. For whereas we urge those many Texts that do expressly deny Justification by the works of the Law, and wholly make it impossible for righteousness to come by it, then they immediately runne to this refuge of justitia legis, and ex lege. But this is a roof without any foundation; for every one may observe that the Apostle useth these expressions indifferently, διὰ οἵτινες ἐν νόμῳ, and ἐν ἡγεμονίᾳ νόμῳ, even as on the contrary διὰ οἵτινες ἐν θεσ, ἐν τῇ αὐτον, διὰ της, so that as it would be an absurd thing to make a distinction of justitia fidei,
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dei, and ex fide, or per fide, a righteousness of faith, and from, or by faith, no less ridiculous is it to coin such a difference about the Law. Indeed we grant, That the Law hath a righteousness it requireth, and that all believers are subjected to it as a rule; yea its impossible but that they should be under the directive and preceptive power of it: God himself cannot dispense with, or disoblige a creature from loving him with all his heart and soul; yet this righteousness in the perfection of it cannot be attained unto in this life, and therefore is not to be looked upon within the circle of Jusification. And certainly to evade such pregnant places of Scripture with such a brittle and aerial distinction as this, as to think cobwebs-harness good enough to save against a Cannon-bullet.

But because great thoughts of heart, and that of the most learned, are in this point, Let us particularly consider, how and in what sense Jusification is denied to the works of the Law.

And

First, There is a grosse and corrupt interpretation of Socinianizing spirits, That the Law did only require a carnal, external righteousness, and to this was promised only a temporal and external reward, To this sense Grotius upon the Text, who therefore makes the Law not able to give life, because that was only converfant in an external righteousness, and terrene promises; and thus many have looked upon all the Jews in the Old Testament, as so many Swine feeding on husks, and not at all acquainted with, or delighting in the pearl of Christ. So that by these Doctors, the Law and Christ, works and faith, shall be thus opposed; that in the Old Testament, all things were visible and carnal, both duties and promises, no faith in Christ, no expectation of heaven; but now under the Gospel, All things are become new, the duties more spiritual, and the glory expected eternal. But the Apostle instanceth in Abraham and David for the pattern of our Jusification, and makes their Salvation to be by Christ, as well as those that have lived since his coming, hence all their Sacrifices did lead to Christ, and their general expectation was of a Messiah, though generally they had earthly and carnal
nal thoughts about him, *And Christ was even the end of the Law to him that believed.* This interpretation therefore may without much difficulty be exploded.

Secondly, *There are those, who say, the works of the Law, to which Justification is denied, is only of the Ceremonial Law.* And this hath had many Abettors, as if the Apostle all along in this dispute had argued only against those that pleaded for a necessity to retain all the Ceremonial Worship, that unless they were circumcised, and observed days, and were constant in their Sacrifices, they could not be justified; and truly its no doubt but this is part of that error which the Apostle doth so vehemently dispute against, and for which cause he calls them beggarly elements, Gal. 4:9. *Elements (faith Cameron) because the false Teachers in their account judged them the necessary principles and foundation of Religion, as if no spiritual building could be reared, unless these were first laid, but yet beggarly, because they had no worth or dignity in them in respect of Justification.* And it must also be granted, that as appeareth by Acts 15. the controversy began at first about this point meerly, viz. the necessity of retaining Circumcision, with other legal Rites; and because the necessity of them was pleaded to Justification, Therefore in the Protract of the dispute, it brought in also all works, as well as these, even such as the Moral Law commanded. So that the Apostle pleadeth a Justification in Christ only, or a righteousness of faith against all works of the Law, yea all works absolutely considered, and that it is not to be limited to the Ceremonial Law, or works thereof, appeareth

1. Because the Law, whose righteousness is excluded, is that which pronounceth a curse to all that continueth not therein, Gal. 3:10. Now this doth more properly belong unto the Moral Law, as the Apostle James urgeth, Chap 3. *He that breaketh one is guilty of all.*

Again, The righteousness of the Law, which is constantly opposed to the righteousness of faith, is that which consists in *Do this, Rom. 10. 5. Do this and live.*
Now this also doth immediately belong to the Moral Law.

Further, That Law is denied in Justification, and the works of it, by which we come to know sinne, and are convinced of it; but that is chiefly and properly the Moral Law. This Argument the Apostle expressly useth, Rom. 3. 20. *Noe is justified by the works of the Law, and this is made the reason, Because by the Law is the knowledge of sinne.* Yea Rom. 7. by the Law sinne is said to abound, and to cause more corruptions in a man. That therefore which accidentally procureth more sinne, and so more guilt, and matter of condemnation, that cannot be a Justification to us: Now this also is the work of the Moral Law.

Again, That Law and its works is disputed against, which yet is not to be made void, is to be established; for the Apostle in all his Objections against the righteousness by it, doth yet still preserve the dignity of the Law that he doth not make it void. Now its plain, that its true onely of the Moral Law, for the works of the Ceremonial Law, to be Circumcised, to offer Sacrifices, &c. are not now to be done by us, because Christ the body is come; The blossoms fall, when the bud and fruit it self cometh; And therefore, though the same God, who said, Thou shalt not kill, said also, Thou shalt circumcise, Thou shalt Sacrifice, yet the commands of the former sort which are Moral, stand; but these of the latter which are Ceremonial, they are abolished. Thus you see not onely a pretended righteousness, by observing the Ceremonial Law, but also by obedience to the Moral Law is shut out from Justification.

Thirdly, Others therefore they are convinced, That the works of the Moral Law are excluded from Justification, but then such onely as are done by the power of nature, and strength of free-will; As if the zeal of the Apostle were carried out only against such as should hold, that for the goodness of those works they did without the power and help of grace, they were justified: And thus the Papists generally, *The works (say they) excluded and disputed*
whereby a man is justified.

Buted against are such as men without the grace of Christ, being acted by their own strength solely do perform. In this Assertion they greatly triumph, thinking it no lesser than blasphemy, to deny Justification to those works that are done by the grace of God; but also, this is more particularly to be spoken to in that distinct Head, That we are not justified by works of grace under any notion or respect whatsoever; yet something must be said at present to pull this beam out of their eye.

And first, Those works the Gentiles and Heathens did before their knowledge and faith in Christ, could not properly be said to be the works of the Law, or to have a righteousness of the Law. Now the Apostle proveth, That the Galatians and Romans, they were not justified by the works of the Law, who yet were formerly sinners of the Gentiles, as the Apostle expresseth it. Therefore the Apostle's Argument, though it may reach the Jew, yet it would not the Gentile; for how could the Gentile think, that the works of the Law which he knew not, or heard not of, could justify him? Therefore Romans 2. 12: the Apostle distinguisheth of two sorts of men, the Jew and the Gentile; The Jew he calls one in the Law, the Gentile one without the Law. If then the Gentile be one without the Law, and so without the righteousness of it, it cannot be imagined, that the Apostle should so industriously prove, That they were not justified by the Law, or the works of it.

Secondly, We grant indeed, That none can be justified by the works he doth without the grace of Christ; but the Question is, Whether the Apostle meaneth no more? Whether these are all the works that he excludeth from Justification? And we blame this Interpretation, though having some truth in it, at least in reference to the Jew, as greatly defective in respect of the Apostles main scope. By the works of the Law cannot only be meant works done by the power of nature, without the grace of Christ, because the Apostle excludeth the works of such as were believers; Therefore its all kinde of works, as works.
works. This appeareth in Abraham, who is said to be justified by believing, oppositely to working; it's not spoken of Abraham before his Call, and while living in Idolatry, but a long time after his knowledge of God. If then Abraham's works be shut out, when and while a believer, yea a friend of God, How much more must the works of those, who are in an inferior rank? But of this more hereafter.

We shall instance in these Galatians, who are reproved for countenancing and abetting of this error; They were not Infidels or Pagans, they had received the Gospel, they had received the Spirit, and had suffered many things for the Gospel; yet the Apostle tells them, That they must not seek to be justified by the works they yet do; The Apostle argueth an impossibility of righteousness by the Law, not meerly respectively to what they were once, but at any time, even since their conversion, as well as before their conversion. This is fully evinced by the Argument brought in the Text, *No man can be justified by the works of the Law; Why? Because The just shall live by faith:* So then, even the just man, he who is righteous, liveth not by works, but by faith. This Argument had no consequence at all in it, if so be the controversy were understood of men working onely by natural power; for what is the just man's living by faith to a natural man acting in his meer naturals? Whereas if we say, The Apostle excludeth all works, either of unregenerate or regenerate, then this is a very powerfull Argument, because the just man as long as he is in this world, must live by faith, and that in the matter of Justification, as well as in other things.

A man in the progress of Justification is justified still by faith, as well as at first: Hence this Text is again urged for continuance in Justification, as well as the entrance thereunto, Romans 1.17. where in the Gospel the righteousness of God is said to be revealed from faith to faith.

Fourthly, The Apostle doth not exclude the works of the Law.
Law only done by nature; because this would necessarily infer such an opinion to be held by the Galatians, that would be wholly irrational, if not impossible; for these Galatians did receive the Gospel, and believe in Christ; they did expect justification and salvation by these; Therefore the Apostle reminds them of that great joy they once took in this doctrine of the Gospel, Gal. 4:15. Where is the blessedness you once spake of? They called it a blessed Gospel, and they were blessed tidings of peace, but their zeal and fervency did abate, since they added their works to Christ. None are ever able with a raised pitch of soul to delight in Christ, that give the least iota or little unto works more than the Scripture requireth; Seeing therefore the Galatians did not raze the foundation, or wholly reject Christ, who can think that their opinion was, they could be justified by works done without him? For why did they believe in Christ still? Why did they retain and hold the Gospel for all this corrupt addition, but because they looked for justification by Christ in part at least? Could they think they were justified without Christ, and then come to Christ to be justified? So that its to conceive an irrational, if not an impossible error, That they who did believe in Christ for justification at least in part, yet should at the same time think they were or might be justified by works done without Christ. And it may be said, The Apostles Arguments to the contrary were very weak, if they did not hold this, for thus he argueth, If justification be by the works of the Law, then Christ died in vain, then you are fallen from grace, then Christ profiteth nothing; for how would this follow, if works of grace were excluded? for works of grace did suppose Christ's death, do necessarily include grace and advantage by Christ; whereas works done solely by natural strength, did necessarily exclude Christ and grace. This (I confess) hath some specious colour; but yet the Answer is, That such consequents of the Apostle are very strong, for even those that joyn works of grace and Christ, works of the Law, and the faith of the Gospel, do ex natura rei, shut Christ out of all; and although they may with their mouths and pens professe Christ and his grace,
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grace, yet really they deny both. The Galatians indeed did not think or intend to fall from Christ, yet in the nature of the thing, without repentance or recovery, they did fall from him, and deny him; for not to give Christ all that is due to him, to put him off with half is to make him no Christ at all. So that by this we see, its a very high sinne, (wherein the zeal of an holy Apostle, otherwise very meek and compassionate) burneth as hot as fire, to put confidence in the works we do, though they be supposed works of grace we do. The Apostle said, If he should give his body to be burnt, and have not charity, it would profit him nothing; but if thou shouldst give thy body to be burnt, and have charity, and that in a great measure, yet if thou put any trust in this, thou deniest Christ, and maketh him to die in vain. Indeed there are men who cannot be guilty of this sinne, for none ever thought to be justified by the works of sinne, and the devil: But there are others again attending to the works of righteousness, and they may quickly swallow down this poison: Therefore let them take heed of establishing to themselves a false righteousness, a Dagon that can never stand before God.
Ser. XXII.

That Justification cannot be attained by the Works of the Law.

Gal. 3. 11.

But that no man is Justified by the Law in the sight of God, it is evident: For the Just shall live by Faith.

We have hitherto shewed what Exposition is made of the Works of the Law, and whether in whole or in part such interpretations are to be rejected: and what other senses are given in this matter, may be reduced to one of those heads. As that of Castelio, De Justif. p. 27. when he saith, He dare boldly make this distinction between the righteousness of the Law, and that of faith; The righteousness of the Law is an external obedience coming from a servile fear; The righteousness of faith a virtue of the mind contrary to vice, which God gives freely to those that believe, pardoning their by-past sins.

Let us therefore consider in the next place, why Justification cannot be by the Law, or righteousness attained by the Works of it. And

First, Because the righteousness of the Law requireth an universal perfection in the subject who is thereby justified. Rom. 10. The righteousness thereof is in Do this and live. Do this yea this, and this, and all in every iota or tittle, or else there

Rea.ons why the works of the Law cannot justify.
is no life. Therefore such a Justification as this was only possible to Adam while he continued in his integrity. Christ (say some) was justified in this manner by the works he did, and then the Angels they were justified by their faithfull continuance in obedience to God. Now then, if there be not one man to be found since Adam's fall, that can plead righteousness by a [Dassius] then he must seek for Justification some other way. This is so evident, that howsoever Papists generally go another way, yet Cajetan Comment. in 3. ad Rom. maketh this difference between the righteousness of God, and the righteousness of the Law. The righteousness of God (faith he to this effect) is that whereby a man is absolutely accounted of as just, both in respect of what is past, as also what is present and to come. The righteousness of the Law is that whereby a man for the present and to come, is accepted of as just, but for the sinnes past that cannot give a righteousness. There is some truth in this; for suppose that there were such an infusion of righteousness into us, that thereby we are enabled to keep the Law of God perfectly, yet how shall we do for a righteousness for our by-past ways, before this infusion was? Cajetan therefore in this respect faith right, That the righteousness of God, which is the same with the righteousness of faith and the Gospel, is that whereby we are looked upon as just before God, in respect of our former conversation. But this can never be by the Law, for that requireth a perfection from the first to the last. To have once sinned, and but once, though a man could be immediately restored unto integrity again, is to make the righteousness of the Law impossible to us; So that righteousness by the Law, though once possible, yet to us accidently by our corruption is impossible; and therefore in this life, while we have the reliques of corruption, we are to cry out: Oh miserable, naked and poor creatures, as we are! Who will help us to a righteousness to cover our nakedness?

Secondly, Justification cannot be by the Law, because the Scripture makes Justification by faith and the Law two immediate contraries. If we are justified by faith, we cannot be by the Law; The East and the West may be as soon brought together,
whereby a man is justified.

as these two kindes of Justifications. This Argument is pressed by the Apostle in my Text, and the verse following, The Law is not of faith; and Rom. 10. The righteousnesse of the Law, and the righteousnesse of faith are made two immediate opposites. The Scripture then always speaking of these two, as diametrically opposite, it must necessarily follow between the Law and faith, as Christ said of God and Mammon, You cannot serve God and Mammon; so neither can you have the righteousnesse of the Law and faith together; you may as well serve two contrary Masters, as enjoy these two contrary righteousnesse. Therefore the endeavours of such who would make a righteousnesse compounded of the Law and faith, is as vain as those who would build Jericho again; and indeed the very nature of them is as immediately contrary as light and darkness, and as inconsistent as the Arctic and Antarctic Pole, for the righteousnesse of faith supposeth me altogether miserable, wretched in sinne, and naked in my self; The righteousnesse of the Law supposeth perfection and all fulness in me; Now how can a man be both these at the same time?

Thirdly, Righteousnesse cannot come by the Law, because that curseth every man by nature, and so is a minister of wrath and condemnation. This Argument the Apostle urged in the verse before my Text, As many as are of the works of the Law, are under a curse: Why? Because it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the Book of the Law to do them. We may then as well expect water from the fire, and sweetness out of gall, as righteousness by the Law; he that runneth to this as a refuge, when Gods anger pursueth him, doth as the man the Prophet speaks of that leaped on the wall, and the Serpent bit him. Alas, when Conscience and Justice shall arraign thee, wilt thou plead the Law? That will heap up thy wrath more, that will add more stings to thy guilt. Its observable that Deut. 27.26. when this was pronounced, Cursed is he that continueth not in all the words of the Law to do them, the people were to say, Amen: what was this but to raise the curse against themselves, onely hereby they were taught to go out of themselves, and to renounce all that right-
righteousness they gloried in, and to seek to him in whom all the promises are Amen, because in the Law all the curses are Amen.

Fourthly, Righteousness cannot come by the Law, because we are justified by an imputed righteousness, whereas the Law requires a personal inherent righteousness. This seemeth to be very cogent; for whereas with Popish Writers, the righteousness of the Law and of the Gospel differ only secondum magis and minus, as an Acorn and an Oak, a child and a man, the one imperfect, the other more perfect; its evident by Scripture that these two righteousnesses differ specie, and so cannot by any addition ever be made the same; yea the more perfect and compleat our righteousness personal and inherent would be, the lesse imputed it would be, and so be the farther off from a Gospel-righteousness. Now that our righteousness is an imputed righteousness, appeareth by the frequent affirmation of it by Paul, and that in one Chapter, Rom 4; and hence also the same Apostle would be found in Christ, not having his own righteousness which is of the Law, Phil. 3. Yea 2 Cor. 5.21. we are said to be made the righteousness of God in him. If then Christ be our righteousnesses, if his obedience be reckoned as ours, then this is as far distant from a legal righteousness as heaven from earth: But of this more in its due time, because this imputed righteousness is the great thing controverted.

Fifthly, If the righteousness of the Law justifyeth, then Christ died in vain, then grace is abolished, then Christ is become of no effect unto a believer. These are consequences the Apostle himself makes; and although a Galatian might have replied, The consequence is denied, for we believe in Christ, we hold him also necessary to Justification, and faith in him, as well as the works of the Law, yet would not this have satisfied Paul, because if Christ be not wholly received for Justification, he is not received at all: Christ was not made part of righteousness unto us, but righteousness in the whole. And indeed it must needs be a great debasing of Christ, to make his death and sufferings a co-partner only with our works, that Christ with us should make up a compleat Saviour. This is so gross
an absurdity, that learned Protestants, affirming the Pope to
be Antichrist, when assaulted with this Objection, That they
believe Christ to be come in the flesh; They believe Christ to
be God and man; Its answered, Because they deny Christ in
his Offices, especially in this matter of Justification by him,
joyning works with him, that therefore they may be properly
said to deny him. Furthermore upon this account, Christ
would have died in vain, if righteousness could come by the
Law, for to what purpose did Christ bring a righteousness, if
the Law had brought it before? Yea, if this were so, then
the contrary to what the Apostle affirmeth, it would prove
true, viz. That the Law did invalidate and disanull the Co-
venient of Grace. Look not then upon this error as meer
hay or stubble: No, it cometh too near razing the foundati-
on it self: For although some learned men in this point have
laboured, if not to reconcile Protestants and Papists, yet to
make it doubtfull, Whether the Church of Rome hold a fun-
damental error? (Hooker Eccles. Polit. in Treat. of just.)
yet if we consider the Apostles zeal, and his Arguments
which he useth against the Galatians, who yet did believe in
Christ; The Wenne seemeth so big that the breasts of chari-
ty cannot cover it, yea that its a Cancer rather which eateth
up the life of Christianity.

Sixthly, If righteousness could come by the Law, then it
would by one of these three ways, either because we are able per-
fectly to fulfill the Law, by a personal righteousness, or because
the Law condescends from its perfect exactnesse, and requireth
no more then we can do; or though we cannot perfectly obey the
Law, yet God will account of, and accept this imperfect obedi-
ence, as if it were perfect. But neither of these three ways
can righteousness be communicated unto us; not from the
first, for he onely fulfillleth the Law that is always without
sinne, that never committed the least iniquity. Now the A-
postle John faith, 1 John 1.10. If we say we have no sinne, we
make God a liar, and there is no truth in us. The Papist there-
fore makes God and his Apostle John a liar in this particular.
The Law requireth a total perfection, a gradual perfection,
and this continually, a perfection subjective, objective and


adjunctive,
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adjunctivè, that Do this and live, is a thunderbolt to strike
down every man; None is able to stand before it, For in ma-
y things we offend all, and what we do comes not up to the
perfection of the rule, and whatsoever is minus quam esse de-
bet, ex vitio est, as Augustine. They must therefore have low
thoughts of the Law's perfection, who have such high thoughts
of their own graces.

2. It cannot be that the Law abateth of its exactness, and
commensurateth it self to our power, for thus many say, The
Law is not such an hard task-matter as many make it: Its not
such a strict immovable Rule, but like Paul, It becomes all things
to all men; it descends to the power and capacity of man, and is
no further obligable then mans power doth extend it self: But Paul, Rom. 7. doth acknowledge the spirituality and
holiness of the Law; The obliging power of that, even
then when he found nothing but evil present With him; and
David doth often commend the perfection of the Law, be-
cause it requireth what is every way necessary, not being
deficient in any thing: Now seeing its our duty to have what
Adam loft, and he losing such an admirable perfection, God
requireth this of us still; The debt is due, though we are
bankrupts and cannot pay it. Do not then bring down the
Law to thy power, but acknowledge thy duty by the Rule;
The Rule continueth a Rule, though thou art not able to
attain unto it. Indeed sometimes the godly are said to keep
the Commandments, and to walk unblameably therein, but
that is in respect of sincerity, and because of their study and
endeavour after perfection. Its true, the whole heart is
sometimes opposed to hypocrisy, and a double heart; but
when its joined with those Concomitants, to love God with
all the heart, all the soul, and all thy strength; This requireth
more then any man can do in this life: especially that the
Law obligeth beyond our power, is plain, because we still
have sinne in us, lusts and sinnefull motions, as the Apostle
complaineth Rom. 7. Now if these were not forbidden by the
Law, they could not be sins, for where there is no Law there is
not transgression.

Thirdly and lastly, What is imperfect God doth not own as
perfect.
whereby a man is justified.

This is an evasion which some later Writers much applaud themselves in, they acknowledge. That we are not able to fulfill the Law, they confess we break it in many things; but then they add, God doth graciously through Christ forgive our imperfections, and accepteth of this, as if it were the fulfilling of the Law. Now indeed we grant, That the obedience of the godly, though very drossie, and accompanied with many imperfections, yet through Christ is accepted of, and God looks upon them as true and upright men, not hypocrites and prophane; but yet for all this, they are not accepted to Justification; We cannot say, That by these we are justified, for that were to make God to pronounce otherwise then the truth is; How can they be accounted Just by that which is not exactly Justice? Gods Judgement is always according to truth, and he doth not judge of things otherwise then they are. Now if God should account of these as satisfying the Law, and answering the perfection of it when they do not, it would suppose error or mistakes in God.

Thus you have heard, That righte us nasse cannot be obtained by the works of the Law, yet to what hath been delivered, its necessary to adde some Cautions; for even Paul when he preached this Doctrine was traduced by his enemies, and they inferred many false consequences, gathering thorns of the vine, and thistles of the fig tree.

First therefore, Though Justification be not by the righteousness of the Law, yet this is not to condemn it, to make it an uselesse thing, as if there was no wisdome or goodness of God seen in the manifestation of it. No such matter, We see the Apostle with great indignation rejects such inferences; yea Rom. 7. he giveth this commendation of the Law, That its holy and spiritual, laying the whole blame upon himself, He was carnal and sold under sinne; distinguish then between that which floweth from the Law per se, and of its own nature, and that which cometh from it by accident, and through our own corruption. Thus it is, The Law was at first given to Adam to Justifie him by the works there- of; It would have given life to him; This was the proper
and intended end of it; but upon mans rebellion, whole mankind is plunged into all sin, and so no more able to obey this Law, then blinde men see, or dead men walk. The Law therefore finding us such, is so farre from communicating a righteousness to us, that it aggravateth our sinne, making it out of measure sinfull, and filling us with wrath and guilt; it is we and not the Law that are to be condemned; Excellent food is not to be condemned, but the corrupted stomack that cannot digest, yea which increaseth its disease by it.

Secondly, This is not so to be understood, as if the Law were wholly abrogated, and of no use to us. It continueth as a Rule, though not as a Covenant by which we are to be justified. Thus the Apostle denieth that he makes void the Law, Rom. 3. 13. ye we establish the Law; Therefore the Apostle, even when he so vehemently argueth against Justification by the Law, doth yet press the duty of the Law. Its one thing to love God, to delight in him, to walk in his Commandments, and another thing to expect Justification by them: This is to mingle heaven and earth, when we confound Justification and Sanctification: So that the works of the Law may be considered two ways, either in respect of the Command or Direction of the Law to which we are enabled by the Spirit of God sanctifying us; and in this sense we preach the Law, we command the works of the Law, and desire God would write his Law in your inward parts.

But then the works of the Law may be secondly considered as the Conditions of our Justification, and whosoever looketh on them thus, he rejects Christ and his grace. This is a dangerous error, when we do the works of the Law for this end, when we love God, endeavor to keep his Commandments, that thereby God may pronounce us righteous.

Hence in the third place, we must distinguish between the works of that righteousness which the Law requireth, and the righteousness of works. All the people of God make it their business to abound in the works of righteousness. The Scripture commands and encourageth thereunto, but then it
it doth as much condemn a righteousness of works. We have a remarkable expression, Deut. 6. 25. *It shall be our righteousness, if we observe to do all that God commandeth us;* our righteousness, not our righteousness to justify us, but a qualitative righteousness to denominate us so inherently, according to that, *He that doth righteousness is righteous,* 1 John 3. 7. Let not then this Doctrine discourage from that righteousness of life the Law requireth; Say not, What have we to do with the Law and Sanctification? For although it be not appointed to justify, yet it is commanded as the way we should walk in; yet the Law is not only a directive Rule, but accidentally a School-master to bring to Christ; For when by that we are convinced of sinne, and have nothing, but despair in our selves, this driveth us out to Christ, and though it cannot be our *Do this and live,* yet Christ's *Do this procureth eternal life;* Though we are not justified by our works, yet we are by Christ's, and whatsoever the Scripture denieth to us it attributeth to him.

Fourthly, *It cannot be denied but that it is a very hard thing to press the Law as a Rule of righteousness, and not to have it looked upon as a Covenant by which we are made righteous. Why should we be bound to follow holiness, and yet not for this to be justified before God?* Hence this confidence in the works we do hath been a sinne of old in the Church. The Prophets did most zealously rebuke it, and we see in the beginning of the Christian Church, what entertainment it had both doctrinally and practically. Now what was formerly done in reference to the commands of the Law, is still generally with us respectively to Gospel-duties: Are there not hundreds to one Christian that fiducially rest upon their Christian performances, that look not to Christ's righteousness in their duties? Now to such we may say, You who seek to be justified by the duties of the Gospel, you fall from grace, and Christ is become of no effect unto you. This sin is like a moth secretly consuming many thousand without any noise. If the Apostle charge some not to trust in uncertain riches, but in the living God; How much more not to put confidence in thy works but in Christ, for this spiritual con-
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Faith in works for justification, is greater idolatry then trusting in wealth, because hereby we rest on them for that which is more directly and immediately God's work, for God only forgiveth sin, and justifieth a man at his Tribunal; and truly, why should there be such voluminous disputations for that righteousness to justify, when the greatest patrons thereof at the close finde a misgiving of their hearts? as Bellarmine known Tullissimum est, and Suarez (Disput.de orat.) adviseth him that prayeth, not to think of, or mention his merits in prayer, ob periculum superbia for fear of pride; what is this but to provide a potion for the diseased, and then to prohibit the taking it for fear of killing him?

Use of Instruction. How blessed a thing it is to be directed in this point of justification, to be assured what is that righteousness God will own; Satan hath alwayes by his instruments endeavoured to take away the live childe, and put a dead one in the room. Let that be thought a matter of great moment, in which the Apostle sheweth so much zeal. As the Psalmist said, Some put their trust in chariots, and some in horses, but we will in the name of God; So let us, some put confidence in the Law, some in their duties, some in good works, some in faith, some in both, but we will trust in Christ, who is the Lord our righteousness; Every thing in the Temple was to be covered with gold, and thus we are to put on the Lord Jesus Christ, that nothing of our nakednesse may appear, but Christ may be all in all; live not, die not, but in this covering.
Serm. XXIII.

That the Works of a Godly man done gratiously, are not the Condition or a Caule fine quanon of his Justification.

1 Cor. 4. 4.

For I know nothing by myself, yet am I not hereby Justified.

At the close of the precedent Chapter, the Apostle seem'd to depreffe the Office of Christ's Ministry in the Church too much, making Apostles and Officers to be servants to the Church, and wholly in reference to it. Left therefore this should puff up private believers, and make them undervalue or contemn their Officers, he giveth necessary counsel, ver. 1. in this matter: for when the Authority of Church-Officers is despised, then confusion and licentiousness breaks forth. [Let a man] that is, every man (an Hebraism) of what rank or dignity soever, though of never such abilities and graces, Account, 200126w, that is to account upon an exact and judicious comparing of things together. There ought to be a serious and well-grounded esteem of them.

Then there is the cause or ground of this account, and that is described in such properties that denote the Ministers dignity, and yet his duty; his duty in that they are servants, Ministers, the word doth not signify every kind of service, but that which is most toilsom and laborious, a Metaphor taken from
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from those that row in a boat, so great a care is required in them to bring the ship of Christ safe to the haven; They are also omn quo Stewards, not Lords or Masters, nor called to idleness and vanity in the world. Thus all the names given to Christ's Officers they are names of labour more then honour, yet in the second place, There is their dignity also, Ministers of Christ, and Stewards of the mysteries of God; What can be more sublime and glorious then this, to be workers with God for men's salvation!

Having thus declared what men ought to esteem of the Ministers of God, he thereupon sheweth how little he is moved with the thoughts men had of him. Mans judgment is called in the Greek, his day, as among the Latins diem dice: Though Hierom thought this a phrase peculiar to the Cilicians, yet the learned shew that it is an Hebraism. Now the Apostle doth the rather slight mens judgements, because he had a good conscience in the discharge of his Office.

So that in the words you have Paul's Justification of himself, as to men, and his disclaim of any Justification thereby, as to God. His Justification before men, is in these words, I know nothing by myself; which is not universally to be understood, as if he knew no sinne at all in himself; for Rom. 7. he makes sad complaints of corruptions working in him, but he speaks it quoad hoc, in respect of his Ministry he had not been an unfaithfull Steward of Divine Mysteries, he was not guilty of any crimes that his adversaries could charge him with; and although he expresseth it negatively (he knew nothing by himself) yet that supposeth a positive and sincere course of his life, both in respect of his Ministry and other-ways. But left this should seem arrogancy and spiritual pride, he renounceth all Justification by the works he did, yet am I not hereby justified.

Grotius limits the sense too much, as if Justification doth denote only freedom from sinne; and in another place speaks superciliously (Proleg. in Epist. ad Rom.) as if none before him had hit right upon the Explication of the word in Paul's Epistle to the Romans. But in its time, I shall make good, That Justification is more then a bare remission of sin.
In the last place we have a reason given why Paul is not justified by what he did, because the Lord judgeth him, he who kneweth more sinfulness and corruption by man then the most Eagle-eyed Christian can discern, God is greater then our hearts, and so is acquainted with those errors and failings that the most tender-hearted Christian cannot take notice of.

This place doth not prove an uncertainty of Justification, as the Papists would inferre; for they grant, That Paul knew assuredly by revelation that he was a justified person, onely it strongly evinceth, That Paul, and so no man regenerate, is justified by any good works he doth in this life; and so where as many would evade the power of several places of Scripture, That only works of the Law, or such as are done by our own strength, are excluded: This place is stronger then Samson's new cords, it holds the adversaries so fast, that they know not how to wrest themselves loose.

That even the most holy and regenerate man is not justified by the works of grace which he doth.

This truth is the more diligently to be asserted, by how much the error that confronts it is more specious and refined, and maintained by such abettors, whose repute is not so easily cast off, as the former we spake of. And that we may keep to the proper point in hand, take notice,

First, That the Question is not, Whether we are justified by works, though flowing from grace as meritorious or efficient of Justification? This the Opinionists we have to deal with, do reject with indignation. To make works either merits or efficient causes of our Justification before God, they grant, is directly to oppose the Scriptures, yea they seem to be offended with the Orthodox, as giving too much to faith, because its made an instrument of our Justification, therefore they are to be acquitted at least from grosse Popery.

Secondly, Although to maintain faith and obedience to be the conditions, and a causa fin quam non of our Justification, be the professed and avowed doctrine of the Socinians, yet some of late have asserted the same doctrine, that yet abhorre Socinianism; for the Socinians deny Christ's Satisfaction, and his
Righteousness in fulfilling of the Law for us, and to make good works a condition of our Justification, not through and for Christ a Mediator, but from the meer grace of God (as they express it) who hath no such justice as to need a satisfaction by an atonement through Christ's blood. Though therefore these later sort of Writers assert the same thing with Socinians, yet upon different grounds.

Thirdly, Neither is the Question about the necessity of holiness and sanctification in those that are justified; Justified persons will abound in the fruits of holiness, that sweet fountain within will also bring forth sweet streams; This good tree will bear good fruit; onely the Question is, Upon what account these are required in justified persons? Whether in some causality or concurrence as faith is, onely not with such a degree of excellency? Whether good works be required as well as faith, so that we may say, Justifying Repentance, Justifying Law, as well as Justifying Faith? This is positively and vehemently affirmed by some, but certainly those Arguments and Reasons they bring are too weak to gain-say the torrent of Orthodox Divines. Its good to fail between Aminomianism on the one hand, and this error on the other hand; and while we profligate one error, not to runne into another extrem. This therefore I shall (God willing) undertake to prove, That good works are not Conditions, or a causa sine qua non of our Justification; and although the Abettors of this opinion do give faith the preheminence, and make it the principal condition, yet if they will rigidly stand to the Apostle James's his words, (which they say, they are much awed with) faith must be last principal, and works be that which giveth life to faith, that it may be enabled to justify; and thus indeed it is affirmed, That works make faith alive, as to the attainment of its end of Justification. But of this more when we shall shew the inconsistency of Authors with their own selves, in answering their great Objection taken from the Apostle James.

I proceed therefore to shew, That no godly man is justified by his works, or works though done graciously, yet are not the condition of a man's Justification, as faith is. And
First, I shall instance in the great pattern and example of our Justification, Abraham, from whom the Apostle concludes a Justification of all believers in the like manner he was. Now that Abraham was not justified by works, or his working, though a godly man, the Apostle, makes it his whole business to prove, Rom. 4. 3, 4, 5. This place is judged by the Orthodox to be very pregnant for Justification without works, even those of a regenerate or godly man; for Abraham, though a godly man, and the Father of the faithfull, yet even then when he was godly, was not justified by any works he did, but by faith. This place is the more to be insisted upon, because its the proper seat of Justification. The Apostle's scope is expressly to determine how a man is justified, and no learned Lawyer was ever more careful to put in many words in the Deeds that he makes, to exclude all cavils and shifts for the future, then was this divine Apostle diligent to shut out all erroneous glosses, in so much that we may despair of satisfying that man, who is not convinced from this example: For Bellarmin who useth not to be very ingenuous, doth acknowledge that this is gravis difficulitas, for Abraham's works are excluded while he was godly, and in the state of grace. Though this mountain be so strong, yet there are those who set their shoulders to heave it away. What the Papists answer, I shall not much matter; but what others more refined do bring in, is worthy consideration. The works (say they) that are excluded, are works of the Law; the Law requiring a perfect personal righteousness, cannot be fulfilled by any, only Christ satisfied this; and then that we might be partakers of this righteousness, faith and good works are required as the conditions, so that the works of the Law are excluded, not of the Gospel. But this cannot be a solid answer, because the Apostle speaketh generally of works in this description of Justification, though in other places he sometimes faith, the works of the Law, yet Abraham could not be instanced in for such works, and therefore the Apostle speaks universally of works, quâ works: Certainly, as they say, it's not fit for us to teach the Spirit of God what to say. So
this is good counsel in this particular. When we read that the holy Ghost speaks generally of all works, Who are we that we should limit it to some? The Apostle then nameth works, when he treateth on purpose, how we are justified and excluseth them; and this is the more cogent, if we consider the opposition between faith and works. The Apostle directly opposeth the believer and the work, which could never be if Gospel-works were not excluded; nay by this means there could be no contradiction at all, because faith itself, if considered in Justification as a condition only its respected as a work; How then could the Apostle make such an immediate contrariety between these two? By their interpretation, the believer should be opposed only to some kind of works and faith, not to all, but to some kind of works, which if so, the Apostle's Argument had then no necessary consequence.

Again, That works of all sort are excluded, is plain, if you consider the object of Justification, who it is that is here laid to be justified, and that is the ungodly. By the ungodly is one meant that hath not a sufficient and adequate holiness, so that Abraham, though regenerated, yet as to Justification, is ungodly, he cannot stand before God or endure, if all his imperfections are enquired after. Now certainly, he that fulfilled the conditions of Justification cannot be called ungodly, for he doth all that which is required: So that this is very considerable, that all those whom God justifieth, he justifieth them not for any thing they have of their own, or any conditions they have performed, but as such who are sinners in a strict examination, and so deserve condemnation, and therefore no works of grace are looked upon.

Lastly, That all works are excluded, is evident by the Apostle's allegation out of David, who makes mans blessedness to be in this, That God imputeth righteousness without works: Who can persuade himself that David excluded only works of the Law, when in his time, that Question which so perplexed the Christian Church in its infancy, was not started? So that the Apostle making this righteousness to be imputed, and that without works, doth counsel a man
whereby a man is justified.

to exclude all works whatsoever in this great point of Justification; and indeed it is at last confessed, That its faith only which makes the contract between God and the soul, That good works are not required to this initial consenting unto Christ, so as to make him ours, but in the progress. This is that in effect, which the Papists affirm in other words, That the first Justification is only by faith, but the second by good works.

Against this general exclusion of all works is opposed, 

vers. 4. where the Apostle faith, To him that worketh the reward is of debt; from whence they gather, That works only which are debts, are excluded: But if this be seriously thought on, it makes strongly against them; for the Apostle's Argument is à genere, if it be by works, its of debt. Therefore there are not works of debt, and works of no debt. This supposition would make the Apostle to argue insufficiently and weakly: If our works be of grace and imperfect, then to them the reward is reckoned of debt, though not so much as if they were fully perfect. Neither will it avail to say, That these Gospel-graces cannot be debt, because God's Spirit enableth us therunto: For if a man (as Parac, well urgeth) set two labourers on work, and to one he lends him tools to work, the other brings his own tools, at the close of the day both receive their wages for their labour, not of debt, though one had his tools given him.

The second Argument may be from the peculiar and express difference that the Scripture giveth between faith and other graces, in respect of Justification: So that faith and good works are not to be considered as concurrent in the same manner, though one primarily, the other secondarily; so that if faith when its said to justifie, doth it not as a condition, but in some other peculiar notion, which works are not capable of, then we are not justified by works as well as faith. Now its not lightly to be passed over, That the Scripture still useth a peculiar expression of Faith, which is incommunicable to other graces. Thus Rom. 3. 25. Remission of sinses is through faith in his blood, Rom. 4. 5. Faith is counted for Righteousness, Rom. 5. 1. Gal. 2. 16. and in many other
other places, still the expression is, Justified by faith; Christ dwells in the heart by faith, Ephel. 3. Believing is receiving of Christ, Joh. 1. Act. 10. 43. Remission of sins is received by faith, Act. 26. 18. Gal. 3. 14. The promise of the Spirit is received by faith: Insomuch that as Christ is the Serpent exalted, so faith is the eying of the Serpent, whereby we are healed: That as the meer looking upon the Serpent cured without any other medicinal helps and endeavours: Thus the meer believing on Christ doth justifie without other works co-operating therein.

From these expressions it is that our Orthodox Divines do say, That faith justifieth as its an instrument, laying hold on Christ, so that Christ received by faith is properly that which justifieth, not faith itself, or any dignity in it. This is the hand that receiveth the jewel, which doth enrich us. This Doctrine, though so generally received and avowed by all Protestant Writers, yet of late is rejected among other reasons, Because there cannot be any passive instrument. Now I much wonder that Bellarmine, Bezaus, and other subtil Jesuites that turned every stone to overthrow faith's instrumentality in Justification, should so farre forget their Logick and Metaphysicks, as not to pitch upon this Objection above all, that there cannot be any such thing as a passive instrument. Truly I think, when a man of godly affections broacheth an errour, which he taketh to be a truth, he himself is a passive instrument to bring others into errours. If we regard natural causes and moral, we may easily mention many passive instruments: In natural things the throat is a passive instrument of drinking. The Conduit-pipe of conveying water, and twenty such instances men may think of. In morality, taking that largely, there are many passive instruments, Nebuchadnessar and all wicked men are Gods passive instruments. The Serpent by which the Devil deceived Eve, was a passive instrument: and to come nearer to our purpose, Who can deny but that miraculous faith was a passive instrument in doing miracles, for the power of working miracles is infinite, and could not be communicated to a creature no more then the Creation of a world, only they by resting on Gods power,
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God wrought these wonderful things by them. But nothing doth so fully represent this, as the opinion of Aristotle and others following him; that intelligere is pati, and so videre, audire, are pati, to understand is to receive, and so to see and hear; the soul doth these by those faculties which are passive instruments therein; and therefore when Bellarmine would prove, That crede and apprehendere were actions and works; it's well answered, That to believe or to lay hold on Christ (The Greek word applied often to faith is ἔλαβεν) Though they be Grammatical actions, yet they are naturally passions, as intelligere, videre, are active verbs according to Grammar, but naturally and physically are passions: So that a man in believing is passive, that is, he receiveth Christ for his righteousness: But of a passive instrument more hereafter. Justification is not in giving something to God, but in receiving from him; we do not curiously litigate about the word instrument; by instrumentum we mean no more then medium, whereby the soul receiveth the Gospel-righteousness tendred unto it, and those peculiar expressions you heard the Scripture giveth to faith, can evince no lesse. If therefore faith justifieth upon a peculiar reason, That that grace only hath, viz. because it receiveth and applieth Christ our righteousness, then other graces and holy works, having no such capacity cannot justifieth. As the hand onely, not the eyes or the feet, are the instrument that take almes given to a poor man. This consideration made that learned man Mr Ball, say, How faith and works should be conjoined as concauses in Justification, is impossible to conceive. Treat. of the Cov.of Grace, p.70. And its a meer Sophism to say, That if by faith we receive Christ, and faith is the receiving of Christ, then we receive Christ by receiving; for its not the notion of faith, that is properly the instrument receiving, but faith as the habit putting it self into act. So that the meaning is, faith acting or laying hold upon Christ, is the instrument receiving him. Neither is this to give too much to faith, no more then in the faith of miracles, when Christ said to some, Thy faith hath made thee whole, that thereby our Saviour gave any dignity to faith, as if that were the cause of their health.
The third Argument is, If in the continuance and progress of our justification, we are justified after the same manner we were at first; then it's not by faith and works, but by faith only as distinct to works. The strength of this Argument lieth in this. Its granted, The first consent and willingness to receive Christ, is that which justifieth, and good works are required by cooperation thereunto, as opportunity serveth: So that (by the way) it must be confessed, That faith in some doth justifie them antecedently to good works, and that some may be so prevented, that their faith could not co-operate with their works; and how will this agree with that discourse they form out of the Apostle James, Chap. i. But that which I pursue by this Argument is, That in the same manner we were at first justified, we are always justified: But its granted, We are not at first justified by works: Therefore not afterwards. Now this truth, That we are justified at first, as afterwards, will appear by these two Texts of Scripture; Rom. i. 17. where the righteousness of God is said to be revealed from faith to faith. Not to mention the several descants of many upon this place. That which the most solid Interpreters pitch upon is, That in our justification we begin with faith, and go on in faith; its from faith and to faith, as parallel expressions from strength to strength, from glory to glory. Therefore the Apostles sense is, That in our justification we proceed not from faith to works, as these must hold, that make works the secondary condition of our justification, but from faith to faith; by faith we began, and by faith we continue. The second Text is, from the place formerly insisted on, Gal. iii. 11. where the Apostle proveth, A just man is not justified by the works of the Law, because he liveth by faith; If then in the progress of our justification we live by faith on Christ, then are we not justified by works, for why might it not be said as well according to the contrary opinion, That we are justified by works, because the just shall live by his works? But I think this would be very harsh to any tender ear. Neither will that crambe not bis, but decies coÉta avail, That works of the Law onely are excluded; for works of the Law may be so called, either quoad efficientiam, as if the Law could enable us to what is good,
or quoad normam, in respect of the regulative part of it, and thus all the works that regenerate men do, are works of the Law, if they do not murder, if they keep the Sabbath, if they take God for one God, and so put confidence in him. This is a work of the Law; and in this sense Paul said, He delighted in the Law of God in the inward man. And thus that Evangelical Righteousness they speak of, is legal in this sense, that is, its according to the rule of the Law: Consider therefore this seriously, take heed of beginning in faith, and ending in works; Do thou go on from faith to faith, not from believing to doing.

**Serm. XXIV.**

**More Arguments to prove the former Position.**

**I Cor. 4.4.**

*For I know nothing by myself, yet am I not hereby Justified.*

We proceed to a fourth Argument by which it is to be proved, That we are not justified by works as a condition, or a Causa sine quâ non, and thus it is pronounced,

*He that is justified by fulfilling a Condition, though he be thereunto enabled by Grace, yet he is just and righteous in himself. But all justified persons as to justification are not righteous in themselves, but in Christ their Surety and Mediator. I say, They are righteous as to Justification in their own persons, Gg 2 who*
who fulfill the Conditions of Justification. But the justified person in the Gospel-way, though he have a qualitative righteousness, whereby he is truly and inherently just, yet as to a righteousness of Justification, that is not his own, but another's; Even the righteousness of the Lord Christ received and made his by faith; Two particulars are comprised in this Argument, and both of them seem so evident, that they need not much proving.

1. That he which fulfils a Condition on which Justification depends, is righteous in himself; for seeing no more is required but this Condition, and that is supposed to be performed by the man that worketh; Therefore he must needs be righteous in himself; for though this righteousness be originally from Grace, yet it is subjectively a man's righteousness: So that we may call it a man's own righteousness, as Paul doth Phil. 3. and the works of righteousness which we do, Tit. 3.5. So that as the temporal mercies which are given of God to us, we call our own, our own health, our own wealth: Thus the holy graces which we act, though enabled to them by God's Spirit, and so efficiently are the fruits thereof, yet subjectively and formally, they are our own, our own faith, and our own repentance: So that if we fulfill these Conditions, we are righteous as to Justification by that which is our own and inherent in us: yea, I think, if it be well weighed, it will be found to be a contradiction, to say they are Conditions, and yet a Causa sine qua non, of our Justification: for a Causa sine qua non is no cause at all; but a Condition in a Covenant strictly taken, hath a moral efficiency, and is a Causa cum qua, not a Causa sine qua non. If Adam had stood in his integrity, though that confirmation would have been of grace, yet his works would have been a causal Condition of the blessedness promised. In the Covenant of Grace, though what man doth is by the gift of God, yet look upon the same gift as our duty, and as a Condition, which in our own persons is performed; This inferreth some moral efficiency, and so though in words they deny, yet indeed they do exalt works to some kind of Causality: And for a Causa sine qua non, though good works may be granted to be such in reference
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to Salvation, yet they cannot be so in respect of Justification, as in the next Argument will appear: For though it be granted, That Justification and an holy purpose to do good works are inseparably joyned together, yet every thing that is inseparably concomitant to another thing is not a Causa sine qua non. A man cannot be but in a place, in an ubi; yet to be in a place, or as they call it ubication; is not a Causa sine qua non, of a man. What hath been spoken may evince, That he which performeth a Condition to which any priviledge is annexed, though inabled by grace, performeth and fullfilleth that in himself, though not of himself.

The second particular is, That though a believer is just in himself with an inherent righteousness, yet as to Justification, he is righteous in another. I shall onely mention the Texts here, because they are to be improved, when we speak of imputed righteousness: That we are righteous in Christ is clear by that full place, notwithstanding all the violent wrestlings of it, 1 Cor. 5. 21. Christ was made sinne for us who knew no sinne, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him. We are made Righteousnesse, and the Righteousnesse of God, but in him: And Phil. 3. 9. Be found in him, not having my own righteousness. But Rom. 4. its made very clear, where all along the Chapter, the Apostle calls it an imputed righteousnesse, not that it is putative, or that it is not truly ours, only its not ours inherently, but accounted of by God, as if it were our own personal righteousness: We are not then justified, because we fulfill Gospel-conditions in our own persons, but because we are in Christ, who is made of God our righteousness.

A fifth Argument is that which so much sounds in all books, If good works be the effect and fruit of our Justification, then they cannot be Conditions, or Causa sine quâ non of our Justification. The Consequence is clear, because such a supposed Condition, or Causa sine quâ non, must be antecedent, and going before. Now the Orthodox bring Augustines known Position, which also may be made good out of Scripture, Bona opera non præcedunt Justificandum; sed sequuntur Justification; And another to that sense is quoted out of Gregory, Gg 3.
Non per opera venitur ad fidem, sed per fidem ad opera, faith must go before works; till we are justified, we are not able to do any thing that is good. The Apostle Tit. 1. 15. informs us fully what every man is till justified, they are unclean, and all that they do is unclean. The person must first be reconciled to God before his duties are accepted: God had first respect unto Abel, and then to his offering. Tit. 3. 5. Those that have believed must be careful to maintain good works. And Heb. 1. Without faith it is impossible to please God. Seeing therefore that Justification is antecedent to an holy life, good works cannot be any Condition of it; and by this we may see, That more things are required to our Salvation, then to our Justification; to the possession of heaven, and the entitling us thereunto; for Justification doth entitle and interest us in that eternal inheritance which is performed by faith; but to be made actual partakers of everlasting happiness, Good works are the way to that Kingdom, not the cause of it. Therefore none contend more then the Orthodox Writers for the necessity of good works, and that in respect of Salvation; yet in respect of our Justification, then the Scripture calls them a monstrous rag, and such as are utterly unworthy. Its true, That Justification cannot be continued in a man unleth he continue in good works, yet for all that they are not Conditions of his Justification, they are qualifications and determinations of the Subject who is justified, but no Conditions of his Justification. As in the generation of man, though there be organical dispositions and qualifications for the soul, yet they have no causality upon the soul, but that is immediately infused by God. Its a thousand times affirmed by our Divines, Many things are required to the constitution of some Subject, which yet are not either causes or conditions of such and such an effect: Light is necessarily required, and dryness, as qualities in fire, ye it burneth as its hot, not as light or dry. To the integral being of a man, are required his head and shoulders, so that the eye could not see, if not seated there, yet a mans shoulders are not the Causa sine qua non of his seeing. Many things are necessarily conjoined together, and yet one is not the Condition of the others effect.
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effect. So that this Doctrine doth not exclude, but command holy works, onely it giveth faith and works their proper place.

The sixth Argument. If justification be by works as a Condition, then one man is more or lesse justified then another, and those works are required to one mans justification Which are not to another, so that there shall not be two godly men in the world justified alike. For if faith justified as a work, then he who had a stronger faith would be more justified then he that hath a weaker: But even the weakest Christian, who by faith receiveth Christ, is justified as fully as the strongest Christian, because the righteousness of our justification doth not consist in the activity of our faith, but in the fulness of Christ received by it; so that as Christ is not a fuller Christ to one then to another, so neither is justification more in one then in another. The Protestant Writers speak no blasphemy, when they say, Mary Magdalen was as much justified before God, as the Virgin Mary; for as the same Sunne communicateths light to one as well as another, and is not exhausted, if there were more men in the world to make use of its light: So Christ is the same compleat treasure of all righteousness to his people, and is not exhausted by communicating himself to all: Insomuch that the weak Christian may comfort himself, saying, Though I have not so much grace, such fulness of holiness as another, yet I have as full a Saviour as a stronger hath.

Its true, one man may have more sense and perswasion of his justification then another, and as was formerly shewed, justification may be extensivelly in one more then another, but it cannot be essentivelly or intenivelly, which it must necessarily be if works be the Condition; for he that performeth the Condition, more or lesse, receiveth the priviledge promised more or lesse.

The seventh Argument. This Assertion according to the sense of the late Writers, (that are otherwise Orthodox, for I mean not of Socinians) will bring in a justification two ways, or make a two-fold justification, whereof one will be needless. For they grant, An imputation of Christ's righteousness in re-
For of the Law, he fulfilled that, and satisfied God's Justice, that the Law cannot accuse us. And besides this, They make an Evangelical personal justification, by our own Evangelical works. Now certainly this latter is wholly superfluous, for if Christ's righteousness be abundantly able to satisfy for all that righteousness which the Law requireth of us, What is the matter that it removeth not all our Evangelical failings, and supply that righteousness also? Surely this is to make the stars shine when the Sunne is in its full lustre. Thus it may be observed; while men for some seeming difficulty avoid the good known way of truth, they do commonly bring in Assertions of farre more difficulty to be received. In this case its farre more easie to maintain one single righteousness, viz. the obedience of our Lord Christ, then to make two, whereof one shall be imputed and legal, the other Personal and Evangelical. Thus the Socinians, while they pretend the Doctrine of the Trinity impossible to reason, and as that which doth transcend all humane faith: Do they not assert a thing as improbable to reason, That Christ should be a constituted God, and God command all such adoration, faith and obedience to be given to him, as belongs to God himself? We hold he is naturally a God; they say, he is a made God. Certainly this later is more incredible. Thus men that do not believe where they ought, commonly believe other things more incredible, and more then they ought.

8. Argum. 3. That cannot be a Condition of justification, which itself needeth justification; But good works being imperfect, and having much drosse cleaving, need a justification to take that guilt away. Its true, Justification is properly of persons, and of actions indirectly and obliquely, yet when the person is justified, then his actions are accepted of. Now then those things cannot be a Condition of acceptance, which themselves need acceptance: How can we conceive God forgiving sinne, and accounting us as righteous for those actions, which in themselves deserve eternal damnation? Its true, the holy actions of a righteous man, may be truly and properly called righteous and good, but because they are not exactly ade-
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guile to the rule of righteousness; Therefore it is that in God's severe judgement, they are damnable. This Question therefore is again and again to be propounded, if good works be the condition of our Justification, How comes the guilt in them that deserveth condemnation to be done away? Is there a further condition required to this condition, and so another to that, with a processus in infinitum? The Popish party and the Castellians are so farre convinced of this, that therefore they say, Our good works are perfect. And Castellio makes that prayer for pardon of sinne, not to belong to all the godly, but to be upon a supposition, if and when we do sinne, then we are to pray for pardon, as the command is To agree with our adversary, viz. if we have one; and Honour thy Father, viz. if we have a Father; so if we do sinne, then we must pray for the pardon of it; and for an holy life, he saith, Christ doth as perfectly sanctifie us, as he did heal the lame and blinde (De Justif. pag. 48) Now (faith he) if a man cured of his lameness, should yet by his unwary walking stumble at some root in the way, should he for this be called a lame man? And therefore in another place, pag. 46 he faith, Facilis est opinio, qua imperfectionem victimp esse statuit, he couplement of the Orthodox, as holding whatsoever is not perfect is a sinne. But we acknowledge a two-fold imperfection, negative or comparative. Thus an Angel, and man created in integrity is comparatively to God imperfect; This is not a sinne, because we are not bound to have the perfection of God. But then there is a privative imperfection, when there is not that degree of grace in us which ought to be, and this is a sinne, and for the pardon of such sinnes, we are constantly to pray, and because of this pollution adhering to our best actions it is, that Paul judgeth them dung and drose in reference to Justification, Phil. 3. 8. Neither can it be evaded, that Paul meaneth onely those actions and privileges which formerly he enjoyed, for the Apostle speaketh not onely in the past time I say, but in the 8th verse he saith higher to the present time, and I say, I say, for the doublet of I do count all things; If therefore the Apostle had not intended the present graces and privileges he enjoyed, his speech had
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had not risen higher, which yet he evidently intended; and in this line the Prophet Isaiah of old complained, Our righteousnesses are, as filthy rags, Isa. 64. 6. Isaiah speaks this in the person of the whole Church; and not relating only to the wicked and ungodly; therefore he useth the word all, and our righteousnesses, respecting that native corruption that cleaveth to everything we do; not only their unrighteousnesses, but their very righteousnesses were filthy rags. It's true, Calvin forsakes this place in his Comments, as not proving the imperfections of our holy duties; but generally the learned do urge this place, and it doth strongly seem to hold out that truth. And Daniel, Chap. 9. 18. speaks fully to this purpose, We present not our supplications before thee for our righteousnesses, but for thy great mercies. This likewise was visibly represented, Exod. 28. 38. where Aaron the High-Priest, a type of Christ, was to bear the iniquity of their holy things. Neither is that Argument, so greatly applauded by some, of any strength at all, viz. That if there be imperfection cleaving to every gracious act, then at the same time the soul doth will and nill; That is produceth one act, and a contrary act thereunto at the same time: for this imperfection is herein discovered, because the principles of grace do not act so vigorously and intently as they ought to do. Therefore being more remiss then God requireth, this defect is a sinne; so that there is not required a contrary volition to what we will in that instant, but it is an imperfect volition. Although we may adde, that the Apostle Paul, Rom. 7. and Gal. 5. 17. speaketh of a combate, and a contrary lust between the flesh and the Spirit, which whether it be instantaneous or successive (though such successive acts are imperceptible) is not here to be disputed.

Others would avoid this Objection, by saying, That Gospel-graces, which are the Conditions of the Covenant, are reducible to the Law, and so Christ in satisfying the Law doth remove the imperfections cleaving to them: And they judge it absurd to lay, That Christ hath satisfied for the sinnes of the second Covenant, or breaches thereof, which is said to be only final in belief.

But
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But this answer may be called Legion, for many errors and contradictions are in it. As

1. How can justifying faith quatuor in the act of justifying and repentance, be reducible duties to the Law taken strictly? Indeed as it was in a large sense discovered unto the Jews, being the Covenant of Grace, as I have elsewhere proved, (Vind. Legis) so it required justifying faith and repentance. But take it in the sense, as the Abettor of this opinion must do, justifying faith and repentance must be called the works of the Law. And then

2. If so, then the works of the Law are conditions of our Justification; and thus he runneth into the extremity he would avoid.

But above all, that is not to be endured, That Christ hath not suffered for the breaches of the new Covenant, and that there is no such breach, but final impenitency, for are the defects of our repentance, faith and love in Christ, other than the partial breaches of the Covenant of Grace, our unthankfulness, our unfruitfulness, yea sometimes with Peter our grievous revolts and apostasies? What are these but the sad shakings of our Covenant-interest, though they do not dissolve it? But it is not my purpose to fall on this, because of its impertinency to my matter in hand.

Argum. 9. If works be a Condition of our Justification, then must the godly soul be filled with perpetual doubts and troubles, whether it be a person justified or no. This doth not follow accidentally through man’s perverseness from the forenamed Doctrine, but the very genius of it tends hencunto; for if a Condition be not performed, then the mercy covenanted cannot be claimed: As in faith, If a man doth not believe, he cannot say, Christ with his benefits are his; Thus, if he have not works, the Condition is not performed, but still he continueth without this benefit. But for works, How shall I know, when I have the full number of them? whether is the condition of the species or individuals of works? Is not one kinde of work omitted when it is my duty enough to invalidate my Justification? Will it not be as dangerous to omit that one, as all, seeing that one is required as a Condition, on?
on? If it be said, That by good works is meant only a purpose and resolvedness to do them when occasion is offered; this is to forsake the rate of the Question, and the Apostle James, who doth industriously prove, That they are works exercised and practised that do justify.

The last Argument is, That if good works be a Condition of justification, then none are justified till their death; because every good work is required perseverance, in so much that perseverance is that to which the promise is made, Mat. 24.6. He that endureth to the end shall be saved, Heb. 10.38. If any man draw back, his soul shall have no pleasure in him. Thus often Revel. 2:7, 26. To him that overcometh and keepeth my works to the end, &c. So that it is not good works simply, but persevered in, that are required, and therefore no justification till the end of our days, so that we cannot have any peace with God till then. Neither doth it avail to say, Justification is not compleat till then, for it cannot be at all till then, because the condition which gives life to all is not till then. Whether perseverance and good works are distinct, are nothing to this purpose. Its certain, Adams and the Angels graces were distinct from perseverance; but howsoever, if perseverance be works persevering, I cannot be justified till this condition be so performed.

Thus we have asserted this truth by many Arguments, and though any one singly by it self may not convince, yet all together may satisfy. Its now time to answer that great Objection, which seemeth so directly to oppose not only what we have said, but also what the Apostle Paul so plainly and professedly affirmeth; For whereas Paul faith, That Abraham was justified by faith without works; and Gal. 2:16. By faith, and not by works. Also, The Apostle James, Chap. 2. 23, 24. faith, Abraham was justified by works, and in the general, That a man is justified by works, and not by faith onely. So that in outward appearances these two great Apostles speak contradictions, which hath made some deny the Canonical Authority of James his Epistle: Yea one said blasphemously Althamei- rius, Mentiris (Jacob) in caput tuum. But this is to cut, not unty the knot. The Spirit of God which breathed in all the holy
holy Pen-men cannot dictate any contradictions.

Therefore that a reconciliation may be admitted, it is necessary that the Apostle James take the word Justification, and the word faith in another sense, then the Apostle Paul, and that their scopes in these expressions were upon different grounds. And hitherto the reformed Churches have generally agreed in this particular accord of these places.

1. That the scope of the Apostle Paul is to treat upon our Justification before God, and what is the instrument and means of obtaining it; and this he doth against those Jewish teachers, That we were justified by the works of the Law. But the Apostle James takes Justification for the declaration and manifestation of it before men, and useth the word faith for a vain title and empty profession of it, herein disputing against carnal Gospellers, who from the misunderstanding of Pauls Doctrine did cry down good works, and an holy life as needless, saying, This titular faith was enough; for Paul speaks of some in his days, that because he magnified grace so much, would therefore inferre, Let us sinne that grace may abound; Paul informeth us, That faith only justifieth, and James what kinde of faith it is, even a lively working faith; and certainly that this is James his intent, appeareth vers. 14. What doth his profit, though a man say he hath faith and no works? Is not this to confute such a man that gloried in the name and Profession of Christ, not at all aiming at a godly life? Abraham did not say, he believed, and had no works in this sense. The Apostles instance likewise concerning Charity, doth evidence this, If a man say to one in necessitie, Be warmed, and be clothed, but do nothing to relieve him, is this acceptable charity? I forbear more Arguments, because our late Writers are copious in it.

It is said, They dare not go against the plain words of the Apostle.

But first, Its not to reget, but dispute, not the words but the sense is to be required, otherwise the Anthropomorphites will be excused, and Lapide, who faith, If God at the last day ask him, Why he believed the bread to be turned into Christ body, he will bring that Text, Hoc est Corpus meum, and if he

Paul _& James reconciled._
be deceived, that God hath deceived him. Again, Why should they not be afraid to go from the Apostle Paul's words in this matter? Lastly, They are forced to add to the Apostle, for they say, to be justified in the condition of the case; which the Apostle doth not speak a word of.

SERM. XXV.

That Faith as it is a work, or the credents is not Imputed unto us for our Righteousness.

Rom. 4.23, 24.

Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him:
But for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead.

In the former part of this Chapter the Apostle had strenuously asserted the manner of our Justification from an instance of Abraham, which having at large pursued, left any should think that was Abraham's personal privilege, and did not at all belong to us, there seeming a great diversity between Abraham's faith and ours, at the 23d verse he applies this example to us also, shewing that Abraham, and all believers, all that walk in his steps are justified alike. And here we see a full overthrow of that Socinian Doctrine, That we and the godly in the Old Testament are not justified in the same way;
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way: If this were so, the Apostle's argument from Abraham to us would be nothing to the purpose.

In the words we have a two-fold use of God's imputation of Abraham's faith to righteousness. The former is for his own consolation and hope. The other is for us, who, though we have not so great a faith and strong as Abraham had, yet having the same object, viz. Christ, the promised seed, we may rejoice as well as he did. Take we therefore these words as they relate to us, we may consider,

1. The Benefit or Privilege spoken of, To whom it shall be imputed, Rom. 4:17. The true and proper use of the word is to be handled hereafter, because the full understanding of that is of great concernment; only for the present observe, the Apostle useth a future verb, to signify the continuation of this mercy in the Church, That as God did, so still he will justify those that shall believe, in the way he justified Abraham; The Benefit is, that their faith shall be imputed for righteousness: In what sense this is to be understood, we shall hear anon.

2. There is the Subject to whom this great privilege shall be made good, and that is to those that do believe: without this hand that heavenly treasure cannot be received. Its not those that work, but those that believe.

3. Here is the Description of this justifying faith from the true and specific Object of it. For though justifying faith doth believe the whole word of God, the Histories and the Threatnings, yet it doth not justify, but as it relates to God in Christ. This justifying faith therefore is described from the fiduciary nature of it. He that believeth &c. as its not used among Heathenish Authors; so in the Scripture it denoteth the recency and fiduciary respect that the soul hath in the object believed, though sometimes it be applied to such as did not firmly believe, John 2:21 its described from the object, which is God raising up Christ, who was delivered for our offences, and rose for our justification. This expression, faith James is brevis and longa, short, because in few words; but long, because it the summe of the Gospel. We see then, what is the object of faith
faith in its Justification, viz. Christ crucified, and raised by
the Father for the expiation of our sins, and Justification of
our persons; faith doth not justify as it is a work, or from
any intrinsical dignity in it, but from the object, which is the
Lord Christ, it layeth hold upon.

Whereas then we have formerly shewed, That our Justi-
fication is not by works that we do under any notion whatso-
ever, we now proceed to confute those, who make faith as
it is a work, or the real credit to be imputed unto us for our
righteousness.

That faith, not as it is a work, or for any dignity in it self,
but from the object Christ Jesus, doth only justify us.

This is necessary to be handled with much diligence, be-
cause some, though they exclude works, yet make faith to
justify as it is a work, and to be instead of all that legal righ-
teousness, which God required in the Covenant of works,
That faith should be in the Covenant of Grace, what works
would have been in the Covenant of works.

Before we come to the argumentative part, take notice of
some particulars:

First, That when faith is all along this Chapter, said to be
imputed for righteousness, thereby is meant Justicia personae not
facti, an universal righteousness of the person, not of the fact.
Some are very pertinacious in the exposition of it this later
way, and parallel it with that place, Psal. 106. 31. where
Phineas executed justice, and it was accounted to him for righ-
teousness, where all agree, that was a righteousness of the
fact; for being it might be doubted, whether he had any call
to it or no. God did approve it, and looked on it as a just
and righteous act. The like expressions we have Deut. 6. 25.
and Deut. 24. 13, in which places an universal righteousness
of the person, so as to be justified before God is not under-
stood. Now that in this Chapter we must necessarily inter-
pret the phrase thus, appeareth in that the Apostles scope all
along the Chapter is, to shew what is that whereby we are
justified before God, how we do become blessed, and have
our iniquities forgiven us; and if it were not so, we could
not be justified as Abraham was, for Abraham believing, as
it was a work cannot be put in practice by us, though our faith may be exercised upon the like objects his was. Neither can it be doubted, whether Abraham did well or no in believing, that therefore it should be accounted a righteous act, and free from any acculation of it. The righteousness then Paul speaks of is so universal, that thereby the person is justified in all points before God.

Secondly, That this phrase (Faith imputed to righteousness) may have several interpretations, for which there are many parties to strive. And

1. The Pontificians, they consider faith materially, as it is a bare and naked assent, not formed as yet by charity, and so (they say) faith doth justify dispositively. They make such a naked assent to be a disposition to our justification. Now although this Historical or Dogmatical assent be necessarily required to justification, yet this is no disposition to it, seeing even devils and hypocrites have it. Again, They consider faith as it is enformed by charity, and so they make it part of our inherent righteousness, and that by it we are formally justified, yea causally and meritoriously, as we are by any other good work. But this proceedeth upon a false supposition, that justification doth formally consist in that righteousness which is subjectively seated in us, as also from the perverting of the Apostles constant argumentation, from the position of faith to the exclusion of works.

2. There are others who expound it thus, We are justified by faith, that is, faith as it is a work, is accepted of by God for our justification, and these are divided into two sorts, first of Socinus, Servetus and others, who make the act of faith to constitute us just before God, (Lubber. contra Bertium, p. 27.) Not that this is done for the merits of Christ, or any satisfaction made to the Father; but these two things they affirm, first, That faith as a work justifieth. Secondly, That it is the meer grace and condescension of God to reckon this faith for our perfect righteousness. This they call Dei gratiosam acceptationem, accounting that which is lame and imperfect for perfect obedience, for they make faith to be informed by obedience, obedience to be forma fidei, of which afterwards.
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2. But there are a second sort, and these do pertinaciously assert the 
credere to be our righteousness, and that the phrase, Abraham believed, and it was imputed to him for righteousness, is to be understood properly without any Tiope at all. The ring-leader of this was Arminius (for I regard not Abairardus) who expressly faith, 
credere imputari in justitiam, id; proprio sensu non Metonymica, (Epift. ad Hippol.) and in other places, Faith is the object of divine imputation; faith as it is an act performed according to the command of the Gospel, is imputed before God for righteousness, and that of meer grace, seeing it is not the righteousness of the Law, and thus Bertius, Vorstius, with many others, as may be seen in Festus Homnium (Spec. Cont. p.82.) denying it to be considered as an instrument, but as a condition or duty in Justification. And to this purpose a late English Writer hath manifested himself, As God in the first Covenant of works required an absolute and perfect obedience to the whole Law for every mans justification; So (faith he) in the Covenant of Grace he requireth nothing of man, but only faith in his Sonne, which faith shall be as available unto him for his full justification; as a perfect righteousness should have been under the first Covenant. Thus you see what is the sense of these Authours, That faith as it is a duty required in the Covenant of Grace, is accepted of by God for all that whole righteousness which we were bound to have; only it may be wondered, why they should thus attribute it unto faith, seeing Vorstius, Bertius; and others, say, works are not excluded from Justification, viz. such works as flow from the sincere root of faith, and that the Apostle excludeth only works of the Law done by our own strength, and such as wherein a constant and perpetual observation of the Law doth consist; and therefore they say, that rule of Augustines. Good works do not precede but follow the person justified, is humanitas tradita, and never to be admitted, as being not a Scripture truth, unlese by Justification be meant conversion from sinnnes to righteousness. Therefore to reconcile this, they must certainly with the Socinians confound faith and repentance.

Lastly,
Lastly, there is a party that expounds this phrase [Abraham believed, and it was imputed to him for righteousness] not in a proper sense, but a figurative, either a Metonymy, or a Metalepsis; by faith is understood that thing, which faith apprehended and laid hold upon. Thus it's often said, faith justifieth organice, and relative, in respect of the object it receiveth. That as the hand receiveth the treasure which makes a man rich; so doth faith receive that Christ, who is made of God our righteousness. So that faith doth not justify from any dignity or worth it hath, no not for the work of apprehension or application of Christ, but meerly because of Christ. This is that Interpretation which we conceive to be the most orthodox, grounded upon Scripture, and consented unto generally by the Reformed Churches. Only I adde, should it be granted, that faith is understood properly, yet it will not thereby necessarily advantage the Authors we oppose, as is more to be shewed. Its true, with Arminius, Episcopius, and others, its matter of offence to say, faith justifieth as an instrument, but onely as a condition prescribed by the Evangelical Covenant; and I heartily with others had not swallowed this Camel.

Thirdly, when we speak of faith justifying or imputed to righteousness, you may take notice of these two things:

1. That faith hath its adequate and general object.
2. Its principal and specificall. The adequate and general object of faith is the whole word of God, consisting of Histories, Threatning, Commands, as well as Promises. True faith doth give him assent to all God's word, because Divine Authority and Revelation is the form of it. But then the principal and secondary object is the Promises, as the Objectum quo, but Christ in them as the Objectum quod; and faith justifieth not as it believeth the whole word of God, but as it rests on Christ. In the Text it is, on him that raised Christ from the dead, who was delivered for our sins: But because this is controverted, more may be said of it hereafter.
2. As faith hath a two-fold object, so it hath a two-fold effect. There are the effects of faith \textit{ad intra}, and the effects of it \textit{ad extra}. The effects of faith within, are as it respects Christ, and layeth hold on him, in which sense it is often said, to receive, as you formerly heard, and in this respect only it justifieth; and secondly, there are the effects of it \textit{ad extra}, as faith puts us upon the exercise of all holy duties, in which sense the Apostle speaks of it in \textit{Heb. 11}. It was their faith made them have an holy fear, and enabled them to self-denying passages of obedience, but we are not thus to look upon it as working, when we speak of our Justification.

Therefore in the fourth place, \textit{Take heed of confounding faith with obedience, as too many do, our Justification consists in receiving from God, not giving to him; and faith stretcheth out the hand to take, not to give.} There is a great deal of difference in these two expressions, or the sense of them, when you say of a poor lame beggar, his hands help, his hands relieve him, and when you speak of a labouring man, who works all the day long for his wages, for the hands of the later relieve him as they work, of the former as they receive: Thus our faith makes us partakers of this excellent priviledge, because it receiveth Christ into the heart; whereas if we look upon faith, as obedience, we are taken off from Christ, and look to our selves; and although it may be granted, That faith is in some sense obedience, yet in the act of Justification its not considered as obediential. But to speak the truth, the places instanced in for to prove the obedience of faith, are not to the purpose, \textit{Rom. 1. 5. Rom. 16. 26.} for faith is not there taken for a grace in the soul, the \textit{qua creditur}, as its called, but for the Doctrine of Faith, the \textit{Fides qua creditur}, the Doctrine which is believed; so that obedience of faith is that obedience which Faith or the Doctrine of God requireth. Thus \textit{2 Cor. 10. 5.} there is \textit{eis xaranlw Xeiser}, the obedience of Christ, that is, unto Christ, and not Christ's obedience subjectively: So \textit{1 Pet. 3. 21.} The obedience of the truth is that obedience which
which the truth commands. Therefore, though many, some more openly, some more covertly would have you to consider faith as its an obedience, yet in the matter of justification, look upon the passiveness of it alone.

These things premised, Let us prove this truth. That faith justifieth not as it is a work, but only from Christ received by it, that faith is not in a proper sense imputed to us for our righteousness. And

First, This Argument seemeth to be very pregnant, because the Apostle all along this Chapter opposeth faith and works, the believer and the worker. Now his Argument would be of no force, if faith could be considered as a work, yea how absurdly would they make the Apostle to speak, To him that worketh not, but believeth, that is, To him that worketh not, but worketh; And again, Blessed is the man to whom God imputeth righteousness without works, that is, a work without works. Abraham believed, (that is) he worked; and thus from hence all along prove, he was not justified by works. Certainly, this is to make the Apostle argue very imperfectly, to make two opposite members in a distinction, and then to argue from one to the exclusion of the other, when yet that is included, can never be made good Logick. None then can rationally persuade himself, That when Paul argued against works by faith, that he thought on faith as a work: So that we are not in matter of justification to relieve on our faith, as if for that we were justified.

Secondly, Faith cannot be imputed unto us for our total and perfect righteousness, because its not a perfect righteousness, nor all the righteousness God requireth. That faith which God commands is but part of our duty, not all our duty, and then what it is, is but imperfect; for we cannot believe perfectly, no more then we can love God, or do other gracious exercises perfectly. We know but in part, and so can believe but in part. The Disciples are often reproved for their little Faith, so that they speak.
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farre more consonantly to reason, though they proceed upon a false supposition, who make our faith and works perfect, at least so farre as the Word requireth. But now to say, That faith is accounted of by God for our compleat righteousness, when acknowledged to be imperfect, and not all the righteousness we ought to do, is to speak a manifest absurdity, for this is to make God to judge otherwise of a thing than it is, and that he doth not account of things as they are. For he shall receive this, as a full debt, which indeed is not a full debt; and like that Steward in the Parable, who though he is commended for wisdom, yet not for honesty, that for an hundred pound debt, bid the debtor write down fifty. Its therefore both against the wisdom and righteousness of God, to say, He receiveth that for a perfect righteousness, which is not, or imputeth that to be righteousness, which is not so. Neither may we conceive in God any such gracious condescension as to receive an imperfect righteousness for a perfect; for why not as well no righteousness at all for perfect? And why not a merciful pardon also coming from God without any satisfaction, as the Socinians blaspheme. But the Opinionists with whom we have to deal disclaim such things.

But lest this evasion should entice any away, therefore the third Argument is thus placed, If faith which is imperfect should because of Christ's merits be graciously esteemed for an universal righteousness, then Christ did not properly die for persons, but for graces, he did not die that the believer might be saved immediately and properly, but that his faith might be accounted a formal compleat righteousness. Now if we observe the Scripture, that speaks universally in this sense, That Christ died for sinners, who believing in him have thereby eternal life; and Rom. 3. Through faith in his blood we have remission of sins; whereas, according to the contrary opinion, the immediate and proper end of Christ's death should be to merit at God's hand, That an imperfect faith should be accounted for a full righteousness, and thus Christ would die not
not for persons, but for conditions. But is not this to go against the universal stream of the Scripture? Doth that any where make this the end of Christ's death, that thereby God should esteem that perfect, which otherwise is not, and not rather wholly for such who being sinners in themselves, yet repenting of, and renouncing all that is theirs, do acquiesce wholly in him as a Mediator.

The fourth Argument is, If faith should justify as it is a work, then he that believeth more strongly than another, should be more justified than another, and thus our justification should recipere magis et minus. Its true (you heard) the sense and application of our justification may admit of degrees, but justification itself cannot, no more than Christ can be more or less: One eye may see the Sunne better than another, but the Sunnes light is equal to all. Hence the Apostle argueth from Abrahams believing, accounted so righteousness, to every Christian believing, though never so weak and languishing, which could never be, if faith did justify as a work, for who would not readily reply, Abrahams example is nothing to us, we have not such a faith as Abraham had? You see how the Apostle aggravateth that, as it was a work, Rom. 4. That he staggered not therow unbelief, but against hope believed in hope; Seeing therefore that Abraham produced such an high act of faith, that if you respect the object believed, or the manner of effecting it, all was very supernatural; This instance could not be brought to all justified persons, whose faith is very weak, and never able to put forth such strength and vigour, unless its justification was from the object, which is common to the weak Christians faith, as well as the strong. So that by this we see, if Abrahams faith justified, as it was a work, it could not be brought as an universal Rule for all believers, because many attain not to such an high degree of faith, or else it would plunge many godly persons in despair, as if they could never be justified, because they cannot believe with such strength and fortitude as Abraham did; yes, Is it not the sad temptation which many of Gods children have,
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have, That their faith is very weak, they find little stirrings of it; Now what an Abyss would the godly Minister cast this soul into, if he should say, Though your faith be true and sincere, yet it is not active and strong enough, you must believe equally to Abraham; if you would be justified, were not this to give as they did to Christ, gall instead of wine to drink?

Fifthly, If faith justifyeth as it is a work, or be accounted for righteousness, then a thing must be an instrument to itself, which is wholly absurd to conceive; for nothing can be instrumentum & instrumentatum, it cannot be the instrument, and the thing received by the instrument, as a man's hand cannot be the treasure it receiveth. The Artificer's tools are not the house he makes, the hydrops sprinkling of blood in the Jewish Sacrifice, was not the blood or the consecration it self: So faith is not our righteousness, but the means to obtain it. Hence Gal. 3., and Phil. 3, it's called the righteousness by faith, which could not be if faith were the righteousness, as righteousness by the Law did not imply the Law was accounted for righteousness, but the means by which it cometh. So then faith is no more our righteousness, then the mouth is our meat and drink. We have it by faith, it is not faith it self, nothing can be an instrument to obtain it self.
More Arguments to prove, That Faith as it is a Work, is not imputed unto us for our Righteousness; With Answers to Objections. Also handling the Point of the Instrumentality of Faith.

Rom. 4. 23, 24.
Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him, &c.

We have hitherto asserted this Position, That Faith as it is a work, is not imputed unto us for our righteousness. I shall be the briefer in it, because what Arguments overthrow works in the general, as to the matter of Justification, the same will stand good for faith in particular only, I shall add to the fore-mentioned,

Therefore in the fifth place, If Faith doth justifie as a work, then am I justifie by something that is mine, it will be my righteousness, which yet Paul renounceth, Phil. 3. 9. Although the godly man's faith be the gift of God, yet it is the believer's work. Its man that believeth, and not God, and so the Just is said to live by his faith. Faith therefore though originally coming from God, yet subjectively being a man's own righ-
righteousness, must necessarily follow, That still the righteousness a man is justified by, is his own, and within him. Now its good to observe, That the Scripture never faith, Faith justifieth in an active sense, but always we are justified by faith in a passive sense; and what may be the reason of this, but that hereby the Scripture would exclude faith as a work? for if it did justifie as a work, then it might have properly been said, that faith justifieth: We must not then onely go out of our works, but our faith also. As the hand which Moses stretched out in working of miracles, was struck with the leprofe, to shew, that it was no efficacy in his hand, whereby those wonderful things were wrought; So that faith which justifieth, hath even a leprofe, an uncleanliness cleaving to it, and therefore as a work cannot justifie, because that is self needeth Justification.

Sixthly, If Faith justifieth as a work, then its no matter what the object is, so that it be a divine truth. Thus every dogmatical faith must be justifying. The Consequence is evident; for if the power to justifie arise not from the object of faith, but from faith as an act exercised, then wherefover this is put forth, there Justification followeth; whereas we see the Apostle limits this justifying faith to Christ crucified, and Rom. 3.15. It's through faith in his blood. Now, how absurd would it be to say, That I am justifie as well by believing that Judas hanged himself, as that Christ was crucified for my offences? Though the adversary wash himself with hope and nitre, yet he cannot get off this spot. Though he would seem to make Christ crucified the object of justifying faith, yea in some sense make faith an instrument to lay hold upon Christ, yet herein they speak plain contradictions to themselves, or else use such words, as Augustine faith the Pelagians of old would the word Grace, and frangendum invidiam. Certainly, if the work of faith justifieth, then wherefover this work puts it self forth, let the object be what it will be, there must Justification follow; for the work of faith lieth in captivating the understanding and heart, to what truth God hath revealed, because of his authority. And this Obedience, or Submission is in one truth as well
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as in another, in respect of the motive to believe it.

Seventhly, this Doctrine must needs obscure and diminish the worth and merits of Christ, yea Christ is hereby made only a remote cause of our righteousness, not the proper and immediate one. For by this opinion, Christ by his death shall purchase at God's hand, that our faith shall be accounted for a perfect righteousness; so that faith is our immediate, formal and proper righteousness, Christ is only the remote cause. Thus the Papists say about the righteousness of works, that tintas sanguine Christi, died in the blood of Christ, they justify us. Works are made the immediate cause of our righteousness, Christ the remote one; what they speak of works, to the same sense these speak of faith: But the Scripture faith, we are made the righteousness of God in him, 2 Cor. 5. 21. and its a righteousness imputed unto us without works: We are immediately and proximely to appear in Christ, not in our selves.

Eighthly, this Position overthrows the imputation of Christ's righteousness unto us, it makes it wholly superfluous and needless, for if faith be the proper righteousness accepted of by God, then Christ's righteousness done for me is needless; what need two Sunnes in one orb? If nature, certainly grace doth not multiply entities without necessity, and truly the righteousness of Christ would not in the Scripture have been so commended, had faith been that which justifieth; the crown must be taken from Christ, and put upon the head of faith; for although faith justifieth because of Christ, and he hath purchased it, yet the proxime and immediate cause hath the chiefest glory. That Christ's righteousness is imputed to us, and so we in and by that immediately and proximely stand justified before God, is in its due time to be effectually proved.

Let us in the next place consider, what Objections are brought, either by Papists, Arminians, or others in this matter; for though upon different grounds, yet they all agree in this, That Faith doth not justify as a means apprehending or laying hold on Christ, that is but Nuga with the Remonstrants. And
First, They urge very speciously, That the Apostle in this fourth Chapter, does several times say, Faith is imputed for righteousness, not mentioning Christ's righteousness at all. Now say they, This is the proper place and seat of this Doctrine, therefore the Apostle would not use tropical expressions, which would rather obscure than clear the matter. Again, They remind us of Augustine's Rule. We must never go from the proper literal sense, unless when manifest necessity doth compel. Otherwise we shall turn the Scripture into an Allegory, and make no sure foundation of any point in Christianity; yea (they say) We cannot bring the like instance of any such phrase.

In these things they are very confident, but for the first its granted, that this is the proper and most eminent place where Justification is handled, not in all the necessary points of it, only what is the way, and manner how we are justified, and therefore the Apostle could not speak otherwise then he doth; for seeing the Question between the Jews and Paul was, Whether we are justified by believing or working? Its necessary Paul should conclude by believing. But then for the matter or form of our Justification, that is not directly touched upon in this place. Its not necessary that the Apostle should speak all things requisite to the knowledge of Justification in one place. Paul therefore determineth according to the Question stated, That it is not by working, but by believing that we are justified. But whether this believing be terminated on Christ's righteousness, was not in this place to be decided.

Secondly, It is necessary that faith should be thus understood Metonymically or correlative from other places of Scripture, as Rom. 5. when it's said, By Christ's obedience We are made righteous, when Christ is called, The Lord our righteousness, when 1 Cor. 1. 30. Christ is said to be made of God our righteousness, and we said to be the righteousness of God in him, 1 Cor. 5. 21. These places do evince, that faith cannot be our proper righteousness; for all will acknowledge we do not need two righteousnesses; then if Christ be our righteousness, faith cannot be, and if faith, then Christ cannot be. If it be said, Christ is
said to be our righteousness *metonymically,* or the cause is put for the effect; We urge their own Rule, they must not depart from the plain letter without necessity. Besides, here they acknowledge such a figurative expression used often in the Scripture, which yet they demanded an instance in before: So that the matter being brought to this, either when its said, Christ is made our righteousness, this must be understood properly; or when faith is said to be imputed for righteousness, this must be understood improperly, or *contra:* We say there is great reason of understanding the phrase concerning faith improperly.

For the Arguments above-mentioned, to which we may add further these considerations,

1. That the Scripture faith expressly, Christ is our righteousness, and That we are made the righteousness of God in him, but it doth not say any where, That faith is imputed to righteousness; it faith indeed, Faith is accounted for righteousness to him that believeth, ver. 3, 5, 9, 11, 24. But there is a great difference between these two Propositions, Faith is accounted for righteousness, and Faith is accounted to him that believeth for righteousness, for the one speaks of faith in its own nature, and if used by the Apostle, would greatly have favoured the adversaries cause, as if faith it self had been accounted by God for a perfect righteousness in its own consideration: But now when its said, To be accounted to the believer for righteousness, that may imply no more, than that by his faith he doth obtain a righteousness; as we may say, Such a mans confidence of possessing such wealth to be given him, makes him rich, by that not intending the confidence itself, but his riches the object thereof make him rich.

2. We cannot take faith properly for righteousness, because in the same Chapter, and in this discourse, the Apostle distinguishes it: Therefore the phrase must be improper, for ver. 11. its called, The righteousness of faith, and not, Righteousness faith: So ver. 13, the promise is said to be through the righteousness of faith; for as when it is said, The righteousness of the Law, the meaning is not, that the Law is
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righteousness, but the means to it: So when it said, *The righteousness of faith,* the sense is not, that faith is the righteousness, but a means to it: So that the same Apostle, when he faith, Faith is accounted for righteousness to a believer, yet also calling it a righteousness by faith, doth plainly discover that he intends not, that faith is properly accounted for our righteousness, as if that were all we were now bound to do in the Covenant of Grace, but only that by this faith we are made partakers of Gospel-righteousness.

3. Faith must be understood as it relateth to Christ, not in it self, because that promise, in the believing whereof Abraham is said to be justified, doth directly look upon Christ: for the seed promised, which was the object of Abraham's faith, is directly and expressly interpreted by the Apostle, Gal. 3. 16. to be Christ; and in this sense Christ said, Abraham saw his day, and rejoiced; if therefore the object of Abraham's faith was not a bare promise of a temporal seed, but of such a seed in whom all Nations, yea Abraham himself was to be blessed, then it was not faith apprehending, but Christ apprehended that is our righteousness.

Lastly, It must needs be a figurative expression, because the faith that is mentioned is but one act, though indeed a very famous and remarkable one. Now how improbable is it to say, that one act meerly of faith, should stand for all the obedience God requireth, and be as much as if a man had personally fulfilled the whole Law? To make one act of faith, thus the whole Gospel-righteousness seemeth to be very irrational. Certainly, though they do much mistake that joyn faith and works together in our Justification, yet to hold faith as a work justifieth, and to exclude all other works of grace, which yet are required, seemeth to be farre more absurd and inconsequential.

And thus much to the first and second part of their Objec- tion, we must not recede from the literal sense, especially when it is the professed handling of a truth. Although we might further adde, That thus Bellarmine argueth for the literal explication of *Hoc est Corpus meum,* because here Christ
Christ intended to give the true knowledge of the Sacrament, and that upon his death, therefore not likely he would darken his speech with figurative expressions.

As for the third part of their Objection, That we cannot shew such like phrases, where faith must be understood thus for the object. To this we answer, That faith is not excluded in the interpretation, but it doth comprehend the object also. We grant that by faith is meant that gracious act of the soul, only what is attributed to it, ariseth not from its work, but from the object. When we speak of Justification its necessary to name that motion of the soul, or means whereby we obtain it, and thus Paul doth: So that faith is not excluded or shut out, but its to be understood as receiving of Christ, whose righteousness doth justify us. Although we may add many such like expressions, as that, *Thy faith hath made thee whole*: by faith is not meant faith as an act or work, but the power and strength of Christ apprehended by faith, miraculous faith was not so called, as if thereby the person was endowed with an almighty power to work miracles, but because it rested on Christ's power: Even as the woman's touching of Christ's garment did not heal her, but the virtue that came out from him. Thus also we are said to be saved by hope, that is, by the thing hoped for. Its very ordinary in Scripture to attribute that to the habit, or act of the soul, which belongs to the object; which is the Metonymy of the adjunct for the subject: Nothing is more ordinary, so that I need not insist thereon.

Though these things seem clear, yet it is acknowledged that some Orthodox Interpreters understand faith properly; hence Gomar, in his analytical explication of this place, brings Arguments why we must understand it without any figure, and addeth, If there were a Trope to be admitted, it would be more conveniently in the predicate then in the subject, in righteousness then in faith, in this sense, Faith is imputed to righteousness, that is, the instrumental cause of righteousness. But I rather encline to the more common Interpretation I mentioned.
The second Argument. That faith justifieth as a work, as a cause or part of our formal righteousness, is from the Papists quiver; for Bellarminian faith, the expressions of justified by faith, denote some causality, and that we give nothing at all to faith, while we make it only an instrument to receive Christ's righteousness; for (faith he) who would say to a poor man that hath only stretched out his hands to receive an alms, that his hands made him have the alms? or to a sick man, taking the physic in his hand, who would say, thy hand hath healed thee? Therefore it is too little and low, when we expound a man is justified by faith thus, that it, it is an hand to receive it, and for this he prepared hard, the Prepositions by, and through, which as when applied to God and Christ, signify causality, so it must also when applied to faith. This seemeth to be a specious Objection.

But the answer is, That those Prepositions are used divers ways in the Scripture, and so do signifie such a causality, as the subject matter requireth: when applied to God and Christ, they signify an efficient and meritorious cause, but in other places they signify only an instrument or means by which, so, Matth. 1.13. Enter through the strait gate. Its said of the Wise men, Matth. 2.11. They went by another way; Acts 14.22. Through many afflictions; we might shew very many places, where the Preposition by doth not signify any cause, but a means through which, so that there cannot be any strength laid upon the Preposition.

One it may be doubted, whether faith may be called an instrumental cause of our Justification: For though some do roundly call it so, yet others call it an organum sine quo non. One faith, When Divines speak accurately and exactly, they call it not an instrument but a medium. Penezius alleged by Fraxinus, Spec. Not. in Armin. cap. 17. de Justif. No. 7. speaketh thus, Fides correlata ad Justitiam Christi a Deo oblatam & collatam considerata, non tam operis actionis operatoria rationem habet, quam passionis & subjecti recipientis, id est, homines justitiam recipientes a Deo agi potissimum, quam opera sunt descend. But this Author must understand subiectum quo, not quod; for faith is not the ultimate subject, but man of justification.

And
And certainly when generally its said to be the instrument of our Justification, by that is meant no more then a means appointed by God, in the use whereof we are made partakers of Christ's righteousness. In this sense Perkins calls faith Instrumentum supernaturale creatum à Deo in animo hominis, whereby he layeth hold on, and applieth Christ's righteousness to himself. This is certain, That whatsoever expressions the Orthodox use about faith in our Justification, they all agree, that this is not from any dignity of faith, or that hereby any thing is attributed to man: yea hereby they say, Man is wholly debased, and wholly out of himself, Christ being exalted all in all.

Now because this Assertion of faith justifying instrumentally hath several censures, and that by men of contrary judgment; Bellarmine thinking that thereby we give nothing at all to faith; and others, that we give too much, because every instrumental cause is reduced to an efficient; Therefore it is good to dig to the root of this matter, and although we have already said enough about faith's passive instrumentality in Justification, yet for further explication sake, let us add some further consideration about Instruments, and they may be divided into Artificial, Natural and Divine.

For Artificial Instruments, if we thorowly consider it, we shall finde little more then a passive habitude, or respect in them unto that ultimate effect of art, which is intended by the Artificer, and some are more passive then others: some instruments of art, have indeed a causality by a previous disposing and working upon the subject, as when the Saw drawn between the wood doth expell part of it, either formally, as Scotus, or rather efficiently, as Suarez, removing it to another place. In this and the like instances Artificial Instruments have an efficient causality, but they are not called Instruments (as Suarez well observeth) in respect of this previous disposition, but of the ultimate effect of Art, as the Saw and hammer are called instruments, not in respect of the cutting or beating, but of the house or the statue and image, which the Artificer by them accompliseth: So that if we speak of the Artificial effect intended by the Artificer, they
are instruments only by a passive relation, and therefore whether the Artificer make an image of a beast, or man, it's all one to the instrumental tools, they incline not, or determine to one way more than another, which argueth they have no efficiency, as to the effect of art; in which respect they are properly called instruments. But that there are artificial passive instruments appeareth plainly in musical instruments, which are called instruments et einoa, for in most of them its plain there is nothing but a local motion of the strings, and an artificial impression upon them by the hand, and then in respect of the melodious sound, they are thereby made passive instruments: So that I think we may almost generally say, That artificial instruments in respect of the effect of art ultimately intended, are passive instruments, and are so called, not in respect of a causal attingency immediately of that artificial effect, but from a passive relation thereunto.

In the second place, There are instrumental causes in Nature, as when the seed of a flower falling to the ground doth instrumentally produce another flower: It cannot be denied but that such have an intrinsic power to produce such a determinate effect, and such causes as these are to be reduced to the efficient, because they work by an inward connatural ability, but I suppose when Divines call faith an instrumental cause of Justification, they do not mean such a cause.

Therefore lastly, There are divine instruments, when God by his appointment and will causeth such a thing to be in the use or application of such or such means. Now these may be said to be instruments of such a mercy, not that they have any efficient causality either principal or instrumental, only the effect is produced not by any virtue of such means used, but because of God's appointment; and thus faith when it justifieth as an instrument, doth it as a divine, supernatural instrument, not as a natural, which will further appear in handling this Question, Whose instrument it is, whether God's or man's? I need not say much to this: See Mr Blake in that solid and learned Tractate of his (Vindict. Factionis, p. 81, 82.) Its there answered, That its both the instrument of God.
God and man, though in a different sense; and to this purpose Doctor Ames (Bellar. Enerv. Tom. quart. pag. 18.) Fides quamvis possit vocari instrumentum Dei, quia Deus justificat nos ex fide & per fide, propriè tamen est instrumentum nostrum; its God's instrument in a large sense, as being that which through his power is created in us, and by which he justifieth us; yet quod actum exercitum, its properly our instrument, because its we, and not God that believeth. Its God's instrument in respect of his institution and ordination of it for such an end. Its men's instrument, as that which is exercised and applied by him: yet though man believeth, he doth not justify himself, partly because it doth not justify as a work, but from Christ believed upon; and partly, because justification doth not follow as a necessary, natural effect of believing, but from the gracious appointment of God, as is to be shewed in answering the next Question. Only by the way you may observe, That justification is not attributed to faith in the same sense that it is denied to works, for those that pleaded for justification by works, did not look upon works in such an organical and relative sense, but as causes of justification, and the Apostle excluding them, doth assert faith not absolutely and in the same causality, but respectively to the blood of Christ.

The last Question may be, If faith justifieth, How doth it come to justify? Is justification a necessary and natural effect of believing, or comes it meerly by the divine appointment or institution of God, as looking upon the brazen Serpent procured healing, not by any inward implanted force, but by the command of God?

Now to this we answer two things:

1. That faith doth not necessarily and properly produce justification, as the fire doth burning: So that whosoever doth believe would be justified, though God had appointed no such way, though he had not made such a promise. Therefore its a calumny cast upon the Orthodox, as if they delivered any such thing, and against reason, for no habit can have two immediate proper distinct acts: If therefore to believe be the natural act of that habit, to be justified cannot be.
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be. Besides, Justification though it be received by us, yet is a gracious privilege vouchsafed by God as he pleaseth, and so cannot be the natural effect of any thing within us.

Yet in the second place, Though it be Gods promise and grace to annex Justification to our believing, Our Divines do well say, That faith hath naturally a passive aptitude and fitness in it to receive Christ, which other graces have not. So that although this natural fitness be not a cause, yet the goodness of God makes use of it for such an end. Therefore though one speak confidently, That when causes have a natural power to produce such effects, it's improper, if not ridiculous to ascribe such effects to the will and pleasure of God, yet herein is much error and mistake; for we say not, Faith hath a natural power to justify, as the fire to burn (though even such natural causes in their operations are reduced to Gods will) (for when he did not will, the raging fire could not burn thee three worthies) but only it hath a passive aptitude from its nature to be ordained by God for such an end, which other graces have not; as the hand hath a natural fitness to receive, which the head, though a more noble part cannot do.

As in the matter of the Lords Supper, we say, the form of a Sacrament lieth in the words of Institution, yet it pleased God to take such elements that have a natural fitness to represent the body and blood of Christ; But the bread and wine could not do this sacramentally without an institution: so its here, though faith have such a natural fitness, as to receive and lay hold on Christ, yet that in and by this Justification shall be vouchsafed, is from the appointment of God.

Thus have we demolished those false ways asserted by many for Justification by faith, and declared the truth with the establishment of it. I shall speak a word to the opinion of a late writer, (Justification justified) who rejects all the former senses of Justification by faith, either as a work, or an instrument, and pitcheth upon a notion of his own: having in that whole Sermon asserted many Novelisms, Faith, he faith, just ificeth, because it's the first grace that doth all upon Christ, and rest upon him for Justification: But where is one word
word of Scripture attributing Justification to faith, because of this priority? The word of God relates always to the object of faith, not to any such presupposed order. Besides, by this rule a man is not justified after his conversion by any acts of faith, whereby we depend on Christ, for, faith being justifieth, because its in order of nature, the first that acts; certainly those frequent acts of faith which the godly after their conversion put forth, are not the first in nature, yet he expressly grants, pag. 16. Justification is applied to us upon the renewed acts of faith, yet these renewed acts of faith cannot be the first in order. Again, If it justifieth, because its the first that acts on Christ, then it justifieth as a work, and so fals in with those that he opposeth; If by acting on Christ, he mean receiving (for he speaks very obscurely): then he fals in with those, that say, it justifieth as an instrument, to whom notwithstanding he is an adversary. In the progress of this reason he faith, faith justifieth only in respect of the sense and comfort, and assurance of Justification, which seemeth a great contradiction to a former passage in his Sermon, pag.2. for he proveth the elect are not justified by God from all eternity: But why not? If faith be only the sense of our Justification, this supposeth Justification to be before faith, and if it be but an hour before, it may be from eternity as well. Thus with him not only good works but faith also doth follow the person justified.

Use of Instruction, To give faith its proper place in Justification, not to exalt it too much, nor yet debase it too low, but above all things nourish the acts of it, because this receiveth Christ and Justification. If a labouring man loseth his hands, he is undone, because by them he liveth; faith is this hand: The Israelite that was blinde could not look on the brazen Serpent to be healed: faith is this eye; this faith that enricheth the soul, with one hand receiveth all from God, with the other hand sets all graces on work for God; So that we may with Gerson the Papist in a well explained sense, cry out, Oh faith, thine is the kingdom, thine is the power and glory! 
Serm. XXVII.

That the whole Nature of justification is not comprehended in Remission and Forgiveneffe of Sinnes.

Rom. 4.25.

Who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification.

In the former words we had this truth contained, That Faith, not as it is a work, but because of the object received and applied by it, is accounted to the believer for righteousness. And this 25th verf. will afford pregnant matter, to prove, That remission of sinnes is not all our justification. For whereas we have evinced, That neither faith nor works, nor any thing inherent in us; can be our righteousness, by which we are justified.

We come to grapple with those, who grant our justification to be without us, and yet for all that hit not the mark, and that which shall be mentioned at this time, is of those, who place the whole Nature of justification in pardon of sinne: So that with them, forgivenesse of sinne is that onely, and adequately, which maketh us just before God. But this we shall endeavour to overthrow from these words.

For the understanding whereof we may take notice of a two-fold
twofold privilege spoken of, with a twofold cause; And 
lastly, The original and fountain, both of the causes and their 
effects:

The twofold cause is Christ's death, and Christ's resurrection, 
for although it be true, That Christ's merit is limited to the 
time of his humiliation, yet because his resurrection did mani-
fest his power and conquest over all his enemies (for had he 
not risen his death had not availed to our happiness) hence 
it is that Justification is attributed to his resurrection, al-
though we may say, Christ's death is the meritorious cause 
both of remission of sines and Justification, and Christ's re-
surrection is in some sense the efficient cause, because by his 
rising again the Spirit of God doth make us capable of, and 
then belloweth Justification upon us. The twofold benefit is 
set down in these words,

First, Christ was delivered for our offences,  
the word signifieth not every light sinne, or lesser fault, but 
that which is a falling, hereby intimating, that Christ died 
to take away our great transgressions as well as lesser: Even as 
the read Sea overwhelmed Pharaoh and the great men, as well 
as those of more weak and infirm natures: So that hereby we 
see Christ crucified an expiatory Sacrifice to take away the 
guilt of our offences.

The second Benefit is our Justification. This is made a di-

finet benefit from the former, even as Christ's death and re-
surrection are distinguished, not that one can be divided from 
the other, onely one is not the other, or at least but a part 
of it.

Indeed the Popishe Commentators do readily expound Ju-

stification for inward renovation, That Christ rose again 
that we might rise to newness of life, but they cannot shew 
the use of the word in that sense, yet that Justification is 
more then bare remission, the Apostle doth evidently mani-

festy the distinguishing of them. Now its greatly agita-
ted by Divines, Why, or in what sense, Justification is thus 
attributed to Christ's resurrection? Some explain it of the 
exemplar cause, and that two ways:

1. That as sinne hath its death by Christ's death, so we
are to have our resurrection and acceptance to life by his resurrection, insomuch that Augustine observeth, whatsoever was historically or really fulfilled in Christ, we are to have such a conformity to himself in ourselves: as he was crucified, so we are to be to the world and sinne; as he was buried, so we are laid to be buried with him in Baptism; and as he rose again, so we in our souls are to arise to all holinesse of life.

But secondly, Others express this exemplarity after this manner, Christ (say they) in suffering was our Surety, God looked upon him as bearing our sinnes, and so we were condemned in him. Again, Christ rose as a publick and common person from the grave, and was acquitted thereupon from all the offences laid to his charge; and thus we were justified in his justification.

Lucius a learned Writer saith, justification is therefore attributed to Resurrection, because it was the compleat and ultimate act of Christ's active obedience; and from hence inferreth, That Remission of sinne is attributed to his passive, and justification to his active obedience.

Others expound this of the final cause, That the expiation of our sinnes was the end of his death, and justification the end of his resurrection, and this is most probable, Only the meritorious causality in his death, for our forgivenes, and the efficient causality of his Resurrection for our justification is not to be excluded.

Lastly, Here is the original of all, he was delivered, viz. by the Father, and he was raised, viz. by the Father. Thus whatsoever benefits comes by Christ, yea Christ himself is made the effect of his Fathers love and mercy to us: So that we have not the least reason to doubt, whether the Father will accept of what the Son hath done for us.

That which I shall pitch upon in these words is the distinction that is made between pardon of sin and justification, and so observe,

That the whole nature of justification is not comprehended in remission and forgivenes of sins.

To clear this, consider first, That there are different opinions
ons, not only between the Orthodox and their Adversaries, but also amongst the Orthodox themselves in this great privilege of remission of sinnes; for some make Justification in the whole nature of it to lie in forgivenessee of sinnes. Thus Pisca{tor} and Watton with all diligence set themselves to assert this, and many others, who deny the imputation of Christ's active obedience to the believer (I say many) for though they deny the imputation of Christ's active obedience, yet grant Justification to be more than remission, herein forsaking Pisca{tor}. (Mc Gatak. Animad in Luc.) Bellarmine would charge this upon Calvin, as his different opinion from other Protestants, but it may be easily cleared, that Calvin doth by placing our Justification in remission of sinne, only oppose inherent renovation against the Papists, not the imputed righteousness of Christ; witness his exposition on this Text, beside other places.

Indeed Vorsts, while Orthodox doth say, (Antibel. de justif.) If we place Justification only in remission of sins, we may the more easily answer all the Popish Objections, neither shall we then be so obnoxious to their malignant columnies.

2. Others they make remission of sinne, not to be any part, much lesse the whole of Justification, but the effect and result of it. Thus for the satisfaction of Christ, we being accounted just before God, thereby we come to have remission of sinnes. There are learned men go this way (Bradshaw, Gataker.)

3. The Popish Writers they make remission of sinne a concomitant of our Justification, which they place in our internal renovation.

Lastly, There are those who make remission of sinnes an integral part of our Justification; for they say, The whole nature of Justification consists in these two parts, remission of sinne and imputation of righteousness; which indeed of these hath the priority, is disputed, but that is not much material. And surely if we regard the expressions of the Scripture, this seemeth to have most truth in it; and with these later, I joyn myself. Neither may it seem such an ab-
furd thing to place Justification in two particulars, as if the form of it ought necessarily to be single, for we are not to speak of Justification, as natural forms which consist in indivisiblity; but we are to look upon it as a favour and priviledge of God, which he vouchsafeth to his children, and to the integral constituting whereof there may be as many ingredients, as God shall put in, neither are imputation of righteousness, and remission of sins so disparate, but that they may well concur to one thing.

In the next place, Let us consider wherein remission of sins and Justification do differ. And

First, They differ as an whole and a part, Justification is the whole, remission is a part; So that as the soul of a man and a man differ, as the whole and the part, Thus doth forgiveness of sinne and Justification. Hence the Scripture, as it sometimes describeth Justification by the pardon of sinne; so it doth also by the imputing of righteousness, Rom. 14. Neither may they be called the same thing, as the expulsion of darkness and introduction of light, for they are two distinct benefits, and although they are inseparable, yet they are not to be confounded, and although where there is forgiveness of sinne, there is imputation of righteousness, yet this makes not them all one, but argueth that inseparable connexion which God hath appointed; Even as remission of sinnes, and inherent renovation of the soul are individually joyned together; Take one away, and you take the other; and yet they are not the same work of God, but two distinct mercies; and the reason why Justification doth comprehend these two, is, because the Apostle makes blessedness to belong to him that is justified, Rom. 4. and Rom. 5. 1. Being justified, we have peace with God. Now to have sinne meerly forgiven, although by Gods gracious appointment it doth de facto bring blessedness, yet this ariseth not simply because sinne is forgiven, but because he is accepted of as positively just, and as having done that which the Law requireth, to which onely the blessing of eternal life is promised; for who can deny but that God might have simply pardoned a sinner his sinne, and yet for all that have annihilated him, or continued his life for
for some thousands of years in temporal happiness, and at last to have ceased to be, and not at all to give eternal life to him. As the Jews had their sinnes pardoned, were brought back to their Country, but not in such Glory, Power and Dignity, as formerly. Thus God (to speak of his absolute Power, and not what he hath promised to do) might have forgiven sinne to the humbled sinner, that is; he might have taken off the guilt or obligation to eternal punishment, and yet for all that not set the Crown of Glory upon his head; and whereas it is said, This cometh by Adoption, and not Justification, that is but gratis dictam, and cannot be proved, seeing that the justified man is thereby put into a full possession of Gods favour, and whom he hath justified, he will glorifie; and indeed Justification is virtually all other privileges, for they are either Effects, or Concomitants, and Consequents of it.

Secondly, Justification doth connote a state, and established condition of a man, and therefore is not frequently iterated, although it be continued. A man is not justified many times in a day, though sinnes be pardoned often in a day. It is true, God doth continue to justifie those that believe in him, and if he should cease to do so, they would immediately fall into misery and guilt; but yet God doth not renew or revive our Justification, as if there were an interruption or intermission of it. That Justification doth denote an estate, is plain by comparing it with all the other privileges God vouchsafeth his people: Regeneration and Vocation denote a state the person is put into, so doth Glorification. As therefore Sanctification is one thing, and those auxiliary actings of Gods grace are another thing; So that though we may say, Such a man hath new quickning grace every day, yet we cannot say, He hath a new Regeneration: So it is here, though we may say, That every day the believer, begging the pardon of his daily infirmities, hath a new pardon, yet he hath not a new Justification, because this denomi-
pardon of this sinne or that sinne, puts a man into the state of God's favour absolutely, but quoad hoc, the pardon of this or that sinne doth not make that universal righteousness of the person, whereby he stands acquitted from all. It is true, some learned men call this daily remission of sinne, Justification particularis; but we are now treating of that universal Justification, whereby the person of a believer stands acquitted, and disoblige[d] from the guilt of all his sinnes he hath committed, and great is the comfort of a Christian in that his Justification is a state of favour with God, for hence flow many other inestimable benefits and advantages, which the believer is to study out and improve.

Thirdly, Even amongst men, we see there is a great difference between forgivenesse of sinnes and Justification, one may be where the other is not. As if a man be accused before a Judge falsely for such and such crimes, and he is able to free himself before the Judge, upon this he is justified, and yet we cannot say, his fault was forgiven him. Again, We see in Joseph's brethren, and Shime's reviling of David, there was a forgivenesse of their fault, but there was no Justification of them; and although according to God's gracious order, which he hath now established, he doth not forgive any mans sinnes properly, whom he doth not justifie, that is, accept to eternal life; yet, as was said before, absolutely he might have done otherwise; So because God had vouchsafed one mercy, he was not bound to add more, I say, forgive sinnes properly, because sometimes in Scripture the taking away of a temporal punishment, is called a forgivenesse of sinnes; and this even wicked men, as Ahabs, have been partakers of, at least a delay of the punishment, when yet they have been obnoxious to eternal wrath. Its plain then, they cannot be the same, when one may be, where the other is not.

Fourthly, They differ in this respect, which is of great concernment, Remission of sinne doth only take away the guilt, or ordination of it to eternal punishment, it doth not remove
remove the sinne it self. So that although pardon of sinne doth make as if sinne had never been in respect of the guilt of it, yet not in respect of the denomination of the Subject. Though David had his sinnes of murder and adultery pardoned, yet that pardon did not make David a just man in those acts, his murder was truly murder, his adultery was truly adultery, although the guilt and actual condemnation of them was taken away; where- as justification doth denominate a man just, righteousness is required to justification, as well as wisdom to make a man wise, health to make a man healthfull: a man cannot be justified, viz. truly, without a righteousness: So that a man is not justified, and therefore just, but just and therefore justified. Its true, this righteousness, whereby we are pronounced just, is not in our selves, because we have sinne and corruption abiding in us, but it is purchased for us by the Lord Christ, and what he hath done is accepted of, as if we had done it in our own selves.

Fifthly, Remission of sinne and justification differ in this consideration. In forgiveness of sinne there is ablatio mali; in justification there is collatio boni: when sinne is forgiven the eternal evil deserved is removed, but when we are justified eternal good is promised. Neither is it of any strength at all, to say, where all evil is removed in a subject capable all good is introduced. If a man shall not be damned, he must be saved; for this is granted, that they are inseparable, but this doth not follow ex naturâ res, but extrinsically by the order and appointment of God; for a man might not have been damned, and yet after some enjoyments of pleasures on the earth, have been annihilated, and never assumed to eternal glory. Certainly, when the Papists tell us of a Limbus Puerum, especially of their Infantum, who are neither damned, or yet ever shall be saved. Our Divines do not argue against it as an impossible thing, that God might not have done so, if he would, but only they say, its against Scripture, and Gods revealed will, that he will appoint such a third place.
This therefore is a perpetual mistake, That because God hath appointed these two inseparably together, freedom from hell, and enjoyment of heaven; Therefore to make them all one, and to be the effect of one act of God. As it is in Sanftification, the removing of spiritual darkness, and vouchsafing spiritual illumination is the same motion, with respect only to divers terms, and this from a natural and extrinseal necessity, but it is not thus in our Justification, he that is not damned is not from an extrinseal necessity therefore saved, but because God hath joyned these things together. When the Papist shall urge, That wherefoever pardon of sinne is, there is infusion of righteousness, and shall demand us to give an instance of any such, who were forgiven, and yet not made holy; We answer, That it is freely confessed that both these are necessary concomitants; No man is justified but he is sanctified, yet these are not one act and work of God's Spirit, but distinct mercies, and wrought in a distinct manner. Thus we may see wherein the difference between these two may be discovered; and that Text Acts 13. 38, 39. seemeth to encline this way; for when he had said, That by Christ was forgivenesse of sinnes, he addeth, as a further priviledge, And by him all that beleive are justified from all things from which ye could not be justified by the Law of Moses. But Daniel speaks more expressely, Chap. 9. 24. There the Messias is said to make reconciliation for iniquity, and bring in everlasting righteousness: Whether this be imputed righteousness, I do not here dispute; only you see these are made two distinct benefits, expiation of sinne, and bringing in everlasting righteousness. And thus to abolish death, and to bring life and immortality to light, are mentioned as two distinct effects of the Lord Christ our Saviour, 2 Tim. 1. 10. And indeed there seemeth to be great reason for it, because its not enough for us that our sinnes are pardoned, but it behoveth us to bring such a perfect obedience as the Law requireth; Now seeing we in our own persons cannot do this, that our Justification may be com-
whereby a man is justified.

compleat and full, its necessary his obedience to the Law, should be accounted as ours. But this reason is to be improved more largely, and vindicated from all opposition, when we treat of Christ's active obedience.

Let us therefore take into consideration what choice and special reasons are brought against this Position, and why its affirmed, That all our justification is comprised in remission of sin.

And that which is much pressed upon, is Rom. 4:6, 7, 8, where the Apostle proving, That a righteousness is imputed to us without works; for a confirmation hereof, addledgeth a testimony from David's Psalm, where the man is said to be blessed that hath his sinnes forgiven him; Now (say they) the Apostles Argument would not be good, if imputation of righteousness, and remission of sinne were not all one.

From this manner of Paul's Argumentation, the Question is, Whether the Apostle give an whole definition of justification, or describe it only Synecdochically, one part for the whole? But there seemeth no reason why the Apostle should be here thought to describe all the nature of justification; its enough if he brings that part of it, which will strongly and clearly prove his purpose. Now the truth Paul was to prove is, That a man is not justified by works, Why? Because David faith, Blessed is the man to whom sinne is forgiven, and his iniquities covered; If therefore blessednesse lie in remission of sinne, in God's gracious favour without us, then it cannot be in any works we do. Thus the Apostles coherence is clear and evident, but whether this be all the nature of justification is not material, if remission of sinne be in our justification, though it be not all of it, the Argument abideth firm. Although we may probably conclude, That the Apostle, though he only mention pardon of sinne, yet includeth also imputation of righteousness, because he makes Blessednesse to consist in this remission: Now blessednesse and eternal life is not promised because sinne is forgiven meerely, but because there is such a righteousness
neffe as answereth the Law, Christ's doing and suffering being imputed to us, That as blessedness is not in a meer privation of evil, but positive affluence of all good: So Justification is not a meer blotting out of sinne, but in- vesting us with such a righteousnesse that hath eternal-life annexed to it. Neither may we wonder why the Apostle should not mention imputation of righteousnesse, as well as remission of sinnes, seeing his scope is not to inform what Justification is; but how we are justified. And again, the mentioning of one must necessarily infere the other; for sinne cannot be pardoned unless a righteousnesse accepted of by God be made ours, and because of that therefore our iniquities to be done away; yes some preffe the very mentioning of imputing of righteousnesse, ver. 6. as a distinct thing from remission, and yet the Apostle (they say) doth well argue from one to another, because they are inseparably join- ed together, and he that hath one must necessarily have the other: Even (as some say) our Saviour proved the Resurre- cution of the dead, by proving the Immortality of the soul, because one followeth the other, Mat. 23, 32. and although they may seem to be of a different nature, yet one as a part may be well put for the whole, as the soul of a man, or the body of a man is sometimes put for the whole man.

As for the Papift, who would from Davids testimony prove inherent righteousnesse to be part of our Justification, because its added [In whose spirit there is no guile] that cannot be, because it would directly contradict the Apostles in- tent, which is to prove a righteousnesse without works; so that those words are brought in, to shew the qualification of the subject who is justified, not a part of our Justification.
S E R M. XXVIII.

R o m. 4.25.

Who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification.

W e have asserted this truth, That justification is not wholly comprehended in remission of sinne: And did in part answer that famous place the Adversaries so much insist upon, viz. Pauls Argumentation, Rom.4.6. which (say they) could not be solid were it not built upon this Rock, That imputation of righteousness and remission of sinne were all one. Nevertheless because this place is accounted of like the Jebusites Fort in Zion, such a strong hold, that if you take that you take all, 2 Sam.5.6.

I shall add some further considerations to clear this point, and some other Objections they bring (deferring the rest till we treat of Christs active obedience.) And

First, Some have thought, That the Apostle doth not argue from the definition to the thing defined, but ab imperium collatione; as if the Apostle had intended thus, If remission of sinne be without our works, we are not sufficient of our selves, by any thing we do to obtain pardon of sinne, much lesse can we think to be justified by any work we perform. Thus Chrysostome who from hence makes justification to be a greater matter then meer forgivenesse. Whether this be a true analytical exposition of the place, I shall not dispute; onely this is true, which he saith, That justification is a greater and more noble priviledge, then meer forgivenesse of sinne; and the Reason is, Because pardon of sinne doth not make a man just.
there must be an imputation of righteousness to do that, and besides the removing of the guilt of sin, we need an entitling of us to eternal glory. Hence to the former Texts mentioned, we may add Acts 26. 18. where forgiveness of sins and an inheritance are made two distinct benefits, and so though they always concur together, yet are never to be confounded: So that the foundation the contrary minded lay, is wholly unsound, which is, That by remission of sin we are made righteous, which is not a truth; for (as hath been shewed) all that pardon of sin doth, is to remove the guilt of it, and to take away that actual ordination of it to eternal punishment, it doth not make us righteous, we need an imputation of the righteousness of Christ for this; and although upon the remission of sin followeth eternal life and glory, yet this is not vi consequentia, but consequentia, its not from any natural resultancy, but from Gods gracious appointment: So that Chrysostome might well argue, If by our works we cannot attain to forgiveness of sin, much less to our justification.

But in the second place grant, That the Apostle doth not argue ab imparium collatione, yet there is no necessity he should argue a definitione and definitum, as if the Apostle had here intended a full and plenary definition of justification. There is no probable Argument for this; for if remission of sin and imputation of righteousness, are inseparable consequences of one another, so that from the nature of the one, we may argue to the nature of the other, This is enough to confirm the Apostles intent, Righteousness is imputed without works: Why? because remission of sin which is a part of our righteousness, that we stand justified by, is without works, as David speaks peremptorily: Whereas then its ordinarily objected, That use doth not admit, or can it be a Synecdoche to say, one part is for another, especially when of a different nature.

It may be answered first, That one part is not here put for another, but a part for the whole, Remission of sin for Justification, part of our Righteousness for our whole Righteousness; as the soul or the body are sometimes
times put for the whole man. Or,

Secondly, Here is not one part put for another only, because here is an inseparable conjunction of both these, that one is always where the other is: God never forgiveth sinne, where he doth not impute righteousness. Therefore we may well conclude from one to the other, even as the Apostle all along makes Justification by faith, and to be justified by Christ, or by grace, all one; because they are indispensible coupled together.

Thirdly, Consider to the clearing of this, and all other Objections, That to Justification there is necessarily required Justice or Righteousness. A man cannot be justified without righteousness, any more then be wise without wisdom, or holy without holiness: So that Justice is the abstract or forme, Justification is the application or communication of it to such a Subject: As learning is a form or quality, but when applied to such a man it denominateth him in the concrete a learned man. Thus it is here, Righteousness is the quality, and when this is applied to a man, he is said to be made righteous or justified: Inasmuch that there cannot be a true and laudable Justification, where Righteousness is not supposed; and hence it is, that Remission of sinne and Imputation of Righteousness must be two distinct things, for Remission of sinnes simply as so, doth not give a Righteousnesse. It is true, that is a known saying of the Ancient, 

Fifthly, Yet to clear this further, take notice, That till we be accounted as righteous; God cannot, God will not in any gracious manner communicate himself to us, be cannot love or delight but in a righteous person. All those promises of a gracious and familiar presence, are still to such as are accounted righteous. Hence those engagements which God is pleased to take upon himself to give everlasting happiness, are always
What is not that Righteousness

always to those persons that have fulfilled the Law. Eternal life cannot be vouchsafed to any, but where the Law hath been fulfilled; Now because we could not do that, therefore Christ's obedience is made ours. Hence Rom. 5.

By the obedience of Christ many are said to be made righteous. Though therefore the works of the Law are excluded from our justification in respect of our own persons, yet not as performed by Christ for us; Therefore Christ is called The end of the Law for righteousness to him that believeth, Rom. 10.4. Christ did not come to destroy the Law, neither in the doctrinal part, or in the obligatory part of it. Hence Rom. 8. 34. Christ is said to come in the flesh, condemning sin, that the Righteousness of the Law might be fulfilled in us; for this purpose it is that Gal. 4. 4. Christ is said to be under the Law. Now in all these obediences unto the Law, he was not for himself; All that he did and suffered was for us, yea and in our stead: So that though we have not our salvation by that rule, Do this and live, yet Christ procured it for us, by fulfilling that, God being an holy and righteous God, never promised eternal Salvation, but to such as had obeyed his Law, either in themselves, or in their Sureties; and if God's Justice would not dispense with a penal satisfaction to the Law, as they themselves confess against Socinus, Why should he dispense with the true and proper obedience to his Law, seeing that punishment is required, and become due only per accident, but obedience is required unto God's Law primarily, and in itself: God then requiring a perfect Righteousness, and promising eternal life only unto that, its necessary that there should be a Saviour, who should be a Saviour, who should not only expiate our sinne, but bring in a perfect and absolute righteousness. It behoveth the Adversaries of this Doctrine to prove, That God will not dispense with a penal righteousness (if we may so properly call it) but he will with an active righteousness; but of this more in its time.

Fifthly, If therefore God require a positive righteousness of us, conformable unto his Law, in the perfect obligation of it, then it followeth, that meer remission of sinne under any distinction whatever
whereby a man is justified.

**whosoever, cannot be our righteousness.** We cannot be said to be righteous in this sense, as thereby to be interested unto eternal life, unless we have either an inherent or imputed righteousness. The distinctions are brought to clear their Assertion, That a man may be just meerly by remission of sinne.

1. They distinguish between a man **just qualitatively and legally.** A man that hath his sinnes pardoned cannot be just qualitatively, for this supposeth he hath sinned, and therefore is not inherently just; but then legally righteous a man is said to be, who though he hath offended, yet compensation is made to the Law. Now (say they) in this Evangelical pardon of sinne, a man is looked upon in and through Christ his Surety, as having satisfied the Law. Now where the Law cannot accuse, there must needs be righteousness. But although this be specious, yet a man cannot be called legally just meerly because of this satisfaction made, because Remission of sinnes, for which this atonement is, doth onely take away the guilt, and the ordination of a man to punishment, as was formerly said, a man is still unjust and a sinner; in respect of the guilt and demerit of it, sinne doth still abide even when it is pardoned (at least original sinne.) Therefore its maintained against Papists, That forgivenesse of sin is not the abolition of it, that it doth not take away the Maculam, but the Reatum: If then the sinfulness of original sinne remain in a believer, though the guilt of it be taken away, How can eternal happiness belong to such, unless otherwise they be accounted of as perfectly righteous, or having an obedience answerable to the Law? So that a Remission of sinne doth not make a man legally just in an absolute and universal sense. Indeed the distinction itself is necessary (though not in that sense the Authors propound it,) for the Orthodox maintain against Papists, That we are not just by a qualitative righteousness, but a legal one; by a legal, meaning the imputed Righteousness of Christ, which by Gods appointment is accepted of, as if we had done it in our own persons. But remission of sinne is not all this legal Righteousnesse; for
though by Christ's death Satisfaction be made to the penalty of the Law, yet not to the obedience of it; and to speak properly, a man is not obliged by way of duty to the penalty, but to the command; for we cannot properly say, It's the duty of the devils and impenitent wicked men to be damned.

Another distinction introduced much to the same purpose is, of a two-fold pardon;

1. A mere absolute and simple pardon, such as we are commanded to shew unto others, of which the Lords Prayer speaketh.

Or secondly, A pardon acquired by Satisfaction, and obtained by a just compensation. Now its true (say they) That in mere simple pardons there cannot be any Righteousness, yea the contrary is there supposed, but in pardons by Satisfaction, thus is a Righteousness procured: But this will fall to the ground upon the same reason with the former, pardon by Satisfaction would be a compleat Righteousness, if that were all, which is required; if so be that Christ had procured such an atonement, that the Law should be no longer obliging of us, that we should be free from all obedience, that the Law should cease to be a Law to us, then this Satisfaction would be our full Righteousness. But Christ died not for this end, to disoblige us from God, neither though he satisfied the comminatory part of the Law, did he therefore invalidate the mandatory part? And who in reason can think, that because man fallen is redeemed by a Saviour, that therefore the Law should not still continue prescribing obedience unto it? But I must not anticipate myself, for this is to be more fully cleared hereafter.

6. Sixthly, Although we say Remission of sinne doth not make a man just, yet it is not necessary that we should assign a third, or a neutral estate of a man, that is neither just nor unjust. For this is perpetually urged, as a grand absurdity, Forgiveness takes away the guilt of sinne, and freeth from hell, and yet it doth not make a man just, nor entitle to heaven. Therefore
Therefore (say they) a man may be in God's account, Objec.: neither a sinner, nor yet a righteous person, neither in the state of death nor life, whereas these are immediate contraries, and so in a subject capable one must necessarily be put. As in the air, there must be light or darkness, a man must be either alive or dead. It's true, where the subject is not capable, there neither of these immediate contraries are inherent: A beast is neither just nor unjust; A stone is neither sinful or holy, because these are not subjects susceptible of such qualities; But man is the proper and immediate subject, and therefore we may conclude, If not a sinner, then just; If not to be damned, then to be saved.

In this Argument they much triumph, this is the Goliak's Sword. But

First, We do not (de facto) say, there is or was any such neutral and indifferent state, wherein men were neither righteous nor unrighteous, neither damned or saved. Indeed the Papists they speak of man's pure naturals, such an estate wherein he is neither good nor evil, till by his free-will he made himself so; and thus they say, Adam was created, and therefore original Righteousness was supernatural, and put as a bridle to him, to keep the inferiour part from rebelling against the Superior. And the Socinians they tell us, of a middle and neutral state Adam was created in, which they call innocency, as if he had no more knowledge or understanding in him; then a meer childe. And for a middle state between heaven and hell, The Papists do (de facto) assigne, by their Limbus Patrum and Infantium; Yea all those in Antiquity, which are thought to be many, that hold the souls did not go immediately into heaven; and such as of later dayes that maintain Psycheopannacha, they do hold. That for a time at east there is a state wherein the godly are neither fully happy or miserable. And the Socinians do (de facto) also give a middle estate between Pannam damni and Senus, and that is a state of annihilation. Thus you see here have been, and are of late, who thought it no imagin Parlable thing, to make such an estate actually to be.

Now
Now if you change the Question, and make it not, Whether God hath appointed such a middle state and condition (for it is plain he hath revealed the contrary) but, Whether by his absolute power he could not have done it, there would not a negative answer be hastily returned.

In the second place, There are many things are not the same in their essence, and yet for their existency are inseparable; so that it would be unreasonable to demand the separation of them. Do not those of the contrary Judgement say, Remission of sinne and inward Renovation are not the same things, that they are two distinct benefits? Yet if the Papists should demand of them, that they should assigne such a middle estate, of one whose sinnnes are truly pardoned, and yet not inwardly renewed, would not the answer be, They are inseparable in their existency, though distinct in their essence? Thus a substance is really distinguished from its accidents, yet we say against the Papists, that it cannot subsist without them, though they run to Gods power to maintain their miraculous Transubstantiation.

To instance in a third thing, Doe not the Orthodox say, That faith alone justifieth, though it be not alone, that its not Solitaria, though sola in the act of justifying? This being the truth of God, we matter not the Papist expostulating, Why faith may not be separated from charity? What repugnancy this is for faith being divided from other graces to justify? By these instances we see, that its no new thing, for several things to be indispensably and individually conjoincd together: So that we cannot say, one can be without the other, though we may truly say, one is not the other. Thus though to have sinne forgiven, cannot according to the order God hath now established, be without righteousness, yet that is not because they are the same thing in nature.

Thirdly, But that which we conceive to be the full and plenient answer is, That righteousness and sinne, life and death, in the sense controverted, are not immediately
ly and naturally contraries: But in a moral sense, by the appointment and arbitrary Will of God; so that if he had pleased, he might have ordained it otherwise: So that Righteousness and sinne, though in a Subject capable, are not naturally contrary, as light and darkness, which in their proper Subjects do necessarily inferre the existence of one at that time; if it be not day, it must be night: it is not one motion that makes the Nick straight, and another, not crooked; he that takes life from a man, doth thereby necessarily kill him, it cannot be hindred. But it is not thus in the State controvcrsed, because.

In the first place, Remission of sinne doth not make a man no sinner, perfect Sanctification doth this, or imputed Righteousness. It hath been often said, That by forgiveness of sinne a man doth not cease to be a sinner, but to be obnoxious to eternall punishment: So that to be righteous in the controversy, is not to have habitual Holiness, to which saine is an immedeate contrary, but to be judged righteous by the Obedience which another hath done for us. Hence it is, that while a man is accounted of by God, as righteous through Christ, yet at the same time he hath sinne and corruption cleaving to him, which God seeth and chastiseth him for: So that, as is to be shewed, it is but a calumny to fasten that Antinomian Position, Of God seeing no sinne in his people, upon the Doctrine of Imputed Righteousness. This Viper can no more cleave to that, then to the Doctrine of Satisfaction by the death of Christ, as is more largely to be shewed.

In the second place, Though life and death be contraries in a natural consideration, yet the life and death understood in the controversy, are made contraries one by Gods appointment, and so they are opposite by an external appointment; for the life we speak of is that heavenly and glorious life which God of his goodnesse
What is not that Righteousnes

will bestow on those that are his, and therefore cannot follow by naturall reluctancy upon the death removed, that God hath threatened; for though God in Mercy would not damne a man, yet it doth not necessarily follow, That therefore he must give him such a life as that glorious being in Heaven; for either he might have destroyed him, or if he had perpetuated his life, it might have been, as some Divines say, Adam would have been partaker of, had he continued in Obedience, (viz.) an happy blessed life here on earth. So that though our life and our death, which are natural, be immediate contraries, yet the eternall death and eternall life are so from the appointment of God only, and then no wonder, seeing they are two distinct benefits, if they be produced by two distinct causes.

To these things we may adde that instance of Adam's, which the learned mention; for Adam, though he was not indeed created in a middle neutrall estate, but after the Image of God in Holinesse, yet though free from the guilt of sinne, he had not a right to eternall life, for that was upon his perfect and persevering Obedience. So that in him we have a clear proof, That a man may be without the guilt of sinne, he was not in a state of wrath, and yet he was not entituled to Heaven, and eternall Glory. And this is acknowledged in effect by the Adversary, who faith, That eternall Glory cometh not by Justification, but Adoption, then all their own Arguments will be retorted upon themselves; for by Remission of sinne a man is delivered from all evil, and yet this is not enough to make him happy without Adoption: They may as well say, All Adoption lieth in Remission of sinne, as well as all Justification. But howsoever they deny this eternall life to be by Justification, yet the Apostle doth expressly attribute it to this priviledge, Rom. 5.18, where it is called Justification to life: So that as condemnation doth include eternal death, thus Justification must eternal life.

I shali
whereby a man is Justified.

I shall conclude this with Admonition, to desire the sense and feeling of this Justification in our selves, as well as the distinct knowledge of it. What if thou art able to confute all Adversaries, and to free the Truth from all accusation? Thou canst justify this Justification, and yet art not justified thy self: But if thou art made partaker of it, then do thou with all thankfulness and joy break out into the praises of that great God, who hath thus justified thee.

O o 2 SECT.

Admonition.

SECT. V.

Of the Imputation of the Righteousness of Christ both Passive and Active.

Serm. XXIX.

That a Believers Righteousness is Imputed. Divers Propositions about Imputation of Good and Evil, and of Christ's Righteousness in particular.

Rom. 4:11.

And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the Faith, which he had being yet uncircumcised— that righteousness might be imputed to them also.

He Apostle having fully demonstrated, how we are to be justified, he now proceeds to shew who they are that are thus justified; he passeth from the Manner to the Subject; for whereas it might be objected, That this instance of Abraham might not at all belong to the Gentiles, because
because he was circumcised; in this verse he saith, That Abraham received the sign of this righteousness of faith, while he was uncircumcised, and therefore circumcision and uncircumcision did not vary this matter.

In the words then we have Circumcision described:
1. From the general nature of it, A sign and seal.
2. From the signified grace, The righteousness of faith.
3. From the subject, Abraham received it.
4. From the exemplarity of this, this did not belong to Abraham alone, but to believers, both circumcised and uncircumcised. That righteousness might be imputed to them also.

Though learned men do much discourse the former part, founding the true Nature and Definition of Sacraments thereupon, yet my purpose is onely to insist on the last clause; That righteousness may be imputed to them also.

Wonder not, if for the demonstration of the Nature of Justification, most of my Texts are taken out of this Epistle to the Romans, for here is the proper seat of that Doctrine; and therefore Melanthon was wont to call the Epistle to the Romans, The Confession of the Reformed Churches. Now this fourth Chapter doth expressly speak of an imputed righteousness, its nowhere so evidently and purposely treated on, as in this place; for the Apostle doth at least eight times mention this phrase of imputing or accounting righteousness: what is implied in this phrase, shall be opened in handling the Doctrine, which is,

That the righteousness the believer hath is imputed. It is an accounted or reckoned righteousness to him, it is not that which he hath inherently in himself, but God through Christ doth esteem of him as if he had it, and so deals with him as wholly righteous. This is a Passive righteousness, not an Active righteousness, a righteousness we receive, not that we do. To understand this, consider many Propositions.

First, That this Doctrine of imputed righteousness is by all erroneous persons judged to be like the abomination of desolation.


However heretical persons contradict one another in other things, yet against this they are unanimously conspiring. It is well enough known what reproaches and mocks are put upon it by the Popish party, calling it the putative and chimerical righteousness. The Socinians they abominate it. The Castellians, however, saying, they have an imputed learning, and imputed modesty, that hold imputed righteousness. The Arminians, though they grant faith to be accounted for righteousness, yet to say Christ's righteousness to be imputed to us, they think to be an Idol of the Protestants brain, and say, it's nowhere expressed in Scripture. But no wonder that the Egyptians (as I may to say) should rise up against it, when the Israelites fight against one another concerning it; of which more in its time.

Let this satisfy us, that the Scripture doth thus often mention an imputed righteousness, and therefore should not be matter of reproach, but worthy of all acceptation; and certainly, seeing none of us have such an inherent righteousness within ourselves, as is able to endure before to perfect and holy a God; We ought greatly to rejoice in the goodness and mercy of God, who hath provided such glorious robes for us, that when we were wholly naked and undone, yet hath procured a righteousness for us, that neither men or Angels could bring about.

Secondly, Consider that the word answering this imputing, is in the Hebrew Chaftab, and in the Greek Ἀκονισμός, of which the summe, (as the learned say comes to this,) That though the words in the general signifie to think, to reason, to imagine, &c. yet very frequently it is used to account or reckon by way of computation, as Arithmeticians use to do; so that it is, as it were, a judgment pass upon a thing, when all Reasons or Arguments are cast together. And from this its applied to signify any kind of accounting or reckoning; and in this sense, imputation is taken here for God's effecting and accounting of us righteous. Therefore when the Osiandrists make imputare, to be as much as the infusion or putting of righteousness into us, as imputare is to cut off; or the Papists to make it an infusion of holy qualities, they go as farre from
Thirdly, although some learned men are very prolix and
large in distributing of this imputation, and making several
kindes of it, yet that which is most proper and fit to our
controversie in hand, is, That to impute, is to account or rec-
kno to a man such a thing, or cause of it, which he hath not, or
bath, whether it be good or evil. Imputation doth not al-
ways imply an absence, or a want of the thing, as Armini-
ans would have it; nor is it always of that which is good and
blessed, it may be of that which is evil, and to be punished,
sins are imputed as well as righteousness.

Now a sinne or the evil of it, may be imputed two
ways:

1. Justly and righteously, when any man hath indeed
committed such a sinne that is imputed to him; Cain's mur-
der of Abel was imputed to him, and thus every man, till
God pardon his sinne, it is imputed to him, Psal. 32. All
impenitent sinners have their sinnes imputed to them, though
others, or they themselves will not reckon themselves sin-
ers, yet God will; and this imputation of sinne after a just
manner may be, when a man though he bath not expressly
sinned such a sinne, yet by interpretation, or some other
equivalent respect, he is fain to do it. To this purpose may
be brought that place discussed so much by Interpreters,
Lev. vii. 4, where the word faith, That if a man kill any
Ox or Lamb for an offering, and doth not bring it to the door of
the Tabernacle of the Congregation, blood shall be imputed to
that man, he hath shed blood; That is, say some Expositors,
That if a man do not keep to Gods order and command in
the sacrifices and worship he appointed, it is as hainous a
sinn as if he had committed murder, as if he had killed a
man; and this imputation by way of equivalency, is often
amongst men.

In the second place, There is an imputation of evil, or the
cause of it unjustly, when that is accounted upon a mans
score, which yet he is not guilty of. Thus David said, They
laid to his charge things he never did; and thus evil judges
when
when they condemn the innocent, as Pilate did Christ, and the Jews charging him with such crimes that he was not guilty of, did impute sin unjustly.

In the second place, There is an imputing or accounting a good thing unto a man,

1. Justly and righteously, as when the Apostle faith, Rom. 4. To him that worketh, his reward is reckoned of debt. Thus if there were any perfect fulfillers of the Law, eternal glory would be reckoned unto them, as the just reward of their labours.

2. There is an imputation of good unjustly and unrighteously, and that is, when an ungodly Judge shall acquit a guilty person against Law, or as when the Israelites did impute all the plenty and abundance they had to their Idolatry, because they did worship the Queen of Heaven.

3. There is an imputation by grace, which is, when righteousness and reward is accounted to an offender, not of debt, but of grace, yet having just and weighty causes for such an absolution and justification. And this is the proper way of our Gospel-imputation. He that is ungodly (as the Apostle speaketh) Rom. 4. is justified, God doth account him as righteous, though a sinner in himself, not of debt; for, How can he that deserveth to be damned, deserve to be saved, but of meer grace? yet that this grace might have a free passage, and not impeach his justice and holiness, Christ became an atonement for us, and made himself an expiation for our sins, and hereby God might appear both merciful and just. This is the righteousness imputed, that a believer is wholly to rest upon.

Fourthly, The Scripture speaketh but of a two-fold imputation, in reference to our matter in hand, an imputation of debt, and an imputation according to grace. This distinction you have Rom. 4. 4. To him that worketh the reward is accounted of debt. Though some may think that imputation is here taken improperly, yet that is upon a false supposition, as if imputation did always suppose some indebitem where it was: but that is not so, 2 Tim. 4. 16. Paul there prayeth concerning such who forsook him, an rogion dous, that it be not
laid to their charge, that it be not imputed to them. 2. The Apostle mentioneth an imputation of grace, and that is most remarkably seen in the Gospel, our sins being imputed to Christ, and his righteousness to us; God doth not absolutely and simply of meer grace pronounce us righteous, but Christ is become our Surety, and so as in the first Adam we are made sinners; thus in the second Adam we are made righteous; This is the wonderful grace of God, herein were the manifold riches of his wisdom seen, that when we were neither able to satisfy the penalty of the Law, or to bring a conformity to it, Christ interposeth, and is become both redemption and righteousness for us.

Fifthly, Hence in this Imputation of Christ's righteousness unto us, There are these things observablc,

1. That there is no foundation or cause within us of this Imputation; when God doth account or reckon us as righteous, then he finds not any thing in us, neither is it because of any foundation we have laid, it is wholly from without us, even from Christ; and this should teach us in that great and noble privilege of Justification, to fix our eyes and meditations more without us; What is the reason that every believer is not with the Church in the Canticles ravished with Christ, accounting him as the chiefest of ten thousand, always languishing and breaking in desires after him? Even because we dwell in our selves, we rest in our selves, we would have a bottom, whereupon to stand and not be belonging to Christ only; When an earthly Judge shall justify a man, he must have a foundation in the man, else he is an abomination to the Lord: but God, though he doth not justify without a righteousness, yet the foundation thereof is not laid by our selves, but it is Christ that beareth up all.

2. It is so farre, that there should be any foundation sought for in us, that there is the clean contrary. When God justifieth he might justly condemn, if we regard what is to be found in us, which makes the Apostle call Rom. 4, the subject justified an ungodly man, viz. one that is not absolutely and perfectly righteous: Infomuch that we may justly stand

5. In the Imputation of Christ's righteousness these things are observable.

1. Nothing in us wherefore God should account us righteous.
and admire the wisdom of God, who hath taken such a way to justify us, as to keep us in a perpetual fear and trembling: for while looking into ourselves, we see nothing but matter of death and condemnation, God at the same time giveth immortality and glory. This is the reason why the Scripture so oftens calleth grace of God, because it is bestowed upon such who are unworthy, and that have nothing in themselves, but the desert of hell, and eternall vengeance.

3. Hence it is that this Imputation lieth in a relative respect of God's knowledge and will to us. For seeing that Christ by compact and agreement with the Father, undertook our debt, and promised to expiate sin, and bring about an eternal righteousness, when Christ had fully discharged this undertaking, and nothing more was to be laid to our charge, then doth God the Father judge us, and account us to be righteous; and indeed herein lieth the infinite comfort and consolation of a Christian, that it is God himself who imputeth this righteousness, therefore what he accounteth to be must be, and shall stand, its God that justifieth, and no condemnation can stand against his counsel.

4. Though this Imputation be thus relative in God's purpose towards us, yet it is real, it hath a most sure and solid being. For that is the daily cavilling of the Adversary, as if we made some Idea and meer figment, an Ens that did neither subsist in God, or Christ, or in ourselves. But though it be in God's minde and will with a relative respect to us, yet it is real and substantial, it is not a meer notion or fancy: for, as you heard, the foundation of it is real, the obedience of Christ; and can there be a surer Rock then this? So the cause of it is real, God's will and Covenant to accept of what Christ did, as if we our selves had done it. Its not then fictio juris, or a meer imagination, but there is a real payment, and a full discharge, which is abundantly able to make us righteous; and although some Divines do divide Imputation into real and rational, making the Gospel-imputation to be a rational or mental Imputation, that is not to be understood, as if hereby they made it a meer fancy or fiction, only we are not really righteous
ous to be justified in our selves, but its a translation, as it were of Christ's righteousness to us, by God's will and appointment. Let not the believer then, while he would satisfy his soul with this imputed righteousness, be afraid this is only some pleasing dream, or an humane fiction; but let him look upon it as that which stands upon a sure foundation, as the heavens and earth do. For what is it that keeps thee from falling into nothing but God's will and power? And is not the same Will of God farre more interested in this imputed righteousness? Fear not then that this beam will break under thy arms: All the believers that ever have or shall be, may lean on this; and not sink under them: Its real, sure and solid, though it be imputed, which doth also appear in the real and lively effects thereof, it brings peace, joy and everlasting consolation to such as partake of it; It makes them glory in tribulations, and triumph over all adversities.

Sixthly, In this Imputation we are to consider the thing itself, the cause and the effect, for all these are accounted to us. The thing itself is righteousness, what is more necessary then this to a sinner? For if you do respect God, he is holy and righteous, and loves only righteousness: if you do regard the Law of God, that commands only righteousness, both in the root and branches; if heaven and glory, that is only provided for righteous persons. Oh then! What can a poor sinner do without righteousness? This then should rejoice the humbled sinner, that in that very thing he is so much afraid and troubled, God hath provided a remedy. A righteousness thou dost want more then food, raiment, or any earthly comfort in the world, and therefore behold the marvellous kindness of God, who hath thus provided one for thee. 2. There is the cause of this righteousness, and that is Christ's obedience, for its no contradiction, That Christ's obedience should be both the meritorious cause of our justification, and our material righteousness likewise, or that matter, which imputed to us, makes us righteous: God then looketh upon us, as if we had done and suffered all that Christ did; and although it seem very harsh to some, to say, That God looketh upon Christ's fulfilling the Law, as if we had
had fulfilled it, and as if we had done compleat obedience unto it, yet there is no just reason to be offended at this, no more then to say, That God looked upon us in Christ satisfying his justice, as if we had done it, or thus to say. Christ is our Surety, Christ is the second Adam. And then lastly, The effect of this righteousness is accounted to us, and that is, we have now a right to eternal life, we now have boldness unto the throne of grace, we have liberty to come before God, there is nothing to be objected against us, we may not fear any arrests or accusations: Oh what tongue of men or Angels is able to express the happiness of this man, who hath imputed righteousness! By this imputation they are what Christ their Surety is, God looks upon them as having Christ's loveliness and perfumes upon them. This is true, and no Antinomian Positions can be inferred from hence.

Seventhly, In this Imputation of righteousness, because it is necessarily conceived to make a relative change, it hath a term, from which and to which; or as some learned men express it, there are two manners of this Imputation, whereof the one is called Negative, the other Positive. The Negative Imputation, is, the not imputing of sin, sin is not charged upon us. The Positive is an affirning or reckoning of righteousness. Thus some would make it the same motion, distinguished only from the several terms it relateth unto. But as we have shewed before, there is no inconvenience, yea a necessity to make remission of sin and imputation of righteousness two distinct things.

Eighthly, If in this Imputation of righteousness there seem many things absurd to carnal reason, its not therefore to be rejected, as not being the truth of God. The Doctrine of the Trinity, or the Resurrection of the dead, Is it not very incredible to flesh and blood? Yea doth not the Socinian cry down an imputed Satisfaction with as much confidence as these can an imputed righteousness in the sense explained? And therefore the Socinians do equally reject both: Was it ever heard, say they, that another mans innocency or obedience should be accounted unto a man as his own? They will grant that in civil things, another mans money may be accounted as mine, but that another mans obedience should be judged mine,
mine, this they abhor. But as the Lord Christ is called wonderful, Isa. 9. so is every thing in him, and that comes from him, wonderful: his natures are wonderful, his offices, and the effects thereof are exceeding wonderful. Therefore, though the Socinians call it absurdum; impium, intolerabile, yea as that which doth contain a manner of our Salvation abhorrine from the holy Scripture, and all humane sense, yet be not staggered at it, for the whole way of our redemption is carried on in a mysterious way. Indeed we are not to make mysteries and wonders, where the Scripture doth not assert them, but when it doth, there we are firmly to adhere to them.

Ninthly, This Imputation of Christ's merits and obedience, is so necessary, that (except the Socinians) it is acknowledged by all in one sense or other. Bellarmine and Bécanus, with the other Papists grant, There is in some sense an imputation of Christ's righteousness to us; so do the Arminians, yea most of those who deny the active obedience of Christ imputed to us. But this certain sense they allow it in, doth not arise to the full dignity and worth that is to be attributed unto Christ in this particular; for its but a remote or virtual imputation, not a proxime and formal one. They explain themselves thus, That Christ's merits are so made ours, that by them we receive grace and power to merit. Thus the Papist. Therefore they grant an application, communication and imputation of what Christ did unto us in this remote sense. So the Arminians with their consociates, They grant an union and communion with Christ; They grant, what Christ did may be applied and imputed to us, but in this sense, that is, for our benefit, for our good; so that through his death either faith should be accounted of as a full righteousness, or else all righteousness be contained in remission of sinne. But that his righteousness should be imputed to us, so as to be made ours, and that in his obedience we are to stand perfect before God: This is a Camel to them that they cannot swallow. But when the Apostle, 2 Cor. 15. 21. as also Rom. 5. 19, &c. makes a comparison between our sins laid on him, and his righteousness made ours, as also a resemblance between the first Adam and the second A-
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dam; this cannot but prove more then a remote or virtual imputation.

10. Tenthly, When we say, Christ's righteousness is imputed unto us. This is not so to be understood, as if it were made so formally ours, that thereby we could be said to be as righteous as Christ, and be infinitely perfect as he was; Therefore learned writers do willingly abstain from the word formal, or to say, Christ's righteousness is our formal righteousness; for although in some sense it may be made good, yet because the expression is obnoxious to much calumny, many do not willingly use it, but rather call this righteousness of Christ made ours, the material cause of our Justification: So that when we say, Christ's righteousness is made ours, that is, the matter whereby we stand justified in the sight of God. And therefore

11. Eleventhly, Christ's righteousness is not properly the form of our justification, but God's imputation of it. For seeing that justification is an act of God, it must be something without us that is the form of it; and that is both remission of sin and imputation of righteousness. It's true, many there are both on the right and left hand that rise up against this truth; but what strength they bring will be considered in their Objections.

Let us from these premises with all thankfulness admire the grace of God, who hath not left us without a righteousness, and that a more noble and worthy one then ever we lost. It is much if our hearts do not always burn like fire in the meditation of it: But it is because we are carnal, fold under sinne, not knowing how ill and dreadful our estate is, till therefore that good hour come, wherein God will make known unto us, that dunghill and hell which is within us, we can never esteem this imputed righteousness. Oh! pray for that Spirit which shall convince of sinne and righteousness also!
S E R M. XXX.

The Doctrine of the Imputation of Righteousnesse demonstrated; With Answers to the Objections against it.

Rom. 4.11.

That Righteousnesse might be Imputed to them also.

We have laid down several Propositions to clear this Doctrine about imputed righteousness; Let us now consider what Arguments may be brought to establish it. And

First, This present Chapter will evidently confirm it, Arg. 1. where imputation of righteousness is so often mentioned. The Scripture calls it several times an accounted or imputed righteousness: Now if it be an imputed righteousness, it must be either our own or another. It cannot be our own for these Reasons.

1. Because its a righteousness imputed without works; if then it were our own righteousness, it must be by works; but we are passive in our Justification, not active; we are not to look into our selves, but on Christ without us.

2. It cannot be our own righteousness imputed, because this is made to be of the like nature with remission of sins. Now its plain, That remission of sin is not any work of ours, but a gracious favour and act of Gods.

3. It:
3. It cannot be our righteousness that is imputed, because the subject who is here said to be justified, is called an ungodly man, one that hath not such a perfect and compleat righteousness that the Law requireth; if then a man hath it not of his own, it must be another that is accounted to him.

4. It cannot be our righteousness that is imputed, for then it would be an imputation of debt, and not of grace. Thus the Apostle argueth Rom. 4:4. To him that worketh the reward is accounted of debt, not of grace. For although to work be of grace in a sanctified person, yet so farre it is of debt, as it is a work done by us. But the Apostle in this point doth attribute all to grace, giving it the Alpha and the Omega, the beginning and end of all. If therefore it be not ours that is imputed, whose can it be but Christ's? and that it is Christ's appeareth by Chap. 5. 19. By one mans obedience shall many be made righteous; and at the 24th verse in this Chapter, It shall be imputed to us also, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead. Thus this Chapter seemeth to give clear light in this point. As for those who would make the very work of believing the credere, to be the imputed righteousness, that hath been sufficiently confuted already. Onely let us hear what may probably be replied. Socinus considers the word apostatam and faith, the word is either used simpliciter and absolutely in itself, or relatively; if simply in itself, then it signifieth no more then to have an account or regard of a thing, as when God is said not to impute sinne, that is, not to take notice of it, not to put it in his account to punish it. And it is readily granted, that the Hebrew word doth sometimes signifieth thus, as Psal. 3. 4 What is man that thou art thus mindful of him? There is the same Hebrew word.

5. But in the next place, it may be understood relatively, where the Proposition est or ad is understood, and then he faith it is not to be translated imputata, but reputata. But this is a mere logomachy, for we take to repute and impute all one in this sense, although indeed when it signifieth to repute or account strictly taken, its put absolutely, as Rom. 6. 11. Account
both Passive and Active.

Account your selves dead to sinne, 1 Cor. 4, 1. Let a man account or judge of us, as the Ministers of the Gospel. Sanderus the Jézuité (Lib. de Faitte, pag. 50.) refuseth this translation of the word, because the Apostle when he would use a word to signify impute, he useth a compound word, not a simple one, as Phil. iv, 18. If he have wronged thee, put that on mine account, πάντες ἐὰν ἐσμένεις. Thus Romans 5, 13. sinne, ἐὰν ἐσμένεις, is not imputed without the Law; but this observation is not universal, for the simple word is used, where imputation must necessarily be understood, as Mark 15, 28. He was accounted amongst transgressours, What is that? But sinne was imputed to him. Rom. 2, 26. His uncircumcision shall be accounted to Circumcision. There is the simple word λογίζεσθαι.

But its further objected, That though righteousness be said to be imputed, yet not Christ's righteousness, Proferant vel unum locum, &c. Let them bring but one place, say Bellar. Socinus, where Christ's righteousness is said to be imputed.

To that we answer, That its necessarily implied, for righteousness is said to be imputed, and that cannot be our own, as the context hath cleared; and besides, its Christ's obedience by which we are made righteous, yea we are made the righteousness of God in him. And therefore it cannot be any other righteousness but that; and whereas its said, it would be a kinde of blasphemy to say, Christ's righteousness is imputed to us for righteousness, as if that were not of it self perfect and compleat, but needed a gracious imputation or acceptation: This ariseth from a mistake; for we say not, That Christ's righteousness is imputed to be a righteousness, as if that of it self were not so, onely there needed some gracious condescension on God's part to accept of it for us. But we say, its imputed to us for righteousness, that whereas we needed a righteousness, and had none of our own; what Christ did, is as if we had done it in our own persons.

A second Argument shall be drawn from that notable colla-
sion the Apostle makes with Christ the second Adam, and the first Adam,
Adams, Rom. 5.12, 17, 18. Where the Apostle doth thus argue, That all men are made sinners by Adams sinne, so all believers are made righteous by Christ's obedience. Now how is Adams sinne made ours? Is it not by imputation? Indeed by his sinne we come also to have inherent corruption, and this is propagated to every one; and this is called originale peccatum originatum, but then Adams actual sinne is ours by imputation, and this is called originale peccatum originantis, therefore at vers. 14, its said, In whom we have sinned, or if we translate it, In as much as we have sinned, it comes all to one; Adams sinne must needs be ours by imputation; for what reason can be given, why the sinnes of all Parents are not made their childrens, as well as Adams is made ours? but because of the Covenant made with Adam, and so all mankinde in him. Indeed Bellarmine bringeth this Argument against the Orthodox, and he frameth it thus, As through Adam all are made sinners inherently through corruption dwelling in them; so through Christ all are made righteous inherently by an inward renovation of the minde. Now all this may be granted, as part of truth, but the Apostles comparison is to be extended further; Neither doth he so much intend the sinne that is in us, as that we were guilty of in Adams disobedience. So that here we see the Apostle mentioning two common persons or representatives, and what they do is to be attributed to all that are contained in them. Thus as Adams imputed sin is the cause of all our inherent corruption; so Christ's imputed righteousness is the fountain of all our inward happiness.

Thirdly, Christ's righteousness is made ours; as our sinnes were made his, and that is only by imputation. This Argument seemeth to be built on a Rock, even that Text 2 Cor. 5. ult. He was made sinne for us; that we might become the righteousness of God in him: He was made sinne for us; How is that but by imputation? For he was reckoned among transgressours, and God laid upon him the iniquity of us all. So that although in himself there was not found any guile, and he was the unspotted Lamb of God, yet as he was our Saviour, and bore our sinnes, so our iniquities were imputed.
If it be said, That by sinne is meant a Sacrifice for sin, according to the usual phrase of the Scripture.

It is answered, first, There is no necessity of taking it in that sense, yea the context seemeth to encline another way, for in the same verse is added, He who knew no sinne, he became sinne. Now sinne in the former place is taken properly, so that the expression would lose its grace; if in the latter place it be not also taken properly. Again, sinne is opposed to righteousness in the Text, he became sinne that we might become righteousness; But sinne as it is sinne, not as a Sacrifice doth in its proper nature oppose righteousness; Neither doth it at all tend to Christs dihonour to expound it so, seeing the Prophet of old said, God had laid our iniquities upon him, which must necessarily be understood of sinnes as sinnes; and indeed the more Christs was humbled, debased, and this argued his greater love, and did the more exalt his Mediatorship.

In the second place, Grant that (sinne) be taken for the Sacrifice for sinne, yet still the Argument stands valid. For he could not be made a Sacrifice for sinne, if sinne were not imputed to him. When the Sacrifice of the Old Testament was offered, the laying on of hands upon it, did signify the translation of the sinnes of the person offering, upon the beast to be sacrificed; and thus it was with Christs, who was typified by those Sacrifices, as the Apostle sheweth at large. Therefore though it be granted, that the sense of this place is, Christs was made a Sacrifice for sinne, yet this doth not exclude, but necessarily include, that our sinnes were imputed to him; and indeed, How could it come about, that Christs should be thus bruised and wounded, that he should die such an ignominious death? but because sinne was laid to his charge, for death is the wages of sinne; seeing therefore he had none of his own, they must be ours; not that therefore Christs was to be denominated a sinner, because he took them upon him, to bear them away.

Fourthly, Christs righteousness is made ours, because in him...
only we are accepted. Notably to this doth the Apostle speak, Ephes. 1.6. Wherein he hath made us accepted in his beloved, absolutely so, that it is neither our persons, or our duties can have any acceptance any further then God looketh upon them through Christ; He is the Altar that sanctifieth all, Rev. 8.3. This is the Incense upon the golden Altar, which was to be added to the prayers of all the Saints. Its therefore very much derogatory to the glorious fulness of Christ, to think that he hath only merited and purchased grace for us, in which, and by which we are to stand justified. No, the very satisfaction and obedience of Christ, must be made ours; We must be looked upon, as if we had done it in our persons. A believer and Christ is to be considered as one mystical person, when God looketh upon us and Christ, as two in this sense, then woe be unto us. All the grace and favour we have is in the beloved.

Fifthly, The righteousness we have to be justified by; is often called the righteousness of God; Therefore that cannot be any otherwise in us, but by imputation. Its often called the righteousness of God, Rom. 1.17. Rom. 10.3. 2 Cor. 5.21. Phil. 3.6. Here we are to have the righteousness of God, and it is opposed to our own righteousness; yea we are said to be made this righteousness of God. Its true, in what sense it is called the righteousness of God, may be controverted; and it is agreed upon by all hands (except Osiander, who had few followers, and his opinion lasted but two years, though Andreas Osiander doth labour to excuse him, and faith, the Orthodox kept communion with him, as if his errors were more in his words, then in his minde) that it is not the essential righteousness of God, whereby he is just in himself. Neither is it the righteousness of God in a causal sense meerly, because God is the Author of it, for our inherent righteousness is wrought by God, yet it cannot be called the righteousness of God in this sense, because its said to be revealed from him, and we are said to be the righteousness of God in Christ, therefore not in ourselves: its always opposed to the righteousness of the Law, which righteousness is of God in this sense, that he was the author of it in Adam,
and doth still begin it in believers, and will consummate it in heaven; therefore its called the righteousness of God; partly, because it is that, which he doth approve of, which can endure his sight; for whereas the Scripture faith, in God's sight no man can be justified, implying thereby, that before man they may; Therefore this righteousness of God is such as may be brought before his severe Tribunal; such as God himself cannot refuse as imperfect and insufficient: But especially its called the righteousness of God, because it was the righteousness of him who was God as well as man; and therefore 1 Cor. 1. he is said to be made of God righteousness, &c. Neither can this Text be so lightly passed over, as some would; That as Christ is said to be wisdom, because he is the author of it, so of righteousness, because he works inherent righteousness in us, for this is comprehended in that expression, when Christ is said to be made sanctification to us; Therefore righteousness is here taken for another thing then inward holiness, and if so, it can be no otherwise then thus, Christ is made to us righteousness, because in and through him we are accounted righteous. Now this is so clear, that in the point of Satisfaction, all our adversaries (except Socinians agree) for there we are righteous as to the Law of God, not in our selves, for we were not able to discharge the penalty, but in another, who was Christ our Surety. The righteousness then of God is in the same sense used, as the blood of God, viz. the righteousness of him who was God and man, and so becoming our full and compleat Mediator, brought such a righteousness as was not in the world before: for Adam's righteousness and the Angels righteousness, cannot be called the righteousness of God, as Christ is: if then it be the righteousness of God, it cannot be ours by infusion or acquisition.

Sixthly and lastly, Our righteousness must be imputed by which we are justified, because that which is inherent in us, is imperfect, subject to much dross and pollution, and therefore doth provoke and offend God, if strictly and severely examined. It is true, we have an inward righteousness which may be called so truly and properly, yea in some sense perfect, but never
never so perfect as to be the matter of our Justification, to be such which we may rest upon before God; if therefore our own inherent will not serve, an imputed one must be assigned.

But I shall no longer be on the affirmative part, because in the Discourse of Christ's active obedience many of these things must be realumed: I shall therefore proceed to answer such Objections as are brought against imputed righteousness, and its good to take notice of this, That the Socinians they oppose all imputed righteousness, whether it be by Satisfaction or Obedience to the Law; so that this use we may make of it, That there is not scarce any one Argument brought by Authors against the imputed active obedience of Christ, but the same is urged against the imputed passive obedience of Christ; and when we come to that subject, shall give you the parallelism of the Arguments which are against imputed passive, and imputed active obedience.

For the present, That which is from Scripture most opposed against this truth, is, those several places of Scripture (and they are almost innumerable, that I need not mention them) wherein believers are called righteous, and God is said to approve of them, and to give them eternal glory in reference to their righteousness, all which looketh as if God did regard inherency and not imputation.

But to such places as these are, there is a free and ready concession, That all justified persons are renewed, are made righteous, walk in the ways of righteousness, give up themselves as servants to righteousness, and that God makes glorious promises both of this life, and the life to come to that godliness and righteousness which they abound in: But what then? Is it therefore the matter for which they stand justified before God? Doth this righteousness answer the Law of God. Thus both Scripture and experience is against it. Consider Job excellently clearing this, Job 9.2,3. How should man be just before God? If he will contend with him, he cannot answer him one of a thousand; and truly for a man to think otherwise, or to bear up himself against God, is called hardening,
dening, and such an one shall not prosper. And ver. 15. Though I were righteous (i.e., though I know nothing by my self) yet I would not answer, but make supplication, and the reason of this is laid down v. 20, 21.

For reasons which they bring, they are like the Apples of Sodom, they have a specious colour, but when touched are nothing but dust. And truly it may be great grief of heart, that whereas formerly imputed righteousness was oppugned only by the professed Adversaries of the Reformed Churches; now from our own selves arise men that with great forwardness oppose it. What uncivil passion doth a late Writer shew against this Doctrine of imputed righteousness? calling it to him an unintelligible notion, empty and truthless words and fancies (justification justified, pag. 20.) Surely, its very uncharitable to make such a number of learned men, pillars in the Church, in all their books to have written, empty and truthless words, and to have delivered unintelligible fancies. But let us see where his strength lieth.

1. If the righteousness of Christ be made formally ours, then we are as perfect as Christ, need no more faith or repentance then Christ. To this effect also the great Papists, Bellarmine and others, especially Sanders, is large upon this, that then we should be made equal with Christ. But doth not the weakest and most distempered eye see the feebleness of this consequence? For the righteousness of Christ is not received by us, as if it were subjectively inherent in us, as if there were such a communication of Christ's righteousness to us, as the Lutherans say. There is of the divine Attributes to the humane nature, to make it infinite, omniscient, &c., but it is imputed to us, so farre as we needed it. Its not made ours in the infinity of it, or the extension of it, but according to our necessity; so that we cannot be said to be as righteous as Christ, as perfect as Christ, for we are but the Subjects receiving of his fulness, he is the Agent that communicates of this his fulness to us; Shall we say, the Stars are as glorious as the Sunne, and have as much light as the Sunne, because every Starre shined with a borrowed light from
Of the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness

from the Sunne? But because the Antinomian doth affirm this as a truth naturally deducted from the Doctrine of imputed righteousness, and because the Adversaries also fasten this upon the Orthodox, as an unavoidable consequence, I shall answer it more largely when we come to assert Christ's active obedience imputed to us.

Object.

2. Its objected, If Christ's righteousness be formally made ours, this would make God's judgement to be otherwise than according to truth. For (say they) by imputed righteousness, we should be pronounced just, and accounted as righteous, when yet we are in our selves imperfect; and that God should at the same time look upon us, and account us to be both perfect and imperfect, is that which is exceedingly wondered at.

Answ.

But (not to say any thing of being made formally righteous by Christ's righteousness, which is acknowledged an expression subject to misconstruction) will not this overthrow the Doctrine of Christ's Satisfaction also? For how can we at the same time be looked upon by God, as having the debt paid in our Surety, and yet in our selves guilty? How at the same time doth God blot out our sinnes, and yet in remaineth in us?

2. If it be impossible to be accounted imperfect in Sanctification, and yet perfect in Justification, then one of these absurdities must necessarily be maintained, either that our Justification is imperfect, and if so, then we can have but imperfect peace and joy, seeing our pardon and righteousness is imperfect, or else our sanctification is perfect, which yet is expressly denied by that Author of the Sermon, pag. 17. Its therefore necessary that God should look upon our sanctification as imperfect, though our Justification be perfect.

3. God's judgement is according to righteousness and truth, we be pronounced righteous in Christ, though sinners in our selves, for there is a righteousness whereby we are made righteous, and this righteousness is by God made ours, we being in the number of those whom Christ undertook to be made a Surety for; So that we are not to account this imputation a meer bare thought in God without any founda-
tion of truth, for as truly and as really as Christ died, and
rose again; so all are the benefits which a believer partaketh
of by him. Therefore imputation is grounded upon the sure
performance of that which Christ undertook for us, and if a
tittle of the Law shall not fall to the ground, much lesse shall
any of those benefits he hath purchased. Now there cannot
be imagined any way how Christ's benefits should be derived
to us, but by imputation.

3. Castellio objects, That this imputed righteousness, or the
Object.
Doctrine of it is very pleasing to flesh and blood; Every one will
in a carnal manner be glad of this, for hereby we shall not be trou-
bled about our own righteousness, we will not much matter bow or
what we do, because Christ hath done all for us. But this is as the
Papists object against justifying faith, they say, This Doctrine is
a ground of all carnal security and presumption, let a man live
as he list its but believing, and then he shall be saved.

Now to all this we answer truly, That the way of faith and
imputed righteousness is most contrary to flesh and blood,
we see Rom. 10.3. That the Jews would not submit to the right-
eousness of God, but went about to establish their own righte-
oues, and they spake the natural inclination of all, who said,
What shall we do that we might be saved? It was long ere Paul
could renounce all the things that were gain to him, and
prize the righteousness of Christ only. Its not then a do-
crime pleasing to flesh and blood, but altogether contrary,
for it driveth a man into a self-judging, a self-abhorrenny, a
self-renunciation, and makes Christ to be all in all. By Pha-
risical and Popish doctrines we see, that its more pleasing to
flesh and blood to set upon some extraordinary works, and to
make them the matter of our righteousness before God.
What else is considerable in this Doctrine of imputed righte-
ousness, will be more largely handled hereafter.
Serm. XXXI.

Of the Sufferings of Christ, both in body and soul, as imputed to us for our Righteousness.

Isa. 53:5.

But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities, the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed.

His Evangelical Prophet doth in this Chapter not so much foretell a Prophecy, as punctually describe an history of Christ's sufferings. As for the Jews' interpretation of this concerning the people of Israel, or Grotes his application of it to Jeremiah, though more sublimely to Christ, they are with neglect to be passed by: for Mat. 8. 1 Pet. 2. Acts 8. 32. do evidently demonstrate this Chapter to be wholly a clear Prophecy or rather History of Christ; in so much that our Prophet is like the morning Starre dispelling the dark shadows of Moses, and shewing Christ, the rising Sun.

In the words you may consider, 1. The corrective or adversative particle, But: this is spoken in opposition to those thoughts which the Jews had concerning Christ, for they judged him to be so smitten of God, and put to death in that extraordinary shamefull manner, because God hated him, as if he had been some egregious impostor, and transcendent wicked man: Now saith the Prophet, But it was not so,
Whatever men thought he was thus wounded for our sins and transgressions. So that in the words we may consider what is derived from us to Christ, and from Christ to us, or the manner how, and the form of supplication, with the forefaid allegations, who was God and man, and for our iniquities and our transgressions, who was God and man. The manner of suffering is expressed in those words, he was wounded. This signifieth his death to be most sharp and piercing, wherein all his bones were as it were to be crumbled into dust.

The Hebrew word signifies the proud and rebellious transgressions of God's commands: and for our iniquities, that signifies all sin, any thing that is a perverse inclination from the right way. It is not worth the while to confute the Sectarians, who take this word to mean a particular benefit in self, our peace; that is either generally all that we may consider the mercy and benefit of this, for the crooked, as commonly the word signifies, or particularly, to learn, and there is neither correction or discipline, it comes from a word that signifies to learn, therefore its applied to chastishments, and calamities, and penalties of our guilt, therefore we understand this text should kindle our love in our hearts to Christ, for how dear did it cost him to bring us peace for us; our sins were upon him, he was crucified and died as a sinner, when yet no guilt was found in his mouth.

Thus the word signifies his death to be most sharp and piercing, wherein all his bones were as it were to be crumbled into dust.

The Hebrew word signifies the proud and rebellious transgressions of God's commands: and for our iniquities, that signifies all sin, any thing that is a perverse inclination from the right way. It is not worth the while to confute the Sectarians, who take this word to mean a particular benefit in self, our peace; that is either generally all that we may consider the mercy and benefit of this, for the crooked, as commonly the word signifies, or particularly, to learn, and there is neither correction or discipline, it comes from a word that signifies to learn, therefore its applied to chastishments, and calamities, and penalties of our guilt, therefore we understand this text should kindle our love in our hearts to Christ, for how dear did it cost him to bring us peace for us; our sins were upon him, he was crucified and died as a sinner, when yet no guilt was found in his mouth.

Thus the word signifies his death to be most sharp and piercing, wherein all his bones were as it were to be crumbled into dust.
Thus we have a wonderful exchange, God became man, wisdom was made folly, righteousness was made sinne, and life became death. Having therefore shewed that the righteousness we stand justified by before God, is an imputed righteousness and that of Christ, let us first consider the satisfactory righteousness which is made ours, and this is very clearly and emphatically described all along the Chapter, so that we may call it a spiritual crucifix wherein the Lord Christ is evidently set forth crucified before our eyes.

That the sufferings of Christ are imputed to us for our righteousness. This is genuinely deduced from the text, for our iniquities are laid upon him, he was bruised for our iniquities, and we were healed and reconciled to God by this means. The sufferings of Christ as satisfying God's justice for our sinnes, are our legal righteousness, as if we our selves in our own persons had made a compensation.

To open this, let us take notice of all the other emphatical expressions that are used by the Prophet in this Chapter, for we are not only speculatively, but affectionately and practically to meditate on them; and the Prophet doth so often mention it, as if he in the Old Testament, like Paul in the New, desired to know nothing but Christ crucified. At v.6. we have a notable phrase, The Lord hath made the iniquity of us all to meet on him; where you see, 1. its God's act, that all our sinnes should be laid on him, here is nothing done against God's will. 2. Its the iniquity of us all, all the sinnes of the elect people of God, let them be great sinnes or smal, there is not one but it is laid on Christ. And then 3. They are made to meet on him; the word is taken from many streams of water, that violently meet in one place, and so will bear down every thing before them; thus all our sinnes in the guilt of them, were made to meet on Christ, that had he been meer man, they would have overwhelmed him over and over again, but being God as well as man, he could with Sampson rise up and break these cords. Thus you see the sharpest stings that all our sinnes could put forth, were run into him, but by this he overcame sinne. At the fourth verse, there is likewise a pregnant expression, Surely be.
be hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows. By griefs and sorrows are meant sinne with all the consequents of it, and the two Hebrew words Nasa and especially Saball signify to lift up a thing, to bear, to induce and carry a thing upon the shoulder as Porters do, and by consequent to take it quite away. This place is allledged, Mat. 8.15. and i Pet. 2.24. but the application of it by the Evangelist Matthew, to the healing of diseases hath caused a twofold difficulty; 1. As if the Prophet spake only of bodily diseases and infirmities. 2. As if the bearing of them was not by imputation, for our diseases were not imputed to him, but only by removing and taking away; but seeing the Apostle Peter doth apply it to sinnes, and the Evangelist to bodily diseases, we may say, that the Prophet speaks principally and most directly of sinne, but secondarily and less principally of bodily diseases, because they are the effect and fruit of sinne, so that we may say in some sense, He took all our bodily infirmities upon him, because he took our sinnes upon him; and howsoever the Learned observe that the Hebrew word Nasa may signify the ablation of a thing, which yet is not derived or imputed to him, as God himself is said to take away sinne, Exod. 34.7. yet no place can be or is brought, no not by the Socinians, though so diligent to search in this matter, where Saball doth signify to take away, but always is used to bear and to carry. So that this later word doth necessarily imply a derivation and imputation of our sinnes upon him; they lay as an heavy burden upon him: Heb.1.3. Christ is said to bear up, or up-hold all things, but that is done easily by his power, there is no difficulty in it, only to bear sinne, that was so great a weight and burden, that with great agonies and conflicts, he labours with it; he bore that burden which sinketh all the devils and damned men into hell. No less considerable is verf.10. It pleased the Lord to bruise him, he hath put him to grief: This relates not only to death, but to all those anxieties and troubles which he indured in his soul; and it is observable, how the Scripture doth not referre this meerly to Gods permission, as if he suffered wicked men to procure his death, but here is an higher design and purpose of God;
therefore in the Hebrew it's Chapite, which signifies God's good pleasure, his evallia, wherein he taketh great delight: so that whereas we might be offended to think that God's Sonne, innocent and free from all iniquity, should be subjected to so much misery and violence, this may satisfy us, that it was the just and righteous will of God, wherein his good pleasure did move itself, for hereby he would create for himself the greatest glory that could be: further more, whereas this death of Christ might be accounted only a glorious Martyrdom or a transcendent example of patience, as the Socinians cavil; We have the nature of his death described in the word, Åatham, which word in its first and proper signification doth denote to sinne and offend, and by a Metonymy is used for a sacrifice, whereby the sinne of the offender is expiated, as piaculum among the Latins: So that we are to look on Christ's death, as that which is propitiatory, and expiatory of all that guilt which belongs to us. We may not pass by ver. 11. where the work of our redemption is called the travel of his soul, which cannot but denote the great misery and affliction he endured to purchase our peace. It was said to the woman, that in sorrow she should bring forth, and thus it was also in Christ, it behoved him in great grief and trouble both of soul and body, to bring forth this glorious salvation, which is to be bestowed on those that are his; and whereas it is said, that by the knowledge, i.e. by the faith of Christ many shall be justified, observe the reason given, for he shall bear their iniquities. This makes it plain that we are justified or constituted and pronounced righteous, because Christ did bear our sinnes. The last verse is considerable, where the willingness and readiness of Christ is described, He hath poured out his soul unto death. This denoteth how freely and gladly he offered up himself, though the bruising and wounding was so great, though his calamities were thus inexpressible, yet he poureth out his soul. Oh what a shame and trembling should this be to us, who finde our hearts so dead and dull, so littlest many times to that which is our duty; Shall Christ pour out his soul to death, and shalt not thou pour it out to prayer and to love Christ? Yea this death is
is called v.g. deaths in the plural number, to aggravate it, as if it were many deaths he died, even as many as there are elect people, who without this redeemer were to die in their own person. The summe of these glorious and full texts concerning Christ's sufferings ariseth to these particulars.

1. That Christ suffered in a most painfull and grievous manner. The Schoolmen determine that Christ endured more grief, than all the sorrows of all the men in the world put together: this is certain the Scripture by these several expressions doth evidence, that his pain and sorrow was unspeakable: and if we read the Evangelists describing what affections were upon him both before and at his sufferings, we shall readily yield they were no less, then what were foretold.

2. That these sorrows and afflictions were in his soul as well as in his body: For it is impossible that the body of a man should be pained and afflicted, but the soul must also be sensible of it, because of the near conjunction of soul and body. Therefore in all sorrow and grief, the soul is the principal, the body instrumental; that as the soul seeth by the eye, heareth by the ear, so it is grieved and pained by the body, as Tertullian well, In carne, & cum carne. & per carnem agitur ab anima, quod agitur in corde. Christ then could not suffer in his body, but he must necessarily suffer in his soul.

3. This suffering in his soul, was not only that which arose from conjunction with his body, but also more immediately from the apprehension of God's displeasure for our sins; in whose room he stood. This indeed is denied, and to a great part of Christ's passive righteousness imputed to us is destroyed; but as is to be shewed, Christ died not a mere simple death, as Martyrs; or as ordinary men, but as a surety, as a curse for us, and as satisfying the justice of God, and therefore there were immediate sufferings in his soul, though without sinne: hence we read of those great agonies and troubles that were in his minde, before he had pain in his body any way.

4. Hence Christ's death is to be looked upon as a peculiar extraordinary thing; that as there is no person ever was like him,
him, God and man, so no death like his, being an atonement to God, to satisfy his justice, to reconcile God. This satisfactory efficacy in Christ's death, we have at large shewed already.

Therefore in the fifth place, It is from this compensatory virtue in Christ's death, that he is made our righteousness. That whereas God was offended, death was deserved, and we wholly impossible to pacifie God, he became our Mediator and surety, making this blessed and happy exchange that our finnes should be laid on him, and his righteousness communicated to us; and in this sense all Papists will yield, that Christ's righteousness is imputed unto us, that is, that Christ by his death satisfied the justice of God, and so what he did was as if we had done it, he paid the debt, and so by this means we are made righteous. Neither may it stumble us, that Christ is but once called a Surety; Heb. 7:22; when yet we lay the whole foundation of this exchange upon that, for once is enough; and besides, there are other expressions which are equivalent to it. Now to this satisfactory righteousness of Christ, by way of imputation, there are two arguments brought, which were not treated of before, at least the first.

Object.
The first is this, It stands not, say they, with the truth and holiness of God, that an innocent man should suffer for the innocent. How can we think, say they, that Christ should be thus bruised and wounded for us sinners and wicked men, whereas he was altogether pure; and unsotted? Doth not God himself say, The soul that sinneth, that shall die?

Answ.
But in the first place, seeing that it must needs be acknowledged that Christ died such a shameful and painfull death as he did, and further that he was innocent, so that no guile was found in his mouth; yea Pilate his judge acquitted him; it must therefore follow, that an innocent man was put to death; he that died had no cause of death; no not in any way: So that Christ's sufferings were not like Job's, whom God did by his sovereign power afflict by way of trial, for though this was not done for any particular sinne of Job's, yet he was not without sinne: Though Job was not thus chastised propter peccatum, yet it was not sine peccato: But in Christ
all his sufferings were, if we respect his own person, causeless, he had no sinne for which any of those calamities could be brought upon him, therefore it must be for our sinnes: and hence the Socinians themselves are forced to acknowledge, that though Christ did not suffer for our sinnes as the impulsive or meritorious cause, yet he did for them as the occasion, because by his death he left us an example, and withall received power to do away our sinnes, if no more be granted but this, it will necessarily follow that an innocent person did suffer for a nocent.

2. It is so farre from being repugnant to Gods goodness, that the Scripture aggravatesb this consideration, that whereas he himself was without sinne, yet he would undertake the punishment of sinners: 1 Pet.2.21. 1 Pet.3.18. Christ once suffered for sinners, the just for the unjust: and 1 Cor.5.21. He who knew no sinne, became sinne for us: So that if Christ had not been innocent, it would have been wholly impossible for him to have wrought our redemption, and herein the Scripture preferreth Christ before the legal high Priest, that he was to offer for his own sinnes, as well as of the people; but Christ was unspotted and altogether holy.

3. That which may wholly satisfie this objection, is, That it is no injustice or cruelty for an innocent person to suffer for a nocent, as Christ did, provided there be these conditions: 1. That the person suffering be of the same nature and kinde with those for whom he suffers, for seeing that it was man whom God had threatened, its necessary it should be one of mankinde that must suffer: Not an Angel, if it had been possible for him to be our Mediatour. 2. Its no injustice, if the innocent person be willing, if this be not laid upon him contrary to his desire; but we see in Christ an earnest readiness of heart to undertake all our grief, he desirseth it as the greatest good that could befal him: Hence its said, He poured out his soul an offering for sinne; so that as sometimes the Scripture speaks of God designing and appointing him thereunto, so at other times it faith, He gave himself a ransom for our sinnes: and Behold I come to do thy will O God, yea he was fireightened till he did it. Thus you see this was not against his will,
yea, it was that which he greatly desired.

4. It is no cruelty, if the innocent party be able to bear and endure all that sorrow which shall be laid upon him. Indeed to lay an heavy load upon such weak shoulders as will break under the burden, is unmercifulness: but Christ was able to go through all. Though he was in agonies, yet he cried My God; and though he was dead and buried, yet even from thence by his own power he could raise himself.

Lastly, It's no injustice, If by the sufferings of an innocent person there can be wrought a greater good, and more glory to God, then his mere suffering is an evil: But thus it is here, by Christ's dying for the ungodly, the greatest glory and honour is brought to God, that ever was or can be; inasmuch that God himself could not demonstrate a greater effect of his love, nor could there be a more open way to advance his glory. Therefore in some sense we may say, the affliction and death itself was justly laid upon Christ, not in respect of men, for they did it wickedly, and maliciously, so that there was no humane reason or law to put him to death; but if we do regard God's will, and the Covenant made between the Father and the Son, then it was just, that if Christ would be a Surety for sinners, and satisfy what God's justice and the Law did require, that he must die such a death as was threatened to sinne.

The second Argument hath greater difficulty in it; and many other inferior difficulties are contained in it: If Christ's sufferings by way of satisfaction be our imputed righteousness, then he must suffer all that we were doomed unto; for by what reason he was bound to die, which was one part of the curse threatened, by the same reason he was bound to suffer all the other parts of the curse denounced: Now the other parts were chiefly a spiritual and an eternal death, which seemeth not applicable to Christ without blasphemy: so that its very difficult to decide what sufferings they are which Christ satisfied God with, and are made our righteousness. As for the Socinians they take away the foundation of the question, so that we are not to engage with them: But even amongst those that hold Christ's satisfaction by his sufferings, there are
are different opinions: That which is weakest and most absurd of all is, of those that hold his sufferings only spiritual; that what he endured as our Surety for us, it was only affliction and trouble in his soul: but this doth so directly confront Scripture, that it may be wondered how any can have such a thought, seeing every where almost his death is instanced in as a ransom and sacrifice for our sins. Neither is the argument of any validity which they bring, That if Christ satisfied by his death, then we could not die, or if we did die, then we should be copartners with him in his work of redemption. But this may be retorted on themselves, who hold Christ's satisfaction only in his soul: for, do not many of the children of God feel the terrors of God upon their souls? do not they often conflict with God's anger, though Christ felt these upon his soul? and are the godly when they feel this, copartners with Christ in the work of our redemption? The godly therefore though they die, yet it is not to the same end and purpose which Christ did, for they die not to satisfy God's wrath, or to appease his justice, but their death is made a blessing unto them, and a sure passage to eternal Life.

Therefore dismissing these, there are a numerous part rise up, that hold Christ's suffering by way of satisfaction was only in his body. Indeed they will grant Christ suffered in his soul, by sympathy or conjunction from the body, for its impossible if a man be living and sensible, but that when the body suffers, the soul also should suffer therewith. But this they peremptorily deny, that Christ suffered in his soul relatively to our sinne, as if he apprehended the wrath of God due to our iniquities, so as to tremble and to be in those grievous agonies because of such an apprehension. The Papists they generally go this way, limiting his sufferings to his body. In former times amongst the Orthodox this was controverted amongst themselves, as appeareth by Bishop Bilsons book on this subject, who is also industriously for the negative, that Christ suffered not in his soul in the sense specified; And now very lately this opinion is revived, that Christ's body offered on the Cross was the satisfactory oblation, and that he suffered not in his soul in the mentioned sense. There is a book whose
whose scope is to assert this, and overthrow the contrary,
[Pinchin of the meritorious price of man's Redemption, and
a Sermon lately printed to justify that opinion.] But it may
be made good by Scripture, That the sufferings of Christ,
wherein satisfaction to God's justice doth consist, and which are
our righteousness, are both of soul and body: So that Christ
while he made an atonement for our sins, was not only brui-
sed and crucified in his body, but in his soul also was without
the sense of that joy and comfort, which otherwise he had,
and that because of our sinnes laid on him, though all this was
without the least sin in him.

Serm. XXXII.

Sheweth, By Propositions and Arguments, That the whole Man-
hood of Christ suffered in Body and Soul, because of the Anger of God
due to Sinners.

Isa. 53. 5:

But he was wounded for our iniquities, &c.

Our work is to answer that great and weighty Objection
concerning the manner of Christ's sufferings: For if
Christ's sufferings were a legal righteousness, and he was bound
to undergo the punishment that was due to us, then (saith the
Opponent) he must suffer the pains of the damned, then he must have
have been guilty of despair and blasphemy, as the damned are.

We have declared the different opinions of learned Authors in this matter; That which was concluded on as the truth, was, That the whole manhood of Christ suffered in body and soul, and in his soul not merely by conjunction or sympathy with his body, or because of a natural death merely, but chiefly because of the anger of God due to sinners, whose person he sustained. And before I bring the Arguments for to prove this, I shall lay down several Propositions to state the Question, and to clear the truth, by which all contrary Objections may be answered: So that I shall not in a formal manner mention them, because I intend not to be long on this point.

First, Concerning the sufferings of Christ, men have been very prone to runne into several errors. The Arians of old they argued against the Deity of Christ, because he thus suffered, How could God (say they) be sorrowfull and grieved? How could Christ be God, and yet complain God had forsaken him? Some of the Ancients answering this Argument, and thinking it indecent and unseemly for Christ to be thus troubled, did say, That Christ did not suffer these things in reference to himself, but for us; he did not grieve for himself, but for us, as if these affections in Christ were not so much in his own person, as our person; but this is to overthrow the letter of the Scripture; for as he was indeed man, so he was indeed sorrowfull and grieved: As he was really crucified, so was he also in Agonies, crying out, My God, why hast thou forsaken me? Thus these give too little: Others they have gone too farre, making the very Divine Nature itself to suffer, but that is impossible. Bellarmine and Maldonat cry out, That we should put our ears against the blasphemy of Calvinists in this particular, who say, Christ suffered the pains of the damned in his soul, and that this was his descending into hell. But if Maldonat had remembered his own Rule, when he expounds those words of Christ [My God, why hast thou forsaken me?] he would not have been so cenforious. [Com. in Mat. 26.] He alledgeith very hard speeches of some of the Fathers, which if rigidly examined would be intolera-
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ble doctrine, and yet he can say, *Bono* *Anteores benigni interpretari decent.* But for Calvin, he doth not only wrest, but falsify his words: For whereas Calvin is brought to say, That *vox desperationis* did *abdi* from Christ. This is a calumny, for that is brought in by way of an Objection, is not Calvin's attention; and besides *Harmon. Evangel. in cap. 26.* *Matth.* *Vox desperationis* is not *desperation,* he doth not say. Christ despaired, yet its his whole drift in that place to free Christ from the least insufficiency; Though, he saith, they are too frigid and cold that expound Christ's sufferings of his body only; This, he saith, is to make Christ a redeemer of the body only, and not of the soul. Its true, there are some expressions in Calvin that happily may be in-commodious, and obnoxious to cavil, as when he saith, that prayer of Christ [*If it be possible, let this Cup pass away.*] was not meditata, and that it came from him *sponti,* which he corrected; for though these are well excused by the Orthodox, yet malicious enemies think they have thereby cause to triumph. But no man that reads Calvin can acknowledge any other but an admirable dexterity in interpreting of Scripture, which made Stapleton himself call him, *Suavissimus Scriptura interpret.* and truly in his Exposition of those Texts, which describe Christ's sufferings, he doth excellently shew, That those great fears and troubles which Christ felt, must needs be more then from the apprehension of mere death, even a conflict with the anger of God, and the effects thereof. Therefore though he saith, Christ did *luctari cum desperatione,* yet for all that he overcame all those temptations. As for the opinion of those who say, Christ suffered the pains of the damned; and if Bishop Billons Refuter said, *That Christ suffered as much terror in his soul as any reprobate could,* These passages are again corrected by those Authors, For they say, *That they acknowledge Christ was all this while free from sin,* and that there was not the least blemish in his pure and unspotted soul. But to avoid all calumnies, it's best to keep our selves to the Scripture.

Oneley in the second place, Take notice of this, That the lower Christ is debased in working out our salvation, the more is he
be honoured and glorified. Any kind of debasement that the Scripture giveth to Christ, and that in general words, we are to expound as largely as they signify, so that we do not attribute sin to him. As when the Prophet faith, He was bruised and wounded for our iniquities, God laid all our sins upon him. We are to interpret this of his soul as well as his body, for seeing the Scripture speaketh it generally, we are so to expound it; Therefore seeing the scope of the Scripture is to amplify and aggravate the sorrows of Christ, we are to enlarge them as far as may be, so that thereby we involve him in no sin; Therefore that fear of some, to say, Christ was truly troubled, that he was indeed in such agonies; and so of others, that will admit of no agonies and conflicts in the soul, with God's wrath for our sins, is a dishonouring of Christ, while they think to honour him; for as it would be a dishonour to say, he was not man, he was not in a state of humiliation, he was not crucified; so likewise that he was not grievously tempted in his soul, though without sin: Ambrose spake better, Confidentior tibi nomen, quia omne praeceps. And again, Non erubescit fateris, quod Christus magna voce non erubesceps profiteri.

Thirdly, In this Doctrine of Christ's suffering the wrath of God for our sins, we are not to measure Christ after our own selves, who cannot have any stragglings and agonies of soul without some sinne adhering. Grant that Christ did only fear death, yet no man could fear it so, but that some imperfection or irregularity would cleave to it. Now in all those troubles Christ felt in his soul, there was a two fold difference to be made between him and a meer man. For

1. Whatsoever feets and agonies were in Christ, they were voluntary, he had a command over them, both in respect of their rise, their progresse and duration; so that it was not with him as with us, who are carried captive and overwhelm'd whether we will or no, by those passions that move us, John 11:33. It's said Christ étegæxet evaiou, we translate it, He was troubled, but in the Original it is, He troubled himself. Thus all the afflictions and grief of soul, which were upon him
him were voluntary, he had a power to command these winds and waves to be still when he pleased. Even as he had power over his life to lay it down, and take it up, so of his grief and temptations, so that because they were under his voluntary government and disposing, there could be no sinne in them. Augustine faith well, He took these troubles not conditionis necessitate, but miserationis voluntate, not by any condition necessitating him thereunto, but a willing and merciful condescension.

2. Another difference is in respect of the original from whence these affections flow, for they came from Christ's pure, holy and undefiled nature: So that whatsoever com- motion and troubles might be in Christ's soul, yet they were always holy, for from such a pure fountain could come no other but pure streams: Even as water in a pure glasse, though ye shake it never so much, yet it is pure and clear. But now man being originally corrupted, and so having some mud and filth in the bottome of his soul, he is never shaken and moved, but some impurity and defilement will rise up; Do not then judge of Christ according to what we finde in our selves? Certainly we could not endure such agonies, we could not have said, My God, Why hast thou forsaken me? But there would have been some gradual dissidence, some sinful impatience.

4. Fourthly, That which was the greatest and most eminent in Christ's soul, while he suffered, was not the fear of death, but a want of that joy and comfort, or the sense and feeling of God's favour and help. This was the sting in his sufferings, as we shall prove anon. I am now onely to explain it, because the Adversaries will not understand the sense of the Orthodox, but take up the words of hell, and the torments of the damned, and a second death; as if hereby all blasphemy were uttered against Christ; but we say, That Christ's sufferings, and those extreme agonies in his soul did arise from a greater cause then mere death, it was because of our sinnes laid upon him; and so as in our stead did undergo our punishment so farre as it implied no sinne, and this was for a season to be defitute of all inward comfort, to want those comfortable
fortable apprehensions of God's favour and protection, which the Divine Nature did for a while deny; that so in his humane Nature he might go through the work of our Redemption. To open this, you must know, That though Christ was God and man, yet the Divine Nature did not always put forth such glorious and resplendent effects, as it could do, but did as it pleased obstruct and restrain them, otherwise Christ could not have been in a state of humiliation and suffering for us; We read Math. 17.2. That Christ was transfigured, his face did shine as the Sunne, and his raiment was white as light. What was this but the Divine Nature communicating and diffusing such glory to the manhood? and had it not been for that economy or dispensation, that Christ must be in a despised, servile and ignominious condition, he would have been always in such glory. Therefore that was not a miracle, for Christ to be so transfigured, his humiliation and debasement was a miracle, for thereby was suspended that glory and luster, which according to the natural course, would have been derived from the Godhead to his humane Nature. Therefore its no more contradiction for Christ at the same time to have faith in God, and yet to want the sense of comfort; then to know God was his Father that would support him, and deliver him, yet to be in such extrem fears and agonies, as they confess he was in, because of his death: So that by what means they can reconcile these two together, so can we his faith in God, and yet want of the sense of God's favour in these temptations; And whereas it might be said, That the want of God's favour is a sinne; that is wholly denied, for the meer want of the sense of God's love is not intrinsically a sinne: Even in the people of God, meer and simple absence, or want of the favour of God, by some defections which they are in, meerly for trial and exploration, is not a sinne. Indeed a godly man can very difficultly be in a spiritual temptation, complaining God hath left him, but there is sinne accompanying such a complaint, because we for the most part procure such spiritual defections by our own fault, and being weak in faith do many times offend against the promises of God, but it
was not thus in Christ. It's true, as every thing almost in Christ was a miracle, that he was God and man, that he should be born in such an extraordinary manner, so likewise that he should suffer in such a transcendent way. This Sunne of righteousness suffered an Eclipse by the interposition of our sins, and though he was sensible of, and struggled with the anger of God due to us, in whose stead he appeared, yet in all this he was not overcome, or did he give place to any temptation for a moment.

Fifthly, Though this spiritual dereliction be not to be limited to an external forfaking and leaving of him into the hand of the Jews, yet we are not to enlarge it unto every kind of forsaking, as if Christ were forsaken of God in every respect, as the damned in hell are, but only so farre that way might be given for Christ in soul and body, to accomplish our redemption by his sufferings. For as Christ would not call for a Legion of Angels externally to protect him in his necessity; so neither would he have at that time those inward joyes and comfortable apprehensions, that so he might drink of that bitter cup which was prepared for him, because of our sins: Christ could not have been in those natural fears and afflictions, had not the Divine Nature given place; So neither in this spiritual desertion; But this desertion was not universal; and in every respect. For

1. There was not a dissolution of the hypothetical Union, no not in death itself; for although the soul was separated from the body, yet the Divinity all that while was neither divided from soul or body, he did not then cease to be God, though in such an abyss of grief. Nor

2. Was it a dereliction in respect of graces, as if God did so leave his humane Nature, that it was deprived thereby of faith and hope, or love of God: how low so ever he was debased, yet still the Scripture faith, his temptations were without sinne in him; and this all those Divines do acknowledge, that yet use these expressions, That his soul suffered death, and that he endured the pains of the damned: he was not then forsaken of God in respect of any gracious qualification.
3. It was not a total desertion in respect of every part; for although Christ in respect of his sense and feeling, cried out of this forsaking, yet in respect of his mind and will, he had confidence in God, and knew that God would carry him through that great agony he was exercised with.

4. It was not a final dereliction; all this forsaking was but for a time, he had before and after more comfortable apprehensions; for formerly, when he had told his Disciples, That all would forsake him, and leave him alone, he corrects that speech, I am not alone, but my Father is with me, John 16.32. This he spake before the temptation, but in the temptation he had not that comfortable sense of his presence.

Sixthly, In this Controversie therefore we must necessarily consider Christ as sustaining two Persons; his own and ours. In his own Person he was altogether holy and innocent, free from all sinne, and most beloved of his Father, from whom no show of anger could appear, if considered in his own Person. But then, if he be considered as bearing our person, in which respect he is called our Surety, Heb.7.2. and our sinnes laid upon him; So he apprehended the anger of God, and was to satisfy the Justice of God, by bearing that punishment which was due to us. Therefore that Argument is very weak, which would prove Christ not to bear Gods wrath, because he was always beloved of his Father: For this is true in respect of his own Person: but then as covenanting for us, so he was to conflict with Gods anger; for why was it, that though beloved of God, and most innocent, that he should suffer death, and that so painfull, that the Adversaries acknowledge it to be the extremest suffering that could be in a way of grief and pain? But only for our sinnes, because he stood in our stead; and as the Javelin which was runne at David missed him, and stuck fast in the wall; So the anger of God, which was to have run on us with all violence, by Christ's interposing of himself, passed by us, and fell on him.

These Propositions thus cleared, you may by the help of their light answer all contrary Objections; I therefore proceed
ceed by positive Arguments to confirm this truth, for its very profitable in regard of the practical use which may be made thereof, to know that Christ suffered in his soul, and that the anger of God, as well as in his body.

And

The first Argument is founded on Gal. 3:13. Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the Law, being made a curse for us, &c. Thus we form it: The curse of the Law did reach to the terrours of the soul, as well as to the pains of the body: But Christ was made the curse of the Law for us; he doth not say, Christ was made accursed, but rather, a curse in the abstract, to shew how greatly he was accursed in this death; Neither may you say, This execration was in respect of men, that men judged him execrable, for his enemies looked upon him as worse then Barabbas; but this curse is in respect of God, as appeareth by the testimony allledged out of Deut. 21:23. for though the Apostle intending the sense, and not the words, omits the mention of God; yet in the foresaid place of Deuteronomy it is, He that is hanged is accursed of God. This is universally true, for though innocent and holy Martyrs have been hanged on the Tree, and so their persons were accepted of and beloved, yet the kinde of death was made by God amongst the Jews an accursed death, partly in a civil and political sense, such a death being inflicted onely for atrocious and hainous sinnes; partly in a typical sense, to presfigure Christ's death: So that as the lifting up of the brazen Serpent was a type of Christ crucified, so that kinde of death amongst the Jews in a particular manner accursed by God, called in the Hebrew The curse of God likewise in the abstract, was typical and prefigurative of Christ's death.

If it be said, That this curse was onely in his bodily suffering that manner of death.

I answer, That cannot be all, for its called the curse of the Law that Christ was made, and such as he redeemeth us from, and that is not onely of the body. And again, its such a curse that is opposed to the blessing of Abraham, and that was spiritual in the soul as well as the body: So that unless they will say, The Law cursed the body only, they must not limit
limit Christ's being made a curse for us to his bodily sufferings.

Indeed the Scripture doth often instance in that, excluding his sufferings of his soul, but because his bodily suffering was most visible to the eye, though in other places it speaks in the general, not naming his blood, as when its said, It behoved Christ to suffer, and so to enter into glory, Luk. 9.22.

A second Argument from the threatening, Gen. 2.17. In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt die. This place is brought by all the Orthodox against the Socinians, to prove the necessity of Christ's death by way of an Atonement and Satisfaction to God's justice; for seeing how God threatened upon man's sin, that he should die, and the verity and the justice of God will not suffer this to be violated, therefore it behoved Christ to come and to be a Sacrifice for sinne. Now by death is meant not only a merely bodily death, but all other spiritual punishments of the soul; Therefore by what reason the justice of God did require he should suffer in his body, the same did require he should suffer in his soul; for what reason can be given, why God should release one part of the debt more than the other? If it be said, that because Christ's death was the death of him who was God as well as man, it had an infinite value, and therefore the sufferings of his body were equivalent to those sufferings which we should have had in our souls.

I answer, The meer and absolute infinity of a price, is not enough to satisfy, unless it be commensurated to the sentence that is adjudged by him, who is to be satisfied: for why is it that with the Papists we dare not say, one drop of Christ's blood had been enough to satisfy for us, seeing it had an infinite dignity in it, but because it was not answerable to God's sentence which required death? So we may say, The infinite value in Christ's meer bodily suffering was not enough, because the sentence required more satisfaction. But if you say, The death of the soul implieth sinne, despair, and all such impiety as cannot without blasphemy be attributed to Christ. I answer, The punishments of sinne in the soul, are either such as are meer sinne, such as unbeli
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3. Such as are punishments and fynes too: such are the despair and blasphemy of the damned in hell, with the gnawing worm of conscience in them. And Lastly, Such as are meerly punishments, such are the meere want of God's favour for a time, sad conflicts and agonies arising in the soul hereupon. Now these, though in us they would necessarily produce sinne, yet in Christ they did not, because of his pure nature: Therefore though the threatening doth not infere Christ should die in his soul, in a sinfull manner, yet as far as the threatening could be accomplished in Christ's soul without sinne, it did behave him to endure, that so the justice of God may be satisfied.

A third Argument is taken from the relation Christ stood in, while he suffered, he died not simply in relation to his own person, he was our Surety, and he died for us in our stead; and thus the Prophet faith, All our sins were laid on him; It behoved therefore our Surety to suffer all that we should have suffered, as farre as there was a consisteny with his holy nature; And the Adversaries to Christ's sufferings in his soul, do upon this Argument reject his propitiatory death, because if so (say they) he must then suffer the pains of the damned. To which the Orthodox reply, That he suffered them equivalently, his holy nature would not suffer him to receive any sinfull infirmities, but he was tempted in all things like us, onely without sinne; compare those places, Heb.2.17,18. Heb.4.15. where Christ was to be tempted in all things like us, in spiritual temptations as well as temporal; not that he was to endure every individual temptation in his soul, no more then every individual pain in his body, only in the general it behoved him to be thus tempted, that so he might have compassion on his members in their temptations.

The last Argument is, from the remarkable description of those sufferings which were antecedent and concomitant to his death. The Evangelist's expresssions are so remarkable, that its a wonder any should think that it was only the fear of death, that should thus possesse him, Mat.26. Luk.22. Before his death, the Evangelists record, that Christ said, His soul was heavy to death.
1. His soul, this sorrow it was in his will, as Maldonat and Melchior Canus grant, though Papists. The greatest grief that could be did freeze upon his will, and therefore it was his natural will that desired the Cup might pass away, though with submission to God's will, and then his soul was sorrowful round about, and that even to death, yea its laid, he began to be astonished and to faint away; insomuch that an Angel came to comfort him, yea for anguish great drops of blood fell from him to the ground, and in his time of suffering, he cried out, My God, why hast thou forsaken? I do not say, No Martyr, but no man scarce ever shewed such fear of death, and shall we think Christ was put into this anguish had there not been a greater cause than death only? Add to these Heb. 5. 7. Neither can those of a contrary minde give a good reason, why the Martyrs should shew such courage, and Christ manifest such extraordinary agonies, but that our sins were laid on him, but they felt the pardon of them.

This Doctrine hath a three-fold cord of practical matter, which should not be broken.

1. To take notice and be astonished at his love, who gave himself thus to suffer in his soul; all his bodily pains did not amount to the least of his soul's grief.

2. To detest sin, and to see the heavy nature of it, that cannot be expiated without so much sorrow. And

Lastly, Of gratitude and thankfulnesse to Christ: Oh what strong obligations are upon us, to part with every thing for his sake, who was willing thus to be wounded and bruised for us I No wonder Paul crieth out, He desireth to know nothing but Christ crucified.
Serm. XXXIII.

Whether Christ while on earth, did truly and properly obey the will of God.

Rom. 5. 19.

For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners: so, by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.

The Apostle at the close of ver. 14. doth begin an admirable comparison or collation, between the first Adam, and Christ the second. It was the wicked opinion of the Manichees, that they asserted two principles, one good, the fountain of all good, the other evil, the cause of all evil: But here in a good sense we see described two different or contrary originals to mankind; the one is of sinne with all the evil consequents thereof; the other of grace, with the admirable effects thereof. Now Adams offence and Christs obedience are compared in their nature, their force and efficacy, and lastly their ends: But the Apostle, as he sheweth their agreement, so also he giveth their disparity and disagreement, making the righteousness of Christ to be more abounding to justification, then Adams sinne could be to condemnation. The Text I have pitched on, is a summary repetition of all that had been said, and a brief collection of their agreement together: In the former part you have the mans. As by one mans disobedience many were made sinners.
The Apostle calls Adam's sin sometimes παρετελοθεν, and that very properly, because it was such a fall that brought ruin to him and to all his posterity; in this verse it's called παρετελοθαν, for disobedience was remarkable in that sin; yea whereas disobedience in a general sense is in every sin, some have thought, that the spiritual nature of this sin was disobedience; that as pride or uncleanness are specific sinnes, thus Adam's sin was disobedience. The Apodosis is, So by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.

In the words you have the person compared, One, that is Christ: he doth not say one man, as before, though that be necessarily implied. 2. The matter in which the comparison is instituted, by one man's obedience, ἀνέκδοτην; that which he called παρετελοθεν before, is here called ἀνέκδοτην. 3. The effects or end of this, Many shall be made righteous. Many, this is opposed to that One, by whom obedience was performed; so that the Dispute about universality of Redemption or Grace, is wholly impertinent to this Text and those preceding; for many and all are not compared in respect of mankind, but in respect of the original or root, which is One, (shall be made righteous.) This is not to be understood of inherent righteousness, but imputed; and although it be in the future tense, that doth not signify the compleat and perfect making of us righteous in heaven, as Paresus would have, but the continual and daily efficacy of Christ's obedience upon all the godly, who shall be in their successive generations to the end of the world, as Beza most solidly.

Now whether this obedience of Christ be to be limitted only to that free and willing offering of himself to die for us, or to be taken largely for that whole course of life which was spent in obeying the law and will of God, is disputed by interpreters. Those that deny the imputation of Christ's active obedience, limit it only to that particular and particular obedience of Christ in his death. But those of a contrary way take it largely, for all the obedience of Christ, which he accomplished both in doing and suffering. With these I join as conceiving they have the truth of God on their side: and from what objections they bring, I shall fully vindicate this Text, when
Reasons why the imputation of Christ's obedience is not to be limited to that which Divines usually call passive.

1. The sense of the Scripture when it speaks generally, is not to be limited unless necessity compell. If the Apostle say, obedience in the general, who may say, it was not all, but some?

2. The antithesis or opposition may evince it. Adam's disobedience was an action dittant, or contrary to the Law of God; Therefore Christ's obedience must be a conformity to the Law.

3. Because this obedience is called, v. 18. Christ's righteousness.

Now the sufferings of Christ are never called in Scripture his righteousness; They are indeed our righteousness, but not his; whereas his obedience is his own righteousness, as well as ours, and indeed the very word Obedience, doth properly denote a conformity to the Law.

4. Because by this obedience, v. 17. We are said to have the gift of righteousness, and thereby reign in life. Now Christ's suffering for us is but a part of that righteousness, neither is eternal life promised merely to a man because his sinne is pardoned, but because he hath that perfect holiness the Law requireth, as hath been and shall be (God willing) more at large proved.

5. Because the Apostle at other times, speaking of Christ's obedience, doth make that of his death but one particular act or instance of it. Phil. 2:8. Christ is there said to become obedient unto death, his obedience was terminated in that which doth necessarily presuppose that it was demonstrated in other things before; from the matter or nature wherein this comparison is made, viz. obedience: Observe,

First, That Christ, while in the days of his flesh here on earth, did truly and properly obey God the Father. He was in a state of obedience; that as Adam's sinne was truly and properly disobedience, so was the conformity of Christ's actions unto the Law of God, truly and properly obedience.

Having already shewed, that the sufferings of Christ are made
made our righteousness. Now we are arrived at that noble and famous Question, whether that obedience of his be performed while on earth to God's Law, be part of our righteousness also: That as we are look upon as satisfying the penalty of the Law in Christ sufferings, so also as perfectly fulfilling the Law in Christ's obedience. And because this cannot be clearly determined, unless we first know the nature of Christ's obedience in the general, with the divisions thereof; therefore I have laid down this first Proposition,

That Christ while on the earth, did truly and properly obey the will of God.

And to manifest the truth hereof, consider these ensuing Propositions.

First, It may seem very difficult to explain how it was possible that Christ should in a true and formal sense be said to obey, and that from two considerations: 1. His hypostatical union; and 2. That union of God, which he did receive. For the former, seeing his humane nature was united to the godhead in one person, so that there was but one supposition, and that divinum, How could Christ be said to obey? for if we cannot say that God did obey, no more may we say Christ could obey, seeing he is the Person God-man: But of this more is to be said in answering the Objection, and this Question will then be discussed, whether this hypostatical union doth absolve Christ from any obligation to the Law: so that we may not say of him, as we do of all men, that they are bound to keep the Law of God. The second ground of this difficulty is, because of the union Christ received, God is said to anoint him with oil above his fellows, and he did not receive the Spirit in measure. If then his inward habitual grace was so overflowing, how could he be said to obey, because obedience is properly where there is liberty? now not only the Hypostatical union, but this spiritual Union put him into a state of impeccability: if therefore Christ could do no otherwise then he did, for who may say he might have refused to take our condition upon him, or to have forsworn our Sureship,
ship, when he had once undertaken it, if then he could not sin, how could he be said to obey?

2. Second Propof. This difficulty hath so extremely perplexed some, that they have runne into gross and scandalous affirmations, especially some Schoolmen, they have granted these Propositions as true, *Christus potest peccare, and Christus potest damnari, (Durand. lib. 3. fem. diuin. 12. qua. 2.)* certainly every Christian must reject this as blasphemous. Others they runne to a miracle in this case, (Molina. 1. par. qua. 14. pag. 235.) That as it was a miracle in Christ, that though he enjoyed the favour and light of God's face beatifically, yet at the same time (which naturally is impossible) it should be so ordered by divine power, that he should have the highest degree of sorrow in his will; so its no lefse wonder, that Christ, by a faciall vision and intuitive beholding of God in a comprehensive and blessed manner, was not so determined and absolutely necessitated, but that he did obey God freely. If you ask the reason why they runne into such extravagancies, its because they receive this as an immovable axiom, standing as firm as heaven, *That there cannot be any obedience, but where there is liberty, and there cannot be any liberty, but where there is a power to do good or evil.* But that which they account as a rock, is altogether sandy, for learned men make it clear, that such an indifferency is not necessary to liberty, yet *posse peccare doth not arise from liberty, but mutability and vertibility; seeing therefore liberty is a perfection, we must necessarily attribute it to Christ; and it did arise from the perfection of his holiness, that he could not but obey; and whereas Adam had liberty, and therein a power to sinne, this was because Adam was made mutable, so that his power to sinne did not arise from his liberty, but his changeableness. Let it not then trouble us to say, How could Christ be said to obey, seeing he could do no otherwise? for to be able to sinne is not constitutive of, or ingredient to liberty. Christ had a willing and ready dominion over his acts, and in this was his liberty. That Christ did not, or could not but obey, did not arise from a natural necessity determining him, as the fire doth burn or the sunne shine, but from the glorious
ous perfection of his holy Nature. This doctrine about Christ's obedience doth also trouble the Remonstrants, who plow with the same Heifer that the Jesuites do, and therefore they say, (Apolog. pro Confess. pag. 188.) That Christ's obedience was of another nature than ours; Christ (say they) obeyed the will of his Father, not as we do, under the com-mination of eternal death, if we do not obey; God forbid:
but as an Ambassadour his King, or as a beloved Son of his father, when a King or a father commit any honourable employment or service to him, that he may perform it, adding a promise of a most munificent remuneration if he will undertake it freely and for his sake; therefore, they say, Christ might not have undertaken this office of a Surety, or when he had undertaken it, he might have relinquished it, or he might not have delighted in the reward promised. Thus they are forced into precipices, that are driven by that inamoured doctrine of indifference and indeterminateness ingredient to all liberty. Its true indeed, Christ might have refused to have been our Surety, if it had been of necessity, it could not be by the Scripture so magnified to be of grace. It was a free and spontaneous offering of himself; Lo, I come to do thy will, O God; and although he had an infinite love to God's glory, yet that did not necessitate him to undertake to redeem mankind, more then the apostate Angels. But when Christ had once agreed with the Father, and accepted of this Office, then he could not subterfuge, nor did it stand with his faithfulness and holiness to relinquish it. They were then given by the Father to him, John 17: as his charge and as his trust; and therefore he could not be found unfaithful therein: Christ did obey the Father, though such was his perfection and immutable holiness, that he could not do otherwise.

Third Propos. Notwithstanding this position, that Christ did truly and properly obey, yet you must understand it in a right sense, for in some considerations Christ could not be said to obey: for in Christ we are to consider two Natures, his Divine and his humane: in respect of his Divine Nature, he could not be subject to the Father, for so he was of the
same equal Nature, and indeed its a contradiction to say, that God can be bound to obey, for that would imply he was not God, that there was a greater and more Suprem; then He. (Again, Christ may be considered in respect of his personal subsistence, and that being Divine; in that respect he could not be said to be obedient or subject to any Law. The Arians were condemned for holding Christ in respect of his suppositum, to be subject to a Law, for they made this only an humane subsistence. The Nestorians also, because they affirmed Christ had a twofold suppositity, Divine and Humane, and in respect of his Humane to be subjected, were likewise condemned. If therefore Christ be considered in respect of his subsistence, this being wholly Divine, so that he is a Divine and not an Humane suppositum or person subsisting, then he cannot be said properly to obey: And upon this account it is that Divines of great note, will not yield to the adversaries of Christ's active obedience, that he was bound to the Law of God: for himself, but that he was above the Law, and therefore what he did, he did wholly for us, being no more bound to obey the Law, then to suffer: for seeing (they say) that Laws are properly given not to natures, but to persons subsisting, and Christ was Divine, as a person subsisting, therefore he could not be under a Law: But how farre this hath truth, is in time to be discussed: and we proceed to a Fourth Propof; That Christ considered as a man, and in respect of his humane nature, might, and did properly obey; and if we believe Christ to be a man it must needs be so: for seeing the humane nature of Christ had not a supream essential and infinite holiness, in which sense Christ said, Mat. 19. 17. None is good but God, it was impossible that it should be above all rule of holiness, and though a creature, yet not subjected to the rule of all holiness, which is Gods increatcd will, and therefore when Christ is called the servant of God, its a proper and not a metaphorical speech, as when he is called a vine and a door: and indeed to deny obedience to Christ, as he was man, is to overthrow our whole Redemption.
Neither may we look upon Christ in the state of a Mediator, as the Remonstrants say an Ambassador or a beloved son, as if there were only a mutual and friendly agreement between the Father and the Son, but there was a subordination and humiliation, in which hence Christ calls the Father Lord, and he calls him his servant.

But in the fifth place, Christ was in this obedient way to the Father, only while he was in the flesh, I say, while he was in the flesh, not as if Christ had now deposited his humane nature, or were not still man, but alluding to the Apostle, Heb. 5.7. when he saith, Christ in the state of his flesh offered up prayers and supplications with tears; so that though a Sonne, yet he learned obedience by the things which he suffered. So that the humane nature of Christ, while in the state of humiliation, did properly and truly obey the Law of God: And in this sense Christ saith, his Father is greater than he, John 14.28. not only in respect of his humane nature, but also of that state of humiliation he was in; he was not yet exalted to that glory, to sit at the right hand of God, and to be invisible Majesty and glory equal to God the Father; and this may be part of the meaning of that place, 2 Cor. 5.16. Henceforth know we not Christ after the flesh, though we have known him so: That is, we look upon him now as re-fen again, as glorified, as becoming a new Christ, as it were; he is now exalted, and not subject to those frailties, nor in that state of humiliation as we once knew him to be in. The humane nature therefore of Christ, while in the state of humiliation was subject to the Law of God, and so capable of obedience: This is to be observed, for Christ might have taken our nature upon him in a glorified way, and not in a servile: To be above the Law, and not made under the Law. As the humane nature of Christ now is in heaven, it doth not cease to be a creature; yet we cannot say, Christ is there in a state of obedience; for although the humane nature of Christ doth love God, and delight in him, yet it doth not this from subjection but from perfection. The holiness it puts forth in heaven, is not so much to be considered as a duty, but as part of that beatitude and glory it hath: Its obedience
not formally but materially; to be sure its not such as to
which a promise is made. Those that deny Christ's active ob-
bedience imputed to us, because it was a debt which every
creature oweth to God, and so he was obliged to this, may
do well to consider, that the humane nature of Christ, though
glorified in heaven, is yet a creature, but the holy actions
thereof are not by way of a duty so properly, but are parts
of its blessedness. But of this more in its time.

6. Sixth Propof. It may not then be denied, that Christ in
respect of his humane nature, while in the state of humilia-
tion, was truly subject to the Law, and so under obedience:
a twofold law he was subject unto, one general, whereby he obeyed that Law which was common to all other
men with him, in which sense, Mat. 5. he faith, he came to
fulfill the Law, which was not only by doctrinal exposition
of it, but by practical obedience to it, yea not only the
Moral Law, but even the Ceremonial Law also, which al-
though it was given to sinners, and denoted some kind of
expiation, yet Christ subject ed himself to it, not for himself,
but for us, who were sinners, that so the imputed righteousness of all the Law of God might be fulfilled in us. The
particular Law he was subject unto, was that peculiar precept
of dying for us. Now that Christ was truly obedient unto
the Father, and subject ed thus to the Law, may appear part-
ly by those texts wherein his obedience is spoken of, Phil. 2.3
and Heb. 5.7. and Is. 53. where he is called God's righteous
servant, partly and more principally in that God is said to
command him, and he is said to keep his commands.

Hence Propof. 7. Christ's obedience was truly so, because
it was done to his Fathers command, which was truly and
really a command, Act. 7.37. compared with Deut. 18.18. So
Christ doth often call his Fathers will, in the work of our
Redemption, a command, John 12. 14. John 15.10. If
you keep my Commandments ye shall abide in my love, as I keep
my Fathers Command, and abide in his. Neither may these
texts be expounded of a permission and not a command, for
if so, then Christ might as well not have been our Redeemer
as our Redeemer, yea he might have deserted it, after he had
begun
begun it; without any sin at all: But this could not be, for
had not a Law or command required this of Christ; his righ-
teousness which he wrought for us could not be called δικαιο-
ματικός: neither could Christ himself, or we in him, be said
to be dead to the Law, if that had not been satisfied; yea
then Christ could not have said that notable profession, Psal.
40.7,8,9. My ears hast thou opened; Behold I come to do thy
will O God: Thy Law is within my heart. As then the com-
mands Christ gave his Disciples were truly and properly com-
mands, not permissions, or bare insinuations of a will, so was
that which Christ had of the Father, for in that of John 15.18,
he makes them of the same nature.

Propof.8. Though Christ's obedience was properly to a
command, yet this command was not imposed on him to the
same ends as it is on men, for a command is given us for di-
rection, to instruct the minde, and to quicken or stirre up
the heart; but Christ needed neither of these, for his minde
was fully indowed with all knowledge, and his heart was
full of all ready affections to do God's will; therefore he
said it was his meat and drink to do his Father's will. No hun-
gry or thirsty man could more desire the relieving of those
appetites, then he longed to do his Father's command: If
you ask whether this command had a threatening to it, for if
not to obey would have been a sinne, then eternall death
would have followed, and so the commination of damnati-
on would have been by way of addition to the command im-
posed on him, as it is on us. But that is not necessary, for the
command was not given to him, to stirre and quicken him
up to his duty, as it is to us, but for other ends: Yea a learn-
ed Divine (Cloppe. Syntag. pag. 469.) doth acknowledge,
that Christ was under the commination of the Law, but yet
this did not strike any terrou into Christ, because the threat-
ing in it self doth only inform of God's hatred against sinne,
it doth not inflict terrou but by accident, supposing a man
to be fallen by sinne. Therefore Adam in the state of inte-
gruity had a threatening joyned to that explanatory command,
which yet could not strike terrou into him, till he had fin-
ned. Indeed this did inform him, how much God hated
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such transgression, and so thereby might inflame him to hate sin the more: But of this more, when we consider how Christ was under the Law. And certainly, the more we consider that Christ was in an obediential way, and became like a servant subject to God: As it did more debaze him, so it ought to stirre us up to more thankfulness, and to make us say of every Law of Christ, which he did of that will of God to be our Redeemer, *Behold, I come to do thy will, thy Law is within my heart.*

S E R M. XXXIV.

Divers Propositions tending to clear the Point of The Imputation of the Active Obedience of Christ. And the Point truly stated.

R O M. 5. 19.

So by the Obedience of one shall many be made righteous.

We proceed to a second Observation from these words, viz.

That by Christ's Obedience all believers are made righteous. That Christ was in a true and proper state of Obedience hath been demonstrated.
The next thing to be considered is, the relation of it to us, and that is in those words, we are made righteous by it. A man may be made righteous two ways, either legally by imputation, that which our Saviour hath done being accounted to us; or qualitatively and inherently, by having the inward principles of righteousness, and acting accordingly. Popish Interpreters, they expound it this later way, and some other that are Orthodox, but without cause. Stapleton [Antidotum loc.] thinketh there is a great advantage for their opinion of inherent righteousness in the words ἀνάλαβεν ὑμᾶς, which (faith he) implicitly a true and real righteousness, not an imputed one; and wonders at Beza, that he should pass over the signification of this expression, who otherwise is very curious about words; Therefore he addeth two places where this word is used for his purpose, Mat. 34.47. His master shall ἀνάλαβεν, appoint or set over all his goods; So James 4.4. Whosoever will be a friend of the world, ἐξοδήσεις ἄναλαβεν, he is an enemy of God; that is (faith Stapleton) he is not by imputation, but really so. But this is easily answered, Though the Greek word be not ἀνέθεσαν, but ἀνάλαβεν ἄναλαβεν, yet it is the same sense; Even as with the Apostle John, who never useth the word ἀνέθεσαν, to justify, yet hath an equivalent one, which is, not to come into judgment, what is that but Pauls to be justified, and thus to be made righteous is to be constituted, pronounced & dealt with as righteous; Therefore in the verse before its called justification of life, and is opposed to καταδικασθανα condenmation. Besides, this is the willful and grosse mistake of Stapleton and his fellows, that they oppose true real righteousness, to imputed, which the Orthodox again and again disavow: Imputed righteousness and inherent differ not in their truth and reality, one is as true and as real a righteousness as another, but in the manner of communication or participation. We say, its as impossible to be made righteous without righteousness, as to be healthfull without health, to be wise without wisdome; onely we say, its not necessary this righteousness should be inherent, it may be by anothers obedience procured for us, and so judged as if we had done it. Indeed there are some things
things that do necessarily import an inherency in the Subject, and such things cannot be imputed as health doth imply a necessity in existency, but righteousness is of another nature; we may, in Law be acquitted by another's satisfaction, or by the obedience of a Surety pronounced to have obeyed the Law, and here is no contradiction in this; and that this must necessarily be so interpreted here, appeareth by the opposition. By Adams, disobedience we were made sinners, not only by propagation, but by imputation; Adams's sin was ours by imputation; it was not only the private personal sin of Adam, but the publique transgression of all. Thus Christ's obedience was the obedience of all those he did undertake for. Its true, the imputed sin of Adam to all mankind, did cause inherent corruption in all; and thus we also grant, that the imputed righteousness of Christ doth work in us inherent righteousness, but this is not that by which we are freed from condemnation. And as, for the use of the word ειρήνη, the place he first instanceth in maketh against him, for to that we may add others of the like nature, Luk. 12.14, Acts 6.3, Tit. 1.5, where the word signifies a legal constituting and appointing of a person to some office or employment: and thus it doth in this place signifies a legal constituting and making of us just, that whereas before the Law did in every thing accuse us, we are now acquitted and declared righteous.

Thus you see the Text vindicated, and this Proposition genuinely built thereon, That a believer is made righteous, not by his own, but by Christ's obedience, and it hath been cleared, by obedience is meant in a general sense, his conformity to the whole Law and will of God, not that particular obedience only manifested in his death on the Cross. And thus Calvin upon this place, We could not be made righteous, unless we bring the perfect obedience of the Law, and that we cannot, but Christ must do it for us; So that it is to be wondered he should be brought in the number of those who are against Christ's active obedience in this controversy, seeing he doth in so many places averre it.

Before we come to establish this truth, some Propositions to clear the point.
sitions must be laid down to clear it. As

First, That the obedience of Christ hath in this later age (by reason of different opinions newly raised) been divided into active and passive, calling his active that which was in obedience to the command of the Law, and his passive that which was in satisfying the penalty of it. Now this distinction hath been rejected upon two grounds:

The first (for which well it might) was for the absurd impropriety of it, calling it passive obedience, as if we should say active passion, for passion quâ passion, or a mere suffering of punishment cannot be any satisfaction, or merit any reward. There must be an obediential resignation of a man self, with readiness and cheerfulness to suffer, else it cannot be available; and therefore to speak properly, All obedience is active; even thus when it is in things to be suffered. Therefore more suitably to the Scripture we may say, The obedience of his Passion, then passive obedience: Yea, Divines say, That all the actions of Christ had passion in them, and all his passions actions in them, from the very beginning to the end, his obedience was with suffering, and his suffering with obedience. Others reject this distinction, as being the Engine of the Remonstrants to divide and rent the Orthodox asunder. Thus Lubbertus [contra Bert. & contra Vorst.] doth several times disclaim it, attempting to be a Conciliator in the controversy, though inclining to the Doctrine of passive obedience only. But whether they were the authors or the somentors of it, it lieth upon him to make good. Now although it be thus rejected, yet for distinction sake, and because these terms are now generally used, I shall give them the titles of active and passive obedience of Christ, although I think, it were better to avoid them, and in stead thereof to say, the whole humiliation of Christ in all the particular acts thereof are made over to us for our righteousness.

Secondly, You may take notice, that this controversy at least under these terms, is but of late originals. Not but that the Doctrine of Christ's active obedience imputed unto us, was asserted in Antiquity, as learned men shew, but the controversy was not then agitated. The Lutherans, Meisner, Brockes, show

A cenure of the terms active and passive obedience.
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man, Himelius, &c. make Piscator to be the first Author of this opinion, That Christ's passive obedience is only imputed to us for righteousness. But Lucius a learned Writer in this controversy, and appearing for the active obedience of Christ, saith [apud Gat. Animad. part. prior. sect. 1. p. 15.] That the controversy first began amongst the Lutherans between George Kargius (against whom Gomarus hath defended the truth) and his colleagues, which controversy was proposed to the Divines of Wittenburg to be discussed and decided, who gave in their judgement for the active obedience of Christ; yet amongst the Calvinists some did embrace it, as Olevian, from whom, as being his Master, Piscator sunk it, and afterwards with much animosity propugned it, and since some few have gone that way. So that for any to say, Vulgar uneducated Divines (except some few) do maintain the active obedience of Christ in the sense afterwards to be mentioned, is out of fear to vulgarity to run into singularity. For generally all the Lutheran Divines do make the active obedience of Christ with the passive, to be our compleat righteousness. And for the Calvinists, Beza Annot. in cap. 5. ad Rom. v. 17. Junius Tom. i. Thes. de Justif. Polanus Symph. Cathol. cap. 12. Thes. 10. Grynaeus, Gomarus, Wallius, Lucius, Andreas Rivetus, Cocceius, Cloppenburgius, Amesius, &c. Insomuch that Vossius said truly to Lubbertus, that it was the opinion of the chiefest Doctors of the Reformed Church [Voss. 52. apud Sybrand.] Neither may those English Divines be called Vulgar, who have professedly avouched it, Perkins, Reformed Catholick.] Davenant, Downe, of Justification and others. Its true, we are not in matter of Doctrine primarily to look to any men or confessions; this is to call some men masters on earth: And Durand saith well, Omnis homo dimittens rationem proper authoritatem humanam, incidit in insipientiam bestiam. But yet when a Doctrine is decried either by the paucity or illiterateness of the patrons thereof, then its necessary to shew who have not been ashamed to appear in publique for it. Its true, some (though but few comparatively) have appeared against Christ's active obedience, and some of them acknowledged to be men of eminent worth.
worth. But as Augustine of old to the Maniches spake excellently well in controverted matters, *Nemo nostrum dicat, jam se invenerisse veritatem*, sic eam quaramus quasi ab nitisque nesciatur. Thus let all considerations of men and Antiquity be a while reposited, as if the truth were already found out to our hands; but let us by the Scripture and Arguments deducible from it, so search for it, as if hitherto to neither party had attained unto it.

Only the third Proposition may be to advertize. That even amongst those who oppose the imputation of Christ's active obedience, in the sense to be mentioned, there is a difference. Piscator and those that rigidly follow him, limit our righteousness freely to Christ's death, as the whole and compleat matter of our satisfaction; and as for his active obedience, they make that only a qualification in him, who is the Mediator. They do not say, it was needless, or that in some sense it was not for our good, only they affirm the proper and immediate effect of it, was to fit and dispose him to be our Mediator, and this they understand of his habitual holiness, and not only so, but of his actual also, which seemeth to be very strange Doctrine; for by this it will follow (as is to be more largely shewed) that Christ was not a qualified or fit Mediator for us, till he had accomplished the last act of his obedience; for if it be only to qualify him to be our Mediator, then till he had fulfilled all his actual obedience, he could not have been our Mediator and Surety. Others they would have the controversy buried; and *Ursin, Paramus, Lubbergen*, though they be produced against Christ's active obedience, yet they take upon them to be Conciliators, rather than to joyn to either party. *Paramus is said* [Lubbert. contra Bertiun, pag. 15.] to call the Disputes about the active and passive obedience of Christ *inanres vivas*, but I cannot in my Edition finde those expressions; indeed he limits the obedience in my Text to that of Christ's death (of which more afterwards.) Yet he grants, That Christ fulfilled the general Law, and that special Law also of a Redeemer. To be sure Paramus [Comment. in Heb. 5.8.] saith, *Scire dispute about the active and passive obedience of Christ, Quidni ueterque? Why are we not
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not justified by both? And very remarkable at the 9th verse of the 5th Chapter of the Hebrews, he addeth, that the effect of our salvation doth not flow from any part of his actions or passions, but from the whole work of Redemption most fully accomplished by him. Therefore we are not to divide Christ; or distract faith, seeking one part of our righteousness in his birth, another in habitual sanctity, another in integrity of life, another in obedience of death. To this last I fully subscribe, but how it will consist with their other Positions, I see not. Others [M. Brad. of Justif. cap. 13. M. Gatak. Animad. pag. 2.] distinguish of Christ's obedience, his legal obedience, and his servile: His legal obedience was that which consisted in conformity to the Law, and flowing from his most pure nature: His servile obedience is that which was done by him as in a state of humiliation; for Christ, though he took our nature upon him might have been immediately received into heaven, and so not have subjected himself to the Law in that debated manner as he did. So that these learned Authors do not make that actual obedience to be a qualification of him for to make an atonement for us by his death. But grant these particular acts of his obedience are imputed to us, and make up our compleat righteousness with his sufferings. Thus we see the dissent amongst those, that yet deny the imputation of Christ's active obedience to us for our righteousness. But yet because these Authors do grant the imputation of Christ's obedience in some sense; and deny in it other, Therefore

A fourth Proposition is, That the full understanding of this truth, lieth in a right explication of the manner how we are made partakers of Christ's righteousness. We are in the dark, and cannot avoid confusion till we separate the light from the darkness, by declaring in what way we are advantaged by Christ's righteousness; for seeing an imputation of Christ's obedience in his doings, as well as his sufferings unto us, is acknowledged by all the Orthodox, yes and by Papists themselves; therefore here is the difficulty to know, how its imputed, and how its not. Now we may conceive this imputation possible two ways:

1. That
1. That which is called by some virtually in opposition to formally, that is, when the whole obedience of Christ is made ours, that is, say they, for our good, for our benefit and advantage, but not so as to be our righteousness it self. And thus some hold no other imputation of it, but in this sense, that all which Christ did, yea and all that he had, even his whole being was for our great advantage. Though the instance will not hold every way, yet it may well represent it, when Paul said, He suffered for the Churches sake, the meaning is not, as if Pauls sufferings were imputed to the Church, as Christs were, only they did tend to the good of the Church many ways: So, say they, Christs habitual and actual holiness did in many respects tend to our spiritual good, to our justification, but are not any part of our righteousness. Here is an imputation granted, but in a very remote way.

Others, and they are Popish writers, grant an imputation in this sense, that his merits and satisfaction are communicated and applied to us, so that thereby we are mabled to fulfill the Law perfectly, and to satisfy God. So that Christs righteousness which he did, is not made our righteousness, but its the cause or merit of our righteousness; and therefore Christ is our righteousness with them, as David calls God often, his strength and his salvation, in a causal sense. Thus they grant an imputation in this sense, as if we should say, a mans money is accounted for his food and raiment, not that he feedeth on his money, or weareth his money, but because by this he can procure them: So say they, Christs righteousness and obedience, its not that in which immediately we appear before God, and look to be justified by, but it procureth and obtaineth a righteousness for us.

Others, they say, There is an imputation of Christs obedience, and its part of our righteousness, but then they will not yeeld, that it should be so particularly applied to us, as that it should be equivalent to our keeping of the Law, or we might be said to fulfill the Law in him. Here is an imputation likewise of Christs active obedience, but none rise up to that fulness as the fourth and last explication doth, which of
positively determine. That Christ’s active obedience is in the
same way required as his passive: So that as in Christ suffering
we were looked upon by God, as suffering in him: So by
Christ, obeying of the Law we were beheld, as fulfilling the
Law in him: Infomuch that the active obedience is in the
same manner imputed to us, as the passive; and the founda-
tion laid down by them, is this, That a passive righteousness
be not all the righteousness we are bound to have; It’s
not enough to have satisfied the penalty of the Law. There
is a perfect obedience still expected from us: So that he who
would appear in an universal compleat righteousness before
God, must bring not only a satisfaction to the punishment,
but a conformity to the Law, and they judge it a great derog-
ating from Christ, and making him but half a Saviour, to
affirm otherwise; and certainly if we do attend to what was
our duty, and what the Office was Christ undertook for us;
it seemeth to be very clear, that both the active and passive
obedience of Christ, must concur to make up our compleat
righteousness. Though some Divines call it our formal righ-
teousness, yet (as hath been said) because that expression is
subject to logical disputes, we may call it our legal right-
teousness, or that matter whereby we stand justified, comple-
pletely before God; the one is not enough without the
other.

Fifthly, It must be considered, That even amongst those that
hold our justification by Christ’s active righteousness, there are
differences also. For there is a three-fold righteousness in
Christ. 1. That which is essential, as he is God. 2. His ha-
bital. 3. His actual. For his essential righteousness, as
God; none have appeared to hold the imputation of that,
but Osiander, and what followers he had, which opinion
was almost like Jonah’s gourd, that did presently wither, and
is by many Arguments confuted by Calvin, and therefore I
shall not stand on that.

2. There is his habitual righteousness, and some affirm
this to be imputed to us for our righteousness to cover our
original and habitual corruption. But some deny this, as
thinking that rather qualifying and constituting of him, and
so no more imputable to us, then his natures are; for this innate holiness was only presupposietive and materialiter in him, as the Schools use to express such things, and was of the same consideration with his being and subsistence. Therefore

3. There is his actual obedience, whereby in an express manner he conformed himself to the Law of God, whatsoever it was either general and natural, which all men were obliged unto, or more special and positive, which the Jews and children of Abraham were bound unto; or yet more particular of a Redeemer and a Saviour, which he himself only was obliged unto. This actual conformity unto the Law of God thus specified, is that righteousness (say others) which is made ours, and by his obedience unto it we are made righteous.

These Propositions thus stated, the first Argument for the imputation of Christ's righteousness, is to be established upon this Text; for its a pregnant place, and speaks directly and positively what is contended for, viz. That by Christ's obedience a believer is made righteous, whereas in other places Justification is attributed to his blood, here it is to his obedience, and that in a general unlimited sense. That this Argument may stand valid, it is good to vindicate it from all exceptions; some have said that its meant of inherent righteousness, as if to be made righteous was to be inwardly sanctified: but that hath been refused. Others, they limit this obedience, to the particular obedience of Christ, which was demonstrated in dying for us: This hath also been removed by several reasons.

Let us therefore consider what Arguments they have to move them to this interpretation. And

1. Its said, That which is here named in the Text, The obedience of one, is ver. 18 called one righteousness: Now if it was but one righteousness, that cannot be applied to the several acts of righteousness, which Christ performed in his life time.

To this we answer, That it is readily granted, that verse 17 and 18. it may be, if we regard the original, as well one offence, as the offence of one: Therefore its so in the Margin of the Bible; and indeed as Beza well notes, If it were not

Arguments for the imputation of Christ's active obedience.

1. From the Text
Rom. 5.19.
not so in vers. 17. there would seem to be a
redundancy; for thus it is translated, by one man's offence the latter seems to
Death reigned by one; the latter seems to
be tautological, unless you understand the former by one of
ence, not one man's offence. Therefore, an emphatical expres-
sion is to be put upon those passages, by that offence of one,
and by that righteousness of one. But though this be granted
in those verses, yet this Text doth expressly name man, By one
man's disobedience, and by the obedience of one (though man be
not in the Original, yet a person is supposed) So that we
must forswear the very letter of the Scripture if we expound
it so.

In the next place, its further pleaded, That we must un-
derstand it onely of Christ's obedience in his death, because
of the opposition between Adam's disobedience and Christ's
obedience. Now (say they) as Adam's disobedience, which
did condemn was one sin; so Christ's obedience which must
justify us, is but one act of obedience.

But first, there is not the same reason of Adam's disobedience
and Christ's obedience in every thing; and certainly the
Apostle maketh a great dissimilitude as well as agreement,
and it may seem even in this very thing at vers. 17. for there
the Apostle makes it one sin that brought death, but its the
abundance of grace, and the gift of righteousness that brings
life. The opposition lieth between Adam's one sin, and Christ's
abundance of righteousness.

Again, there is not the same reason, because one sin is
enough to condemn; but more then one act of obedience is
required to justify; hence we say, Though Adam condemned
all, yea the greater part of man shall be actually damned,
and Christ he justifieth and saveth but a few, yet Christ the
second Adam is more potent then the first, because there is
required more efficacy to save one, then is to condemn
many; as there is to restore one man to life, more then to kill
many.

Furthermore, Christ's obedience may be called one, even
as Adam's disobedience; for as Divines say, His sin was not
one single, simple sin, but many sins, were ingredient therein,
which
which made it to be a very hainous transgression: Thus Christ's whole obedience, is but one entire and compleat obedience consisting of many acts, even as the adversaries must acknowledge Christ's sufferings was one compleat obedience integrated of many particular kindes of sufferings, for it was not one numerically suffering that procured our Redemption, he suffered from men and from God, in his body and in his soul, extreme grief and torment in his body, as also the sense of Gods wrath in his soul, as Piscator doth acknowledge.

S E R M. XXXV.

Arguments to prove the Imputation of Christ's active obedience to us for our Justification.

Rom. 5. 19.

So by the Obedience of one shall many be made Righteous.

There are further assaults to get this stronghold out of our hands: But this we are to maintain, That by the whole obedience of Christ, we are made righteous. Let us therefore consider what further Answers are brought to this Argument. And in the next place, its said,

By obedience is meant only passive obedience, because the Scripture in other places doth alwaies attribute our Justification and Redemption to Christ's death: Therefore it must be so understood here. This is judged a strong Answer and likely to prevail.

But 1. The Scripture doth not alwaies attribute our Justification...
fication or Salvation to his death: for cap. 4. v. 25. its there
given to his resurrection, He rose again for our Justification!
and at the 18th verse of this Chapter, its said, By the righte-
ousnesse of one, the free gift came upon all to Justification of life:
yea Phil. 2. 8. the work of our Redemption is wrought by
Christ in the whole state of his humiliation, Being in the form
of a servant, and obedient unto death, even the death of the crost:
Where all that obedience he shewed unto God, antecedently
to his death is taken notice of; and what is it to be redeemed
from the curse of the Law, but to be justified? yet that Gal.
4. 4. is attributed unto Christ's being under the Law; so that
we see Christ's death is not every where expressed as the cause
of our Justification and Redemption.

2. Its granted, that in very many places our Justification,
and forgiveness of sins is attributed to the death of Christ,
but not exclusively or negatively, so as to deny the other
acts of his obedience, but because in this was demonstrated
most eminently his obedience, as also his love to us: We are
then by his death to understand, all that course of humiliation
he did so willingly undergo, which was at last consummated in his
death. And this may well satisfie the Piscatorians, for seeing
they hold that it was not mearely Christ's death that was an
atonement, but as laid down by him who in his soul was fully
apprehensive of the wrath of God against sinne; so that
those sufferings in his soul made the greatest part of a sacrifice
for our sinnes, it must needs follow, that by death they can-
not barely mean death, but something more. And as the
strict adhering to the words death and blood, would exclude
the sufferings of his soul, so all his other sufferings, which
yet the Scripture takes great notice of, the reproaches and
revilings he indured, but especially those agonies and great
conflicts he had, while in the garden with his Disciples, that
were before his death. It is a good rule and of use in this
case, In Homogeneis connexis & subordinatis unius inclusio non
est alterius exclusio. But its good to follow the Scripture in
the universal extent of it in describing all that is done for us
by Christ: some remove his active obedience, restraining it to
his passive; others they detruncate his passive obedience, ra-
king away the greatest part of that, and limit it to a bodily suffering: Then come others at the last, and they take away even his bodily suffering also, as to be any imputed righteousness to us by way of satisfaction to the justice of God, so that its dangerous to remove those Land marks the Scripture hath set us; when you once begin to take any part away of Christ's humiliation, as not imputed to us, its hard to say where you will stay: and its again and again to be considered, whether by the same reason you take away part, you do not remove all; certainly the Socinian thinketh by the same blow to beat down all.

The next Answer that is runne unto as a sanctuary, is: That the opposition seemeth to necessitate us, that we restrain it to passive obedience only: for thus they observe, As the disobedience by Adam was not a transgression of the moral and general Law, which did bind him as a man, but it was a special command by way of trial, and obliging only in that case: so the obedience of Christ must be not to the moral and general Law, but to some special command, which was to be a Mediator, and so to die for us. But its well observed by the Antagonists, that the Apostle makes the opposition between Adam's disobedience, and Christ's obedience, as the disease and the remedy, and so we must look for a contrariety, not an identity at least in the manner of curing, otherwise we must say it behoved Christ to have a command about the eating or not eating of the fruit of some tree, that so the obedience and disobedience might have agreed. Every one seeth absurdity in this inference. In the second place, Adam in transgressing that positive special command, did at the same time finne against the general and moral Law, its impossible to break any positive precept, and not to break the general Law of God; for the moral Law of God requireth obedience unto him in whatsoever he shall require, only positive commands may specifies or institute some matter or medium, which was not expressly commanded by the moral Law. Thus all the ceremoniall worship which was introduced by positive precepts, yet is reduced to the Second Commandment.

As for those who say that Adam could not have transgressed.
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Rep.

The moral Law, because that was written in his heart, and he was made perfect. Such argue so feeably, that no answer is necessary, yet ex abundanti, we may tell them, that though Adam was created perfect, yet mutable and changeable: Besides by this argument he could not break a positive Law neither, for to sinne against any kinde of Law, and especially in such a matter as Adam did, must needs argue he did degenerate and fall from his perfection. Furthermore, Adam's sinne was not only in the actual eating of the forbidden fruit, but it was in unbelief, and distinct in God's Word, and many other sinnes were either internally antecedent to the eating, or concomitant of it, which could not but be transgressions of the moral Law. And thus on the contrary it was with Christ's obedience, for he did not only obey that special Law of a Mediatour, but the whole Law of God which we are obliged to, for the special was in some sense included in the generall, and he who undertaketh to bring us to a perfect and plenary righteousness, must not only satisfie the Law, but obey it also: But of this more when we consider that text, Gal. 4. of Christ's being under the Law, and thereby redeeming us.

Answ.

They bring a third Answer to enervate this Argument: for it is said, that we prove from a general expression of obtaining such a thing, a determinate manner of obtaining it, which cannot be any good way of reasoning. It doth not follow, that because Peter died, that therefore he died of such a disease, or was slain by the sword: so neither here doth it hold, that because we are made righteous by Christ's obedience, that therefore his active obedience is accounted as if we had done: for we may be made righteous otherwise.

Rep.

But 1. Not only the general, but the determinate manner is contained in the argument, for we are made righteous by Christ's obedience; as we are sinners by Adam's disobedience, and that is by imputation: believers in Christ are made righteous, as we in Adam are made sinners. Thus the Apostle doth not only declare the benefit, but the manner of communicating it to us; for its a great part of the Apostles scope to shew how by Adam we come to die, and how by Christ we come to live.
2. If there were as many ways to be made righteous, as there are for men to die; here might be some pretence to escape the force of the Argument: but there are but two ways mentioned by the Scripture, Imputed and Inherent, or our righteousness, and the righteousness of God: a righteousness of faith and of works: so that if we are not constituted inherently righteous as to the matter of Justification by Christ's obedience, its necessary it must be by imputation. And although men imagine several senses and ways of imputation of righteousness, yet that is no more to be regarded in this point, than in other Doctrinal Controversies, when the Orthodox seeing those many texts of Scripture, which speak of Christ dying for us, to prove a satisfactory atonement unto the justice of God, by this death, and that it is in our stead, as if we had suffered: If a Socinian caviller should say, that they argue from a general to a determinate manner, Christ might die for example and for doctrine, not for satisfaction, or there may be a metaphorical and improper redeeming, would this be admitted as of any validity? no certainly: For its not enough to put many senses and interpretations upon the place, and then to say, The Scripture doth not prove it, unless it specify such or such a sense: This is to make it impossible to prove anything almost in a determinate sense out of the Scripture, against an heretical interpretation.

Lastly, They seek to the shadow of that opinion, That Adams sinne is not ours by imputation, and if this can be made good, then they think the foundation of the Argument is razed; for thus they affirm, that Adams actual sinne of eating the forbidden fruit is not made ours by imputation, but Adam's sinning, and thereby losing the Image of God, We descending of him, as the root, have by natural propagation, an unclean nature: For Who can bring an unclean thing out of a clean? Thus we sinned in Adam, not by imputation, but because he being the original, and source of all mankind, the fountain was polluted and thereby all the streams.

To Answer this fully would require a large Tractate; Its Answer cannot be denied but the objection is very considerable, and
of great consequence: for *Austins* said well, (*lib. de peccato Origi. cap. 14.*) That in the cause of those two men, *Adam*, and *Christ*, whereof by the one we are sold under sinne, and by the other we are redeemed from sinne, the Christian faith doth properly consist. That we are made sinners by *Adams* disobedience, is so plainly and positively set down in this text, that none can deny it: But how we are, that is controverted. The Pelagians of old, understood it by imitation only: but because infants die, which yet could not imitate *Adam*, therefore that hath been easily refuted.

Others interpret to be a sinner, to be guilty; as sinne is often put for guilt, and so they will not yield, that we have properly the sinne of *Adam* made ours, only we are sub reatu, not culpâ, under guilt, not sinne by him.

Others, they grant we are made sinners by him, but inherently, by natural propagation.

Lastly, Those that seem to have the truth on their sides, affirm, that we are not only made sinfull by him, being born of him that was an unclean root, but that also his very actual transgression was made ours: That his sinne was not only *Adams* personal actual sinne, but also by Covenant and imputation the sinne of all mankind. Its true that custome and use in the Church of God, doth now call that only Original sinne, which every one hath as soon as he is born, but yet *Adams* first actual transgression may be called Original sinne, in an active sinne, as being the cause of that original passive sinne in us; now if this be so, then as *Adams* actual disobedience was ours by imputation, so Christ's obedience is also ours in the like manner. Its true, some will hardly admit this, therefore *Pelcanus ajesuite*, (*lib. de Origin. peccato, pag. 110, 111.*) refuseth this opinion, which *Catharinus* and *Piglius* defended, for this reason amongst others, because, faith he, it doth plainly favour their error, who in this age urge the figment of imputed righteousness. But *Adam* is not to be considered only as a root and a natural principle, but as a publicque person, with whom God made a Covenant for himself and his posterity, that upon his persevering obedience, he and his posterity should be established in holiness and life; but
but upon his disobedience, he and all his should be deprived of both. Now Adam who was then a publique Person, and a common Trustee, as it were, for all mankinde disobeing, we became sinners, not only by natural propagation, but by imputation. The Covenant makes it to be our act as well as his, and this may appear to be true by these Reasons. First, Because the Apostle in this Chapter, ver. 12, saith, that in him all have sinned, whether it be in whom, or for that, all will come to one issue. All sinned in him, or because he sinned all sinned, which cannot be understood of any other, but Adams actual disobedience. Now to say, All sinned in him, is more then to say, All are made sinners by him: The one denoteth an act, the other an habitual qualification. If it were only said, We are made sinners by him, that might enforce no more then what the opponents affirm, viz. that by descent from him we have inherent pollution, that doth really constitute us sinners; but when we are so made sinners, that thereby we did sinne in him, we were peccatores, as well as peccatores: This cannot be any other way but by imputation, or some compact. 2. If it were by natural propagation only that we are made sinners by Adam, then there is no reason to attribute all to Adam, to one man, and to that one offence, for we may as well charge it upon all other immediate parents, as well as he. If you look only to natural descent, and set aside the Covenant and Imputation, then there is no difference between Adam and other parents, it might be as well said, we sinned in many men, as in one; and we might as well say, by any other mans disobedience we are made sinners, as by Adams. Again, If it were not by imputation, but natural propagation, Why should that one disobedience of Adams be mentioned more then other sinnes? Why should not all those sinnes after his fall be pitched upon, as well as that offence only? Is not all this because in that particular command Adam was a publique person, and so covenanted with, and what he did was the act of all mankinde? as what the Master of a Society doth, if impowered thereunto, is the act of all the Society. Lastly, It must be by imputation, not natural descent, because if Adam had not fallen, all Divines agree
agree that not only himself, but his posterity had been crowned with immortality and life. Indeed what kinde of life and blessedness it would have been is controverted, but immortality and blessedness in the general is concluded on by all. Now Adams posterity could not be made partakers of righteousness and blessedness, by meer natural propagation, there must be a Covenant necessarily presupposed to make this good; and it was at the meer good pleasure of God, whether he would convey such glorious priviledges or not: So that the Covenant God made with Adam, is that which takes all his posterity with him, and makes, as Austin said, Omnes homines ille unus homo, all men that one man: And therefore its observed that Adam is used both for Eve and Adam also, as being collectively all mankind. Now if we come to speak of Christ, and our being made righteous by him, it will hold more strongly that his obedience must be ours by imputation, for he is not our natural root as Adam was to mankind; what Christ did for us cannot become ours but by a Covenant and agreement, therefore some are made righteous by it, and not others; so that as by his passive obedience we are made righteous by imputation, and by a Covenant, thus it is also by his active obedience. And thus I have at last vindicated this first Argument, taken from the collation and comparison with the first and second Adam, from the many Objections I have any where read or observed against it.

A second Argument to prove the imputation of Christ's active obedience unto us, shall be from those several texts, which say, Christ either came to fulfill the Law, or that by him the righteousness of the Law was fulfilled in us, that Christ is the end of the Law for righteousness: That he was made under the Law to redeem us. These texts will strongly evince, That Christ's active obedience and fulfilling the Law was for us, as well as the satisfying the penalty of it. Let us take the texts in order: The first is Mat. 5.17,18. I am come not to destroy the Law but to fulfill it. ρνεριγις, Beza makes it a metaphor from untying bonds and losing them, because the Law is a bond to duty. Piscator makes it a metaphor from a building, if you loosen the foundation, the whole fabrick will fall. Which

I

II.

Arguments from Mat. 5.17,18; Rom. 8.
Which waies soever you take it, this is plain that Christ came not to destroy or overthrow the Law, but to fulfill it: To see the force of this text, consider

1. That its undeniable by the Law, is meant chiefly, if not solely, the moral Law. So that whereas in other places, the evasion commonly is, that Christ fulfilled the ceremonial Law, because they were shadows, and he the body: This cannot be so here, for he doth plainly instance in the moral Law, at the 21. verse, and so along the Chapter: Its true, he saith, he came not to destroy the Prophets neither, but to fulfill them also, and that is, because whatsoever they had prophesied concerning him did come to pass: But this doth not weaken, yea it rather confirmeth, that as he fulfilled the Prophets every way they could be fulfilled, so he did also the Law every way that could be fulfilled.

2. There may be a twofold fulfilling of the Law, meant in this expression. 1. A doctrinal fulfilling of it, by giving the true and pure meaning of it, against those corrupt glosses that were put upon it by the Pharisees. 2. A practical and obedientiall fulfilling of it, by a conformity to the command of it: Now Christ did fulfill the Law both waies, by a doctrinal interpretation of it, that is plain in the text; and by obedience, that is easily made good, as part of the sense, to fulfill the Law, as appeareth, ver. 19. For when our Saviour had said he came to fulfill the Law, he confirmeth it by two arguments: First, The immutability and perpetuity of the Law. Secondly, The danger and punishment of him, who shall break it, and that is not by false doctrine only but by disobedience: Therefore he saith, Whosoever shall break one of these commands, and teach men so to do. So that disobedience is one way of breaking the Law, and corrupt interpretation of it another way. Therefore our Saviour came to fulfill it by his true doctrine, and by his holy life; and this is acknowledged by Piscator, who upon this place saith, that Christ fulfilled the Law in himself and in us; in himself by the love of God, and in us, which he maketh true several waies: First, By working faith in us, whereby we lay hold upon Christ, who by his death removed the curse of the Law.
Secondly, By enabling us to obey the Law in some measure: and thirdly, By chaitising and affliction of us when we go astray. But this seemeth not much to the purpose, though there may be some truth in it, for here lieth the Question, Whether Christ did obedientially fulfill the Law for us or not, or for himself only; if for us, as the Scripture makes the salvation of his people, the ground of all that he did, and suffered, then we have enough for our purpose out of the text. Its true, they distinguishe between obeying pro nobis, in our stead, and propter nos, for our good. Even as the Socinians distinguishe between Christ dying for us, and in our stead; but the same reasons which perswade to understand (for us) in matter of his death, to be in stead of us, will also concerning his obedience, as is more to be shewed. Its said likewise, that Christ obeyed the Law for himself, his humane nature being a creature, was by the obligation of the moral Law, bound to love God, and do those acts which are commanded therein, and so being due upon that ground, could not be imputed to us, as his sufferings could not have been made ours, if he had been bound to suffer for himself, but the discussing of this, will be most proper, when this Objection is brought in.

I therefore proceed to a second text, and that is Rom.8.3. 

That the righteousnesse of the Law might be fulfilled in us. Here we see plainly the great end why Christ came into the world, it was to condemn sinne; you have also the occasion of this, it was because the Law was impossible to us, we could not fulfill it, because of the adhering corruptions to us. Lastly, Here is the effect of this condemnation of sinne through Christ. That the righteousness of the Law might be fulfilled in us. The δικαιοσυνη νων: Many thoughts there are about the sense or meaning of the word δικαιοσυνη: I willingly go along with those that render it the just and power of the Law, that which the Law might require at our hands. This is fulfilled in us, so that whatsoever the Law could demand, that through Christ is accomplished in us. Now the right of the Law was in requiring two things: First, Satisfaction to the penalty of it, for that being broken there cannot be any hope
hope till the justice of God be satisfied. But that is not all:
Secondly, The right of the Law is to require perfect obedience, without which we cannot inherit life, and both these must be done for us in and by Christ; so that this ἡσαλογία was fulfilled in us, by Christ's sufferings, and by his obedience. Its true some understand this of sanctification, because it followeth, **who walk not after the flesh but the spirit**; but as the Apostle at the 5th verse brought this expression as a qualification of those who had no condemnation, so he seemeth in this verse to make it in those who have the righteousness of the Law fulfilled in them; & if it were to be understood of sanctification, it would not be so properly spoken in the passive sense, for so we do rather fulfil the Law actively, though imperfectly, rather then have it fulfilled passively in us: I wonder therefore at Gomars, an eminent and learned Author, with great assurance & diligence propugning Christ's active obedience, that he should in his analytical Expositions on this place, quit this Interpretation, and understand it of sanctification: His reason is no ways cogent, Because (faith he) the text faith, this righteousness is fulfilled in us, and not in Christ; but it is acknowledged by the Opponents, that the satisfaction of the penalty of the Law, is part of this ἡσαλογία, which is also accomplished by Christ and in Christ for us; yet in the text its not said to be fulfilled in Christ. Therefore its enough that the Apostle had in the verse before, mentioned the end of Christ's coming into the flesh, and so in and through that we come to have the righteousness of the Law fulfilled in us: Certainly the patient and willing suffering of the punishment of the Law, cannot be said to be all the righteousness the Law requireth.
SERM. XXXVI.

More Reasons to prove the Imputation of Christ's Active Obedience to Believers.

ROM. 5.19.

So by the Obedience of one shall many be made righteous.

The third and fourth verses of the eighth Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, have been brought in to establish this truth, That Christ's obedience to the whole Law of God is made righteousness to us. The righteousness of the Law by Christ, is fulfilled, though not by us, yet in us. I have not observed any considerable Replies to this Objection, but what I meet with shall be Animadverted upon. Two things are said to this Text:

Answ.

First, That it would not be any rational inference, from Christ's condemning sinne in the flesh, to conclude, that his perfect obedience is made ours, but rather the clean contrary, for if sinne be taken away, what need we have a righteousness imputed unto us.

Reply.

But this is no strong Answer, for we grant indeed that in the third verse, Christ is there said to condemn sinne, and that by obligation of himself as a sacrifice, for so that εἴσεις ἕννεράσις is to be rendred, as Ludovic. de Dein doth excellently clear that place, which hath so tortured Interpreters; he well
both Passive and Active.

well sheweth that the Septuagint use the phrase οἰκείανιαις, for a distinct kind of sacrifice to the Holocausts, as appears, Lev. 5:7. and so it is used by the Apostle, Heb. 10:6,8. Burnt offerings, and οἰκείανιαις, sacrifices for sinne thou hast no pleasure in. Its true then that the Apostle speaketh of Christ’s offering himself a sacrifice and an atonement for sinne, and this admirable benefit doth hereby accrue to the Believer, that sinne is condemned, he speaks of it as a person that now is disabled from accusing or laying any thing to our charge, sinne cannot accuse us any longer. Oh glorious privilege, sinne that did condemn all others, is now condemned itself. We say a condemned person in Law cannot give in any witness, how wonderfully may faith improve this to quiet and comfort the conscience. Doth sinne accuse thee, doth that threaten condemnation to thee? say, Christ hath condemned it, that now it hath no more power to accuse; and as if this were not enough (as indeed it is not) there is a second benefit, that the righteousness of the Law is fulfilled in us by this means. Christ did not only by his sufferings remove the curse, but by his absolute conformity to the command of the Law, hath obtained for us a perfect obedience, so that the righteousness of the Law is fulfilled in us. This followeth most genuinely, yes and necessarily; for the righteousness of the Law could not be fulfilled in us, unless we had either by inherency or imputation, a perfect obedience made ours. Seeing therefore the Law cannot of it self allow or approve of any thing, but what is perfect, that cannot be said to be fulfilled, unless there be an absolute and full conformity to it. So that by Christ, the Law which was our enemy, is now reconciled to us; and that which did once curse us, cannot but bless and approve of us, because it cannot reject, but approve the obedience of Christ.

A second Reply is made. That by fulfilling should be meant the accomplishment of such a righteousness, as the Law had foretold of, and so its parallel’d with that place where the Law is said to give witness of this righteousness, Rom. 3. and so its said, this is the most proper use of the Word τανάσθη in the Scripture for
the accomplishment or full manifestation of any thing that was under a promise or prediction.

But this will appear easily to be a mere evasion; for when the word is used to fulfill, in that sense there is added ἀγαθὸν ἀγαθῆς, τά ἐν, τά ἐργαζόμενα, and the like; now here is no such thing here, but its like the expression Rom. 13. 8. He that loveth ποιμήνα, hath fulfilled the Law, And Gal. 5. 14. The Law πληρῶσθαι is fulfilled in one word: Even as Romans 13. 10. Love is said to be πληροῦσθαι the fulfilling of the Law.

A third Text is, Rom. 10. 3. where Christ is said to be the end of the Law for righteousness to him that believeth. Did not men obscure the Text with Interpretations, and so put a vail on it, the light of it would easily appear to this purpose; That whereas the Law had this for an end, to bring men to perfect obedience, and so to obtain justification thereby, this through man's corruption being made impossible, yet through Christ the end of the Law is established, and so the Law is not destroyed, nor the intent of the Law-giver frustrated, for Christ is the end of it to him that believeth, and that for righteousness.

I shall not insist long on this, because I have some where else handled this. It's true, some understand this of the Ceremonial Law, and so make Christ the end abolishing not accomplishing, the finis interfecti not perficiens, the finis consumens, not consummatis; but seeing the Apostle argueth against the Jews, who sought to establish their own righteousness by the Law, we must take it in as large a sense as they did, and they thought by all the works they did to any kind of Law God had commanded to be justified thereby: For although the dispute about justification began at first by the ceremonial Rites, yet afterwards it extended to all the works of the Law, as plainly appeareth by Pauls arguments. Therefore the Apostle at the 5th verse describeth the righteousness of the Law, by doing those things, and so a man shall live; now they were not bound to do the things of the ceremonial Law only, but the moral Law also.

Again, If this were to be understood of the ceremonial Law.
Law only, that Christ came to abolish that Mosaical administration, and so was the end of righteousness in that respect, then it would follow, That Christ was only righteousness in this sense to the believing Jew, not to the Gentile; for the believing Gentile was not bound to that ceremonial Law, neither did Christ abolish it as to them, seeing they were never under it. Certainly by this means, all we that are believers of the Gentiles can have no comfort in Christ's being the end of the Law for righteousness. But see the Apostle speaking universally, Christ is the end of the Law for righteousness to him that believeth.

Some understand this of the moral Law, and say, Christ was the end of it, because the Law did convince of sinne, and shew us our impotency, and so drive us to seek unto Christ; but this is a secondary use of the Law, and by accident merely, otherwise the Law would have been the Ministry of life as well as the Gospel. The primary use of the Law, and that which is intended per se, is to bring unto a perfect and compleat obedience. Look then on Christ, not only as the end of the ceremonial, but also the moral Law, and what obedience thereunto is defective in thee, see it compleated in Christ.

The last Text under this second kind of Argument alleged for the imputation of Christ's active obedience, shall be that famous and notable one, Galat. 4, 4, 5. where Christ is said to be made under the Law, that he might redeem us from the curse of the Law; He was made under the Law, both in respect of the mandatory part of it, and also the comminatory part of it. The Apostle doth there describe his being made of a woman, and made under the Law, to be the ground of our redemption from the curse of it.

If it be said, Christ was under the obediential part of the Law for himself, and not for us.

That is to be discussed in answering that Objection where-in the Adversary puts so much confidence. Piscator would render ἔναντίον, born under the Law, but if that be granted, it would not much avail him, for still he was under the Law; but that must not be granted, for his birth is expressed in,
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that, when he is said to be made of a woman. That which hath the greater colour is, That to be under the Law, doth imply to be under the curse of it, not the obedience, as when the godly are said not to be under the Law, but under grace: So that by this interpretation, it will reach onely to Christ's death, as Gal. 3. 13. but the phrase is not to be thus straightened, for we must take it in the same sense, as the Jews urged it, against whom the Apostle manageth this Epistle. Now when they desired to be under the Law, none can say, they intended to be under the condemning power and curse of the Law only. Tell me (faith the Apostle at vers. 21.) ye that desire to be under the Law; certainly they did not desire to be under the curse of the Law: Therefore the Apostle would take them off from seeking Justification by the works of any Law, and look wholly upon Christ, as both obeying and suffering for them. And thus we have ended those Texts that are brought under one head for a second Argument.

We proceed to a third, and that shall consist of such Texts as make us to be righteous in Christ, and not in ourselves, to be accepted of in him, to be compleat in him, and that we are to be found in him. All which do teach us thus much, That our righteousness is of and in Christ. It is what he hath done for us, and not what we ourselves do: and its good to adhere to these, because hereby Christ will be the more exalted.

The first Text is, 2 Cor. 5. 21. He who knew no sinne, is made sinnne for us, that we may be the righteousness of God in him. I have discussed this Text already, when I proved an impumed righteousness: Therefore briefly take notice of these three things in the verse.

1. We are made the righteousness of God, all believers are distributively made the righteousness of God, that is, not onely the righteousness which God hath procured, or which is accepted of by God, but a righteousness that is not a meermans, therefore its said in him, who was both God and man, otherwise it might have been a righteousness of God in us.

2. Its said, A righteousness of God in him, to denote, That though it be ours by imputation, yet its subjectively in him.
him. Not that this righteousness, as it is in him, is made ours, so that we should have the righteousness of a Mediator, and an infinite righteousness, but so farre as we stood in need of it; Of which more in the Objections: Its then our righteousness by imputation, but in Christ, not in our selves. And

3. Consider the comparison, We are made the righteousness of God in Christ, as he was made sinne for us. Not indeed in every respect; for in several particulars there is a diffimilitude, but as to the matter intended by the Apostle, which is to shew, that as our sinnes laid on him, made him die, and endure the wrath of God, when yet he had no sinnes of his own, so his righteousness is made ours, when we had not that of our own which could answer the Law. But because I have spoken of this already, I proceed to a second, and that is,

Ephes. i. 6. He hath made us accepted of in the beloved. To be accepted of, implieth the end for which, and that is to eternal life, yea and for the present our persons and duties are also accepted of, but it is still in him. Now, seeing God is so holy and righteous that nothing can be accepted of, with him to such eternal glory, but what is compleatly holy, therefore that supposeth our acceptance to be grounded upon his obedience. And thus that known comparison of our appearance in Christ's righteousness, as Jacob did in his elder brothers cloaths, doth suppose, that we are covered with Christ's righteousness, as with a garment. To have sinne pardoned by the passive obedience of Christ, is but a limited and restrained acceptance, viz. quoad hoc, so farre as not to incurre eternal judgement; but this Text speaks of an universal acceptance, even so to be received into the favour of God, as thereby to partake of all the glorious priviledges God hath promised in his Word. This Text will more confirm it, if you joyn Col. ii. 10, where believers are said to be compleat in him, as in Christ their head. Thus as in him we are risen, as in him we sit in heavenly places; so in him we satisfie the justice of God, and in him we fulfill the Law. By vertue of this mystical union all that Christ hath is made ours, and
what he did we are accounted of as to do it. Therefore the
Church is called Christ, because of the intimate communion
with him, 1 Cor. 12.12. Christ and believers make one my-
stical person, as what the natural or political head doth in
that relation, all the proportionable members are said to do.
Therefore Aquinas said truly, Opera Christi habent se ad mem-
bra, sicut opera hominis constitutis in gratia ad seipsum. If a
man be holy, then his handes, his eyes, his minde, his will
and affections are holy. Thus what Christ did as our head,
is imputatively ours; for in these things he was a publique
person, and acted in our behalf; not that he repented for
us, and believed with a justifying faith for us, as some have
fondly imagined; for these things, though graces in them-
selves, yet necessarily argue some imperfection in the subject
where they are.

To these Texts we may add the practical and experiemen-
tal way which Paul took for comfort, when he would see
himself before Gods Tribunal, and that is Phil. 3.9. To be
found in him, not having his own righteousness, but the righ-
teousnesse which is of God by faith. To be found in him, that
dothing notably imply, when the Law and Justice of God shall
make enquiry after Paul, he would not, though so great an
Apostle, and one who had laboured more then them all, yet
he would not be found in himself. And certainly thus it is,
as Contarenus an ingenuous Papist in this controversy hath
well observed, The more grace and holinesse any man have
attained unto, the more humble and modest they are in
themselves, and the higher esteem they have of the imputed
righteousnesse of Christ. Not but that they indeed grow
more godly, onely hereby they see their own failings more,
and the greater necessity of Christ, they are pleased in them-
selves lesse, and are more contented and satisfied in Christ.
Its he that lived for them, and he that died for them, Christ
is all in all. Neither do they divide and separate Christ's life
and his death, but by faith receive whole Christ in all that he
undertook for them.

IV. A fourth Argument is taken from such places where Christ
is expressly called our righteousness, and is said to be made of
God
our righteousness, Jerem. 23. 6. Jer. 33. 16. 1 Cor. 1. 30. and which is very remarkable, he is said to bring in an everlasting righteousness, Dan. 9. 24. All these places are very emphatic, and not easily to be put by as some think they may. For the first

Jer. 23. 6. It is plain at the 5th verse, that he whose name shall be called the Lord our righteousness is Christ, and that he doth not speak of God the Father for us at the 5th verse, he describeth his humane nature; so in this 6th he declareth his Divine Nature, he is called Jehovah, which is never directly and properly attributed unto any creature, as the Orthodox prove against Socinians.

2. As his two Natures are described, so also his Mediatorial Office in that attribute, our righteousness, this is the righteousness of the Gospel, and that which Christ is made to us.

3. There is the believers thankfull acknowledgment and profession of it, He shall be called. To be called doth signify not only the being of a thing, but the famous publishing and notifying of it: Every believer shall know where his strength lieth, where his comfort and righteousness is treasured up, and that is in Christ, who is both the Branch and the Jehovah. This is most genuine, if we do regard the scope of the Prophet, and is received by the current of Interpreters, yet Grotius upon the place, applieth it to Judah, and not to Christ, as if the sense were, The name that Judah shall be called by, &c. and by righteousness doth understand (as sometimes the word is) beneficence and mercy; but every one may see this is to compel Scripture to go whether it would not.

The second Text is almost like this, if not the same, Jerem. 33. 16. This is the name whereby she shall be called, The Lord our righteousness. Grotius thinketh this will confirm his interpretation of the former, for here, faith he, the city shall be called thus, and there the people of Judah, there is the Masculine Gender, here is the Feminine; but suppose it should be granted, that the right interpretation is, She shall be called (as our Translators do), yet Lapide's observation upon the place,
place would much confirm the truth we contend for, That such is the union between Christ and the Church, that there is a communion unto it of all the good things Christ hath; and in 1 Corinth. 1. 30. We are said (that is, the Church) to be the righteousness of God in Christ: Even as Christ maketh the persecution of the Church to reach to him, Saul, Saul, Why persecutest thou me? Thus Paul on the other side, Galat. 2. 20. I no longer live, but Christ in me. If then Christ be the Lord our righteousness, and this title is given her, for the near communion she hath with Christ who is her righteousness, then this doth greatly make for the imputation of Christ's righteousness unto us. But that translation which Junius gives seemeth to be more consonant to the former place, and so makes both this and that alike, which is thus, And be that shall call her, is the Lord our righteousness: So that Christ the righteousness of the Church is here said to call his people to him.

The third Text confirming this, is 1 Cor. 1. 30. We are of Christ, who is made of God to us, righteousness; Here you see He is righteousness, He is made righteousness, and he is made righteousness of God, and that to us, his righteousness was not for himself, but for us, and he is made it to us. To these places the Adversaries of imputation in the sense stated, though differing amongst themselves, yet all agree to give this answer, That Christ is made our righteousness causally and effectually, that is, he is the Author and cause of our righteousness: Even as God is often called by David, his strength, and his hope, yea and so Christ likewise is called, there being nothing so ordinary (say they) as to denominate an efficient with that title, which is effect or wrought by him: and indeed its granted, That this answer might prevail, if the Scripture did not in other places manifest a nearer union between Christ and his people, then of a meer bare efficient; Christ is not onely made the cause of believers graces, but they are said to be in him, and to be made one with him, and he is their Surety and Mediator, which doth imply a nearer union, then a meer outward cause. Therefore I subjoyned these Texts to the former Argu-
our righteousness whereby we are justified, then he doth the grace of our inward Vocation and Regeneration, for he is not the matter of that: we cannot say, Christ received by faith is the matter of our Vocation and Regeneration, as we may say he is of our Justification. The Father works holiness in us, the Spirit worketh holiness in us, yet we cannot say, These are made righteousness to us, whereby we are justified, because neither of them did interpose to be a Surety for us; Hence by reason of this Union, Christ calls the sinnes of those whom he is to redeem, his sinnes, Psalm 40. 12. Its Christ that speaks there, though it was also true of David as the type in another sense, Mine iniquities have taken hold on me; our iniquities are called Christ's iniquities; Therefore Heb. 9. 28. Christ is there said to come a second time without sinne, implying his first coming was with sinne, not indeed inhering in him, but imputed to him, so that he was to bear them away. Thus his righteousness and obedience is made ours, and both his obedience and sufferings were not only for us, but in our stead he accomplished all, as undertaking our obligation upon him.

Yet in the fifth place, We must thus understand the communication of Christ's obedience to us in those things only wherein we were obliged. We cannot say, That many things Christ did, are our obedience, and are imputed to us. The miracles that Christ wrought, though they were for our good, yet they were not imputed to us as our righteousness; and the reason is, because we had no obligation upon us to these things, and therefore Christ acted as our Surety in those things only wherein we were obliged, whatsoever other things he might do as God, or occasionally as man, or as a Mediatour: These things though they had their direct and proper benefit accruing to us, yet we cannot say, Christ did them as in our stead: Even as with Adam, it was not every personal action that he did, that was imputed to us, we did not eat or drink in Adam; as we sinned in him, but that only in which the Covenant consisted. And thus have we finished the fifth Argument: we were the larger upon it,
V. I. 

Argument from the perpetuity and immutability of the Law.

It, because this is the foundation of all, and all the other Arguments are at last to be reduced to this, this giveth life and strength to all the rest.

The sixth Argument shall be taken from the perpetuity and immutability of the Law: God will not give eternal life, but upon a Do this. This righteousness will be for ever required, as the condition of happiness, Levit. 18. 5. Ezek. 20. 11. Mat. 5. 18. and whereas it might be thought by the Apostles Arguments, that he did overthrew the Law, he disclaimeth such inferences. Rom. 3. 31. Ye (faith he) we establish the Law, the righteousness of faith doth not dissolve that. These places prove the immutability of the Law, both in the preceptive part of it, it doth and will require perfect obedience, as also in regard of the promise of eternal life: Inomuch that learned and great Authors (as it is a learned, and great Authors say, Beza, Junius, Perkins) That we may claim eternal life, ex formula foederae, Hoc fac & vives. Do this and live; but I see no necessity of granting that, because the Law required it in our persons, and so it is not our doing, but Christ's doing for us by which we live: Its the same righteousness we and Adam in his state of Integrity are justified by, in respect of the nature and substance of it, only the manner of communication of it is different, in Adam, it was inherent, in us it is imputed: Therefore the Leyden Divines do well observe, [Synop. puri. Theol. de Justificat.] That the righteousness of faith, or the righteousness of the Gospel and the Law, are not absolutely and simply contrary one to another: we are not justified contrary to the Law, only in respect of us, there is such an opposition that he who is justified by one cannot be by the other, not that they are two distinct righteousnesses every way, but two opposite ways of communicating the same righteousness, that righteousness we formerly had in us, is now in Christ our Surety, and we by faith are made partakers of it. Therefore its wholly a mistake to think, that the Apostle argued against justification by works, or righteousness by the Law, as fulfilled by Christ for us, for his purpose is to establish it so, only he bends himself against those that sought for this righteousness of the Law in themselves, whether with
without the grace of God, or with it. The Apostle then
doeth not absolutely and universally argue against the righte-
ousnesse of the Law, but the endeavouring to finde this in
ourselves, and not in Christ. And indeed this must be so,
because the primary work of Christ our Surety was, to per-
form that obedience of the Law we were obliged unto;
and secondarily to remove our punishment, which was due
to us by the transgression of the Law: So that if we con-
sider the stipulation that Christ made with the Father to be
our Surety, his active obedience was the main and prin-
cipal: Even as all Law-givers regard more the obedience
of their Laws, then Satisfaction to the penalty; and indeed if
we duly consider it, God himself cannot take off the oblifi-
gation from us, no more then he can cease to be our God
and Creator; for obedience is founded necessaril}' in the sub-
jection of a creature unto its Creator.

A seventh Argument may be from the typical prefigurations
of their active obedience by Christ. Indeed there is a later Wri-
ter [Forbes] that ufeth this Argument the contrary way,
We are not (faith he) justified by the Active obedience of
Christ, but the Passive only, because all the legal Types
were of that only. But I urge on the contrary, There
were prefigurative Types of his Active obedience; There-
fore that concurreth to our Justification. Although there
is no strength in that Argument, to say, Such things were
not in Christ, because there was no Type of it; but we
need not sinne to that in Exodus 28. 36, 38. we there reade
plainly, of the pure gold that was to be on Aaron, with this
engraven on it, HOLINESSE TO THE LORD,
and this was, That the children of Israel might be acce-
pted of in all their holy things: the pure and excellent
Garments of the High-Priest, as also his Washings and Pu-
lications did manifest this; yet in the Lamb that was
sacrificed there was required, that it should be without
spot and blemish; which integrity was confidered as part
of the Sacrifice; and this the Apostle confidereth as part
in Christ's Sacrifice; i Peten t. 19. The precious blood of
Christ, as of a Lamb, without blemish and without spot. The

C c c 2 precious
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Of the precious blood of Christ there is his Passive obedience; without spot or blemish there is his Active. This purity was not a qualification of the Sacrifice, but a constitutive ingredient into it. To be without blemish, that required no defect in the parts, and without spot, that required no spot or streaked colour upon it. The Incense alto that was offered on the Altar, denoted Christ's Active obedience, which makes the duties of all the godly accepted, as appeareth Rev 8.3,4.

VII. The eighth Argument shall be from the object of our justifying Faith, which is the Person of Christ, or whole Christ. Hence it so often called Faith in him, or in his Name, and believing in him; If then whole Christ be the object of our Faith justifying, we are not to look to his sufferings merely, to his blood or death, nor to his birth or works solely, but to take whole Christ, as the adequate object of our Faith; and certainly, the limiting of our Justification to his Passive obedience, divides Christ, and takes off much from his whole Person as the Mediator, and rests on part of that righteousness which we have by him.

VIII. Lastly, The Doctrine which holds the imputation of both Obedience active and Passive, sends more to Christ's honour and our comfort. Its true, we must not honour Christ, or take comfort upon feigned opinions of our own; neither may we argue, This (we think) honours Christ, and will bring comfort: Therefore its true; But when we see the scope of the Scripture is to exalt Christ, not in his own Person so much, as our Mediator, and to commend his love, by how much the more he was debased for us; As also, to comfort us by the proper fulness that is in him, for every want and temptation we have, then finding many particular Texts subservient to that general scope, we may with the more confidence and comfort assert the latitude of all his obedience for us: For the Scripture doth not onely speak of Grace, but riches of Grace, and superabounding Grace by him, and that he became poor that we might be rich; so that they extenuate it, who
limit it onely to a Satisfaction of the penalty of the Law, and will not admit an obediential righteousness to the commands of it. Certainly, the temptation of a godly man doth not onely lie about the pardon of his sinne, but the defect and imperfection of his obedience. Therefore Beza (in his Confessio Fidei, cap. 28.) amongst other strong temptations of Satan, whereby he assaults the godly, makes this one. That we have not in us the righteousness which God justly requireth of us. Its not enough to have satisfied for sinne, but God also requireth perfect obedience. Now in this temptation, he directs the believer to the other treasure of Christ, beside Satisfaction, which is his most absolute and perfect righteousness, which by Faith applied, we are in Christ accepted of, as co-heirs with him. Hence also be faith, Pag. 63. The Law and the Gospel differ not in respect of that righteousness we are to be clothed with, if we would have eternal life, but only in the manner of participation of it.
Serm. XXXVIII.

Arguments against the Imputation of Christ's Active Obedience, answered.

So by the Obedience of one shall many be made righteous.

Its Lastantius his Observation, That erroneous persons do usually set themselves destruere aliena, rather than astraere propria, to overthrow other men's opinions rather than establish their own. And thus indeed the Socinians are remarkable herein, whose greatest work in all their writings is to destroy and demolish what the Orthodox have built, little attending to establish their own Doctrines. Seeing therefore the more noble and worthy part hath been dispatched by us, viz. the argumentative asserting of Christ's Active Obedience, as well as his Passive, as to our Evangelical righteousness; Its our work in the next place, to consider and weigh the contrary Arguments, some of which seem to have great colour of reason and strength with them. And the first shall be that which they judge palmarious, and the chiefest of their Scripture-Arguments, and that is,

The Scripture attributing our justification every where to the blood of Christ, it makes our redemption to be by his death only. So Piscator argueth, (2. Vol. Thes. de Justif.) The Scripture attri-
attributeth our remission of sinne and salvation, onely to Christ's death, therefore onely by it are we justified. To this we may reduce Forbes his Argument, concerning the Sacraments of Baptism, and especially of the Lord's Supper, that they represent onely the passive obedience of Christ; and these being in their Institution the seals of the righteousness of faith, must necessarily inferre, that our righteousness is only by Christ's sufferings.

Now although we have formerly answered sufficiently to this, as it was an Argument brought to limit the obedience mentioned in the Text, only to passive obedience, yet something more is to be replied to it, because they put so much confidence in it.

And First, They put the word Sola in the Argument, which the Scripture doth not; They say, by Christ's passive obedience alone, but the Scripture useth no such limiting or exclusive particle. If our Protestant Writers had not upon better ground said, Sola side, by faith alone we are justified, they would have been justly obnoxious to the Popish censure. When therefore the Scripture doth so often mention Christ's death, this is not to be understood exclusively to his antecedent obedience, but synecdochically, by a chief part of it intending the whole; for as we formerly shewed, the Scripture attributes it sometimes to other things, especially Phil. 2. there is the whole course of his obedience from his birth to his death, mentioned as the ground of our salvation, and to these former places, I shall adde all such Texts, as make the whole person, even Christ himself the ground of our reconciliation, not restraining the person to his sufferings, but making the whole person to be the matter or object of our acceptance with God, Rom. 3.25. Whom God set forth to be a propitiation. So 2 Corinthians 5. God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, and Christ was made sinne for us. John 10.16. As many as received him; and in many places, Christ speaks of himself in his whole person, that he is life, that he is the bread of life. That he who believeth in him shall never die. So that to speak properly, not the death of Christ, but Christ himself is the object of our Justification: Neither are we
to seek it either in his active, or in his passive obedience by dividing or distinguishing of them, but in Christ himself.

Secondly, Even the Adversaries must acknowledge from their own principles, that by death we are to mean other things besides that, for otherwise his sufferings before in the Garden would be excluded, wherein Christ seemed to be more afflicted then in death itself, as also the sufferings of his soul under the sense of God's anger, which yet many of the opponents acknowledge: yea there are those that confesse all the servile acts of Christ's obedience to be part of his satisfactory righteousness; and if death be not understood synecdochically, they must be all excluded; it is therefore of necessity that we must look upon Christ's death, not as oppositely to his former acts of obedience, but because this was the ultimate and most signal expression of it, therefore doth the Scripture so often mention it.

And as for the Sacraments, though they may visibly in a more peculiar manner represent Christ as suffering for us, yet most Divines say, That our communion sealed in them, is not properly with those actions of Christ, but Christ himself: So that in every Sacrament, its Christ himself we put on, and its Christ himself that we are more ingrafted into: Hence John 3.14,15. Christ dying on the Cross is resembled to the Serpent lifted up, and Whosoever believeth in him shall not perish, but have everlasting life. Thus the eating of his flesh and drinking of his blood sacramentally, is nothing but believing in him, and receiving whole Christ primarily, and all his benefits flowing from him by consequence. It's therefore a great mistake to oppose Christ's death to his active obedience; for Christ's sufferings, meekly as so, do not make an atonement for us, but as they were the effects of his obedience, and of his love to God and man; Therefore we are to look on Christ's death, as an obediential act, which was the consummation of all his former obedience, yea if we thoroughly search to the root of the matter, it was not so much his external sufferings, as the inward promptitude of his will to die for us, that was meritorious, and this will he bad as soon
foon as he came into the world. Therefore that very place so much insisted on by the opponents, is a pregnant instance against them, Heb. 10. 10. By the which will we are sanctified, through the offering of the body of Jesus once for all; because that [once] is not spoken determinatively, as if then, and only then our consummation of happiness was attained, but its expressed oppositely to the frequent repetition of the Sacrifices in the Old Testament: and that we are not to restrain this blessedness of ours to the time of his death, appeareth vers. 5. Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou hadst not, but a body hast thou prepared for me—Lo I come to do thy will (O God.) By this its plain we are not to look so much to Christ's death, as his will to die, for that external act had no merit in it, simply as so, without Christ's will; and Christ's will is not to be considered as immediate before his death, but as soon as ever he came into the world. And although we are not curiously to enquire when began the time of Christ's merit being for us, yet we see by that expression (when he cometh into the world, even then it is, to do thy will, O God) that this must needs be very early, and by this will which he had as soon as he came into the world, we are said to be sanctified; and therefore as Suarez (though a Jesuite) yet speaks more soundly in this particular, than many others who pretend to greater Orthodoxy, when out of Aquinas he sheweth, That by the Covenant and appointment of God its brought about, that the whole life of Christ should be ordained for the obtaining of a full right, as it were of one merit to be consummated in his death. (Suarez. De Christo Quest. 19, Disp. 39.) So that our proper duty is not to divide his active or passive obedience, or to attribute his holiness to one end, and his sufferings to another, but to look upon his whole life and death, as that full and integrall righteousness, whereby we stand justified before God. And thus much for the first Objection.

The second Argument brought against the imputation of Christ's active obedience in the sense controverted, is taken from the rights and obligation that lay upon Christ in respect of his humane
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humane nature to obey the Moral Law of God. From whence they argue, That which Christ was bound to do for himself, that cannot be imputed to us for our righteousness, but Christ in respect of his humane nature was bound to obey the Moral Law for himself: Therefore it cannot be imputed to us. Even (say they) as if Christ had been bound to suffer for himself, his sufferings could not have been a Propitiatory Atonement for us. This is one of the principal Arguments insisted on: Christ as a man, and as a member of the Jewish Church was obliged to an actual conformity in obedience to them, and therefore it was not for us, but himself, that he did so obey.

This Argument deserveth a large discussion, for a great part of the cause will be gained if this be cleared. And

1. There are Divines of very great name, that do wholly deny that Christ was bound to the Moral Law, because though his humane Nature was a creature, yet because the personal subsistence of it was Divine, and Laws being given not to Natures, but to Persons, therefore it was that he was not bound to obey any Law; and indeed it must be acknowledged, that the whole order of nature was inverted in Christ: Every thing in him was a miracle, he was a Lord of the Law, and yet obedient to it, he was both a Viator and a Comprehensor: so that it's no wonder if those things which are easily granted of pure mere men be denied of Christ, who though man, yet had a Divine Subsistence. But whether this hypostatical Union did absolutely free him from an obligation to the Moral Law, I much doubt, for still his humane nature did abide a creature, and the will of a creature cannot be the supreme Law, therefore it had an obligation upon it, and if this be not so, it will be hard to say, how Christ could obey, for actions are suppositorum also, actions are of persons properly, and not of natures, and so by this means we shall make it impossible for Christ to be our Redeemer and Surety. We must therefore necessarily conclude that Christ was obliged to keep the Moral Law, not indeed as God, nor in respect of his personal Subsistence, but as man; For its an undeniable Rule, amongst the learned, that what doth belong to either of the Natures of Christ, is yet attributed to the
both Passive and Active.

person, by κατανοηθαι, the communication of properties: So that as Christ himself said of himself, while on earth, John 3:13. That the Son of man is in Heaven; and Acts 10:38. God is said to purchase the Church by his own blood, which expressions are true by the communication of properties: So also its true, when we say, Christ was bound to keep the Moral Law, that is, in respect of his humane Nature: Neither is it necessary to put in that limitation always (as a man) in our speeches, for we see the Scripture speaking so often of Christ, without limiting either to his humane or divine Nature, because common reason will make us apprehend, in respect of which nature it is, that such a thing is affirmed of him; Therefore let us grant, that Christ as man was bound to obey a Law.

In the next place, Let us consider what Law he was obliged unto. And

1. There is that which is called by some, the Eternal Law, or Law of Nature, whereby things intrinsically good are commanded, and intrinsically evil are prohibited; such are, to love God, not to lie, &c. Now even to this Law say some eminent Divines, Christ was not bound, because the hypostatical Union did exempt him, for this they think as absurd, as if a man should say, Christ was subject to himself, or Christ was bound to obey himself. Therefore though they will grant, That Christ could not lie, could not but love God, yet this did not arise from an obligation of any Law he was under, but from the perfection of his Nature: Even as God himself cannot sinne, not because he is under a Law, seeing his Will is the Rule of all goodness, but because of the infinite holiness which is in him. But I cannot subscribe to this, because (as was said before) the personal Union doth not exempt the humane Nature of Christ from being a creature, neither doth he cease to be man; And therefore seeing his humane Will was not the supreme Rule of holiness, its necessary it should be conformed to that which was supreme: Hence he said, Not my will, but thine be done; and although it be true, that its the person that is the principle of actions, and to whom Laws are made, yet mediately they extend to Natures also.

D d d 2

The
The person or supposition is the *principium quo*, the principle that doth act, but the Natures in Christ, are the *principium quo*, the principle by which the person doth work. So that I shall not deny, but that Christ as a man was obliged to this Law, yet there is no consequence at all, but therefore this obedience of his may not be imputed to us.

In the next place, there is the civil or political Law, under which I comprehend the command of obedience to parents; though that also may be called natural, and so it is in respect of mere man, but I think it was positive only in respect of Christ; and here the Question is, Whether Christ was bound to obey these Laws? Onely take notice (as is more to be shewed) that an obligation may arise two ways:

1. From the nature of the thing antecedently to a man's consent.

2. From supposition only, supposing a former consent to such and such a condition, then he having ingaged thereunto, by that means he hath induced an obligation upon himself, as between man and man; Though a friend be not bound to be Surety for another, or to pay his debts, yet if once he hath undertaken it, then he is obliged, not from any intrinsical cause, but by an extrinsical supposition.

To apply this to our purpose, when we question, Whether Christ was bound to obey the mentioned Laws? We speak not of an obligation by supposition; for when he had once voluntarily made himself under such a Law, then he was bound thereby; but of an intrinsical obligation arising from the nature of the thing, Whether Christ was bound to obey his Parents, or the civil Magistrate, as other men are? or, Whether the obedience he did shew was onely voluntary, and for our example, and concerning his subjection to his Mother Mary? Certainly, even in that Law of honouring Parents there was a great difference between Christ and a mere man; Therefore we reade, when his Mother (John 3-3.) told him, they had no wine, that Jesus said to her, Woman (not mother) What have I to do with thee? my hour is not yet come: So again, Luke 2:48. when his mother said, Sonne, Why hast thou thus dealt with me? Behold thy father and I have sought
sought thee sorrowing: he said unto them, Wilt ye not that I must be about my Father's business? These expressions do argue some independency in Christ, more then in a meer unnatural sonne; for although Levi is commended for not knowing father and mother; yea in Christ's cause we are to hate father and mother; yet our Saviour seemeth to insinuate more in himself then this. Its true, its said at the 51. verse, that Christ went down with his parents to Nazareth, and was subject to them; but the ground is not set down whether it was a voluntary subjection, or necessary from a natural obligation. Certainly, it could not be a natural obligation, as to Joseph, who was his father only, (as it was supposed) or his legal father amongst men; and in respect of his mother, although he was born of her, and made of a woman, in respect of his bodily substance, yet seeing her conception was in a miraculous and extraordinary way, we cannot say, that she was his mother in such a manner as ordinarily mothers are to their children: This is to shew, that though Christ was subject to his Parents, yet there was not such a natural obligation upon him, as is on meer men, but it was in a great measure, though I cannot say universally voluntary, I say universally, because so farre as she was his true mother, and he her true real Son, so far the natural honouring Parents did extend to him. There is no lesse doubt about the civil Magistrate, Whether Christ as man was bound to obey him; for when they came to demand Tribute of him, our Saviour's Argument seemeth to carry it, that he was free. Matt. 17. 26. a difficult place it is, that hath occasioned much debate upon it. Its granted by all, That quod factum and usum did subject himself to the Magistrate, did pay Tribute, did not refuse to appear before their Judgement, acknowledged Pilate had power over him: But the Question is, Whether there was an obligation upon him as he was man to do thus? Or, Was it a meer voluntary privation of the use of that right which he had? To this there are several Answers, which arise from several springs; for there are those that say, Christ as man by his lineal descent had the true and proper right to the Kingdom of Judea, that the Scepter did belong to him, as being the next successour,
only he did voluntarily abstain from the claim and exercise of this right; so that when he was taxed with others, and paid Tribute, this he did, not as bound to it, but relinquishing or suspending his right. But there must be many doubtfull conjectures cleared ere this can be positively asserted. The Popish parasites upon a carnal designe to advance the Pope above all civil power, say, That Christ as man had the direct and absolute dominion over all the Kingdoms and Nations of the world, and that by a three-fold title, 1. Of his personal Union. 2. By Merit. 3. By Redemption. So that by this right, Christ, if he would, might have depos'd all the powers that then ruled, and have taken their privileges into his own hand; he had this dominion, they say, in habitus, though he did not put it forth in actu secundo. But this is contrary to Scripture; for Christ faith, John 20. His Kingdom is not of this world; neither was such a privilege any ways proper or accommodated to his Mediatorial Office, howsoever by this opinion Christ was not obliged to obey any civil Magistrate, because all temporal Jurisdiction did belong to him, as a Superiour. In the third place, Spalato (l.6.de Repub. Eccl. cap.1.) acknowledged to be a learned man, though in a large Discourse, he is very vehement against such fawning Positions of some Papists, yet affirmeth, That it cannot be said sine blasphemia hereticali, that Christ as man was subject to the civil power, or that Cæsar and Pilate had any right over him even as man. The reason he proceedeth upon is, That the right of civil power doth not extend to humanities in the abstract, but to persons, and therefore Pilate did not only in by unjuft judgement condemning the innocent, but also by an usurped judgement, exercising jurisdiction over him, who was not over him. Its true, he will not grant Pilates judgement was usurped, for he had right upon a lawfull presumption, because Pilate was not bound to know that Christ was God, as well as man, or that his humane Nature did subsist in the Divine Person. But this is infirm, for Pilate being the Judge, as he was bound to know, Whether Christ was innocent or no, so having the opportunity and means of knowledge, he was bound to have believed in him as the Messiah, Not
Not to be too long on this, we may conclude, That Christ did truly subject himself unto civil powers, and was obliged thereinto as man, taking such a servile form upon him, as he did; only this subjecting and obedience was voluntary, in that he was not necessitated, but voluntarily took our nature upon him in such a subjected way for our everlasting good: Even as he voluntarily took a passible body, subject to thirst and weariness, yea pains and death itself for our sakes: So that although he might have been made man, and yet not put himself into such bodily infirmities, or moral subjecting and debasement; yet when once he hath thus subjected himself, then there is an obligation upon him.

A further doubt may be made about the positive precepts, which God gave the people of the Jews, to be circumcised, and perform those ceremonial precepts God gave the people of Israel; for Piscator he faith, Christ was bound to these as being an Israelite, and so it was his duty to be circumcised, which accordingly he was in reference to his own obligation. Others that deny the active obedience of Christ in our sense, do grant, that he was not bound to these, but they were part of that Mediatorial Law Christ had imposed on him.
That Christ was truly and properly subject to the Law of God, both general and particular: And that he suffered in obedience both to the natural and positive Law.

Rom. 5:19.

So by the Obedience of one shall many be made righteous.

The Answering of this Question will be of the same affinity with the former. As Christ was not necessitated to be man, so neither to subject himself to that positive obedience; yea though as man he might not have submitted himself unto it: for if this submission did necessarily follow his humane nature, then still Christ would be bound to such an obedience, for he doth not cease to be a man though glorified in heaven. This obligation then of Christ in the days of his flesh to be circumcised, and to observe such positive precepts as were commanded the Jews, did arise because of that voluntary resignation of himself to be made under the Law, which God should give his people, though in respect of his Divine nature he was Lord of that Law. Hence it was that he did observe the Sabbath, and although he did those things which his adversaries judged to be a breach of the Sabbath, yet he vindicated those passa
passages, because they were the duties of charity and necessity: Its true, he faith, The Son of man is Lord of the Sabbath, Matth.12.8. but that may be understood because he who was the Son of man, was also God, and so there is the communication of properties; or else in a general way, that the Sabbath was made for man, and therefore in cases of necessity a man was not obliged to such duties, as ordinarily are required. And certainly, that our Saviour was obliged by the Law, as others were, (though also with great dissimilitude) doth appear in that he challengeth his adversaries, Which of you can accuse me of sinne, and what evil have I done? Implying, that if he had broken the Law, they might justly have accused him: He doth not at any time plead an exemption from the Law, or that it was made for meer men, but not for him who was God and man, but still acknowledgeth an obligation upon him; and although in paying of tribute he pleaded his freedom, that is, if absolutely considered, if it had pleased him, he might not so have debased himself; yet supposing he would become man in such a way for our redemption, then he did voluntarily take this obligation upon him, which appeareth in that expression to Peter, when he yieldeth to pay, that he may give no offence, Matth.17.27. which supposeth that there was an obligation upon Christ as man, not to give just offence or scandal, otherwise if Christ had stood upon his absolute exemption from all Laws, there was no cause to regard the matter of offence. Thus our Saviour, Matth.4.10. when the devil tempted him to such things as were unlawful, he repels him by such arguments as are taken from those duties that belong to a man. Thus Christ made that command, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God, to belong to him: So Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve, Christ appropriateth to himself; by which it appeareth that Christ looked upon it as his duty to worship and serve God according to those waies that God had commanded others.

But against this there are Learned men that Object, Christ Object: (say they) could not, no not in respect of his humane nature, be obliged to the positive worship and ceremonial Law of the Jews, be
because he was not truly and properly a child of Abraham, because he was not in the loins of Abraham, as other Jews were, even as he was not in Adam; therefore though Adam was under a common Covenant for himself and his posterity, yet this Law did not bind Christ as it did all mankind, for then Christ should have joined in Adam, as well as the rest of mankind. Thus it is also in respect of Abraham, seeing he was not contained in Abraham, properly, neither was of Adam, quoad feminalem rationem, but corpulencam substantiam: Therefore it could not be, that those positive precepts should reach to Christ. And further, such precepts are made to those that do imply imperfection in them, for the ceremonial Law did signify the expiation of sin.

Now though this be very specious, yet it will not hold: For 1. its granted even by them that Christ did actually submit himself to the observation of those positive precepts. They grant the Factum, but not the Fui, the observation, not the obligation. But their Objection will fall on themselves, Why should Christ submit to that, which in the institution of it did denote imperfection and sinne in the subject obliged?

2. Their Arguments prove, that Christ was not obliged to put himself in such a condition that required such subjection, but when once he had resigned himself unto it, then he was bound not indeed properly for himself, but for us, as he was not made man for himself, but for us. Christ being circumcised, did thereby make himself a debtor to keep the whole Law, not for himself but for us; Its true those that deny this obligation of Christ, say, that passage of Pauls, He that is circumcised becomes a debtor to keep the whole Law, is to be meant only of meer man, not of Christ, who was not feminally in Abraham. But first, The Scripture calls Christ, the seed of Abraham; he is that seed in whom all the Nations of the earth are to be blessed. And secondly, Being a true man, though not in that ordinary propagation, he was thereby a member of the Jewish Church; even as if God had raised up children to Abraham out of stones, they would have been Abrahams children in the Scriptures sense, though not by natural propagation from him. Christ then being true man, yea and
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ejusdem speciei with other men, in respect of his humane nature, he was obliged to such a worship of God, as was then appointed for all men, who should serve him according to his will. Hence it is that John 4. he puts himself in the number of the Jewish members, when he faith to the woman of Samaria in the plural number, We worship what we know. So that it was his duty, as man, to worship God: And therefore we read so often of his praying unto God, and that with so much fervency; for although he could as God do whatsoever he pleased, as appeareth by his working of miracles, and so needed not to pray any more then God himself, yet as man it was his duty to pray unto God; Prayer being by Divine ordination, the means by which God had decreed to befow on him that glory he was to partake of: So that as its said, it behoved him to suffer, and then enter into glory, Luke 22. thus it behoved him to pray, and so receive that exaltation of his person. Hence Psal. 2. its said, Ask of me, and I will give thee the inheritance of the earth, He was bound to ask and seek for it by prayer at Gods hands; and John 17. he doth there make a large prayer, which is for to accomplish and effect all those things either for himself or his Church, that he had merited at Gods hands. By all this it appeareth, that Christ having once subjected himself in this way as he did, there was an obligation upon him to conform himself unto those positive precepts, and that he did observe those commands not meerly for example, but from obligation and duty as he was a man in that debased way.

3. The next and last thing to be debated about the Laws Christ was obedient unto, is, Whether there was a peculiar Law or Commandment laid upon him to be our redeemer and to die for us. And to this we have formerly answered, that Christ was truly and strictly under a command, and that what he did was properly and truly called obedience. We shewed many places, wherein Christ himself called it a command, not a meer bare insinuation of Gods will, but a strict command, and indeed otherwise it could not have been obedience, unless materialiter, as its said, the glorified Saints in heaven do, to whom properly no command is made; they
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being

Whether Christ's obedience was to a peculiar command laid upon him,
being now no longer viatores, or travellers to heaven, but at
their journeys end; and so comprehensores of that Crown of
glory laid up for them: So that although they love God-and
delight in him, yet (say some) this is obedience material-
ter, not formaliter. But that Christs obedience was formally
so, appeareth, in that otherwise he could not have merited,
neither could he have been our Surety to take our obligation
upon him.

This then being granted, there is a further and a more
difficult Question arising from the former, viz. whether
Christs obedience in dying for us, was to a natural or a posi-
tive command: That is, Whether Christ in undertaking our re-
demption, was bound by a meer voluntary positive precept,
such as God made to Abraham to offer up his son Isaac: or
whether it was from that moral Law, to love God with all
his heart and soul, and his neighbour as himself. There are
Learned men that say, Christ being once made man, he was
bound as a man from love to Gods glory, and to his neigh-
bour, to lay down his life for mans salvation: And this they
think will hold the more firmly, if we suppose it revealed to
the humane nature by the Father, that he will not save man
any other way. Then say they, as it is a mans duty in some
cases to lay down his bodily life to save the spiritual life of
another, and the Apostle faith, we are to lay down our life for
the Brethren, 1 John 3.16. So it was Christs duty as man, be-
ing no other could do it but he, and he was only qualified
for it by his debasing of himself, both in life and death to pro-
cure our salvation. Neither is that thought any considera-
ble Objection, though it be a duty to a meer man, because
the salvation of another们的 soul is a greater good then the bo-
dily life of another; whereas Christs temporal life being the
life of him who was God also, did serve to be more worth
then the salvation of all mens souls. This (I say) is not con-
siderable, because Christs life was not absolutely lost, it was
only for a little time that his soul and body was separated,
though his Deity was not from either of them. Thus these
Authors think, that as in some cases the moral Law doth
bine to be .Martyrs, and to lose our lives for the confession
of faith, and edification of others; so it was also a command upon Christ, that God having decreed to save man no other way, but in mercy and justice joined together, and there being no other in the world but he that could do it so, but he who was God and man; therefore the love to God's glory and man's good, was requiring him to become a Surety for us. Neither will this take off from the free love and grace of Christ thus in living and dying for us, because it was wholly from his meer goodness to put himself in such a condition of suffering for us, in so much that absolutely he was free to do otherwise. This obligation ariseth only from the supposition, that he will become man for us; and certainly if Moses, but especially Paul could arise to such a measure of love, as to say, he could desire to be an Anathema for the good of his brethren in the flesh, Rom. 9. 3. no wonder if Christ did absolutely submit himself to be made a curse for us, out of love to God's glory, and the salvation of man.

But if we speak exactly and properly, we must say, That Sol. command imposed on Christ to die for us, was reducible partly to the moral Law, and partly to a positive and special command. It was a positive and special command in this sense, because this duty of dying for man's salvation, could not be enjoined any other man, for that could not be his duty; which was intrinsically impossible for any man, though possessed with so much perfection as man's nature was capable of. And besides, it must in this sense also be positive, because it was in God's gracious good pleasure, whether he would open a way or no for the salvation of a sinner, and whether he would accept of a Surety or not. But whatsoever is commanded by the moral Law primarily and directly, its from its own nature intrinsically good and just; and therefore said not to be just because commanded, but commanded because just. And indeed if it were not so, all the grace of God would be evacuated that is seen in our Redemption: For then God should necessarily will, That Christ should be our Redeemer, and Christ also be necessitated to undertake this Office upon him; so that so farre that here is a particular way commanded, whereby our salvation is to be accomplished, this is altogether po-
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ative. But in the second place, If we do regard the root and fountain from whence Christ as man, was thus willing to be subjected to this command, that must needs arise from the moral Law; for seeing the Law doth require even of Christ as man, to love God and man perfectly; hence we may say that eminenter and virtualliter, though not formaliter it was required by the moral Law. It was by a special command that there should be such a way injoynd to demonstrate Christ's love; yea it was a way ordained by the infinite wisdom and goodness of God: it was wholly supernatural both in the institution and revelation of it; yet when that way was made known to Christ as man and imposed on him, it was from the moral Law he submitted to it; the moral Law in the general commanding this, that whatsoever God shall require or appoint as an instance to demonstrate love to him, that we are bound to do: So that it is here, in this respect, as in the Command, Thou shalt do no murder, &c. This Law did oblige Adam, though while in the state of integrity there could be no object about which such a prohibition could be conveyant. But when through sin, such temptations are, then the moral Law is put forth into actual exercise: So that it is very great weakness to say, Christ was not bound to die for us, nor any to be Martyrs by the moral Law, because that was given to men in integrity, for the command doth oblige, not only to what was then, but also to what new occasions or objects shall rise afterwards. Thus by the moral Law we are commanded to love our enemies, to believe in Jesus Christ; for though these objects were not in the state of Integrity, yet when they shall be propounded, they are commanded by virtue of that old Law. Hence our Divines do well demonstrate against the Socinians, that Christ injoynd no new moral duty, only did interpret the Law in a more spiritual and large extension, than the Pharisees had done. Thus we may say of that personal command to the young man, to sell all he had, though it was in respect of the matter, special and personal, yet in respect of the original and root, it was from the command of God, which requireth us to love God with all our strength. Its true, the Apostle John, 1.eap. 3.16. doth press the
the duty of laying down our lives for the Brethren, because
of Christ's doing so for us, which is a new motive that the mo-
ral Law strictly taken, did not know: but its ordinary in Scri-
pture to press an old duty, from some new and special consider-
ation. Thus they are commanded to have one God for their
God, because he brought them out of Egypt. This holds also in
that exploratory command to Abraham about killing his son,
it was special and positive in respect of the matter comman-
ded, yet when once commanded, it was from the moral Law
he should obey. Thus it is also in Christ's dying for us, the
matter and the way was wholly of free-grace; but when
once determined and appointed by God, that this way and no
other way he would have man saved, and it being supposed
that Christ would become man for us, then that command of
love did rule in Christ's heart: and therefore Psal. 40. he saith,
Behold I come to do thy will! Thy Law is within my heart. Nei-
ther will it follow from hence that Christ as man was bound
absolutely to will and procure the salvation of all men, be-
cause his humane will was directed and circumscribed by the
Divine. Thus we have at large discussed this noble point,
that hath so much influence into this Controversy, concern-
ing Christ's subjection to a Law, wherein I have closed with
those that do hold Christ as man was subjected to a Law. And
therefore do wonder at those, though great Pillars that will
answer the Argument proposed, and put all upon this issue,
That Christ was not bound to obey any Law, and therefore
what he did by way of obedience it was wholly for us, not that
any obligation lay upon him.

Before we dismiss this Point, let us consider what is objec-
ted to this Doctrine: And first its said, Christ though he be a
man, yet being one person, and that Divine, he could not be sub-
jected to a Law any more then God himself.

To this it is Answered, That its true that Christ, both in
respect of his Divine nature, as also of his personality, is not
bound by any Law, but in respect of his humane nature: and
its an acknowledged rule in Divinity, That by reason of the
communication of the properties, we may predicate that of Christ's
Person in the concrete, which belongs to him only because of one
of his Natures. Thus we say Christ died, Christ suffered; certainly this is more than to say, Christ was subject to a Law, and all is true, because of his humane nature, which was the principium quo of these things.

Object. If it be said, that Laws are given to persons, not to natures, to men, not to humanities in the abstract, certainly this is more than to say, Christ was subject to a Law, and all is true, because of his humane nature, which was the principium quo of these things.

Answ. Its answered, First, This is not universally true, for the separated souls damned in hell, do yet sinne against the Law of God in that they hate him, and rage at him, when yet they are not subsisting persons.

But secondly, Commands are given primarily to persons, but secondarily and remotely to natures, and therefore though the Law did not immediatly, yet mediately it did extend to Christ's humane nature.

Object. It is further objected, That Christ needed not any command, because he had a perfect inclination within to what is good and holy. Besides a command there is injoyed threatening, and so it would be thus, that if Christ did forsake or fail in his trust, he would be a sinner, and so guilty of condemnation.

Answ. But two things may be replied to this, 1. That commands were not given to Christ as they are to meer men, who need direction and quickning to their duty: Therefore such additaments of encouragement, or commination were not necessary to him.

2. It may be granted that even such comminations were added to the commands, yet they made no impression of terror upon Christ, who was not subject to any failing, and therefore were only to inform how much God did hate or dislike the contrary to what he commanded, not that they supposed any necessity of such spurrets to Christ for the performing of what was imposed.
S E R M.  X L.

Some Objections Answered, and Distinctions Examined, concerning the Obedience of Christ.

R O M. 5.19.

So by the Obedience of one shall many be made righteous.

Christ (we have heard) was truly and properly subject to a Law, and that both general, which concerneth every man, and also particular, which did relate to him as Mediator.

There is one Doubt more to be removed ere we proceed, and that is, How it could be called a command imposed on Christ to die for us, seeing that his death did depend upon the wicked and corrupt wills of other men, and he was not bound to kill himself: Therefore that seemeth not to be a command to him, the effecting whereof was to be by the wickedness of others.

But this is easily resolved, That the command upon Christ was to walk in such a way, and to do that work of God on earth, which he had commanded, not to shrink or fly from duty, in the accomplishing whereof the malice of his enemies would be stirred up to put him to death, and when that hour was come, Christ would not decline it.

Thus I have been large in discussing this Answer, which many learned men give; but upon the weighing of it, it seem-
feemeth to be too light. Though this deep searching into the particulars of it, is very profitable to give light in the controversy.

I proceed therefore to a second Answer to the grand Objection, which was, That Christ being obliged to the Law for himself, could not fulfill it for us, it was paying his own debt, and so could not thereby discharge ours.

A second Answer, which seemeth to carry more truth and solidity with it, is, That Christ, though when he assumed the humane nature, he was thereby indispensible subjected to the Law of God, yet because he did freely and voluntarily become man, and so put himself of his own accord into a state of subjection, therefore we may absolutely and truly say, Christ was free from the Law, and this may fully satisfy the Objection. Its denied, that if we speak simply and absolutely Christ was obliged by the Law, because this obligation comes by supposition, and upon a mere voluntary dispensation; for as he was not made man for himself, so neither made under the Law for himself; he did not become man, that he might obey the Law for his own good, but all this was for us. Hence Isa. 9. To us a Sonne is born; and the Angel told the Shepherds, Luke 1. To you is a Saviour born, therefore he had his Name Jefus, not in reference to himself, but to save his people from their finnes. Thus also Galat. 4. His being made of a woman, and made under the Law, are put together, with the final caufe, why? Not for himself, but to redeem us from the curse of the Law: So that if we speak absolutely, we may say, Christ was not bound by the Law, because he did of his mere accord put himself into this subjection; and although while he is in this way of submission, he is bound to obey, yet that is but an hypothetical and conditional obligation: Even as being made man he was bound to suffer for us; for although it was his mere goodness to undertake the Office of our Redeemer, yet when once he had taken up that will and resolution, Behold, I come to do thy will, O God, then it was necessary he should suffer for us. Therefore the Scripture puts a dη & an oportet upon it, It behoved him to suffer, and so to enter into glory, Luk. 2.2. Then its his duty
ty to drink of this Cup, and it cannot passe away. Therefore Christ was no more obliged to obey the Law for us, then to suffer for us: for it was his voluntary giving up of himself to this work, only when it was once undertaken, it was necessary he should accomplish it, otherwise he would have been unfaithfull in his trust. Therefore these are unclean and unsavoury positions of the Arminians, who say, Christ might have relinquished this Office of Mediatorship, he might not have delighted in the glory set before him. No, such was his holy perfection, that he had an immutable necessity, though not a natural one, to fulfill his Fathers will. Its then in this case, as the Schoolmen say about the liberty of the will, when the will hath formally determined it self to will, and doth produce such a volition, it cannot do otherwise, for the old Rule is, Quicquid est, quando est, necess esse esse: yet they say, That act of the will is free, and the will hath not lost its liberty, though determined. Thus seeing Christ was not originally necessitated to take our nature upon him, and the Scripture attributeth it always to his love, therefore it is that we may say with Calvin, he was immuuis, exempt from the Law: So that although Christ was as man bound to the Law, yet there was a vast difference between him and us, because Christ became man voluntarily, we necessarily and antecedently to our wils, and which is the signal difference, Christ became man, not for himself, or to have eternall life and glory by any obedience, but for us: So that we cannot distinguish of a righteousnesse which Christ had for himself meery, and another he had for us. And this brings in the examination of some distinctions. As First, Of a legal Obedience, and a servile Obedience. A le-
gal obedience they call that which Christ as man was bound to put forth, even his conformity to the whole Moral Law. Servile obedience they call that which Christ demonstrated in respect of that special command of his Mediatorship: For (say they) though he was bound as a creature to obey the Moral Law of God, yet he was not obliged in such a low, debased manner, both by doing and suffering to procure our Sal-

An examination of some Distinctions.
This distinction hath some truth in it, onely its insufficient and imperfect, as it is managed by the learned Authors of it to serve their opinion. And

Take notice, that this opinion doth not Piscatorize. For our justification is not hereby limited to the mere death of Christ, but all that obedience he showed in his life time, Subserviently to the Law of his Mediatorship, both active and passive, do make up our compleat, satisfactory righteousness. So that all active obedience is not excluded, but what is supposed not to be an act of humiliation.

But first, This distinction is built upon a metaphysical abstraction or notional precision of respective formalities. Its true indeed, Christ might from his very birth have been in such a condition, as the glorified Saints shall be. Its the opinion of some Schoolmen and others, that Christ would have been incarnated, though Adam had not fallen, because it was such a glorious mystery, and desirable in itself, without any respect to sinne: Onely (they say) then Christ would not have come in a passible body, and then he would not have been in a meriting way, neither would his obedience have had any penalty or debasement in it. Whether this be true or no, its not material; onely we grant, That Christ might have taken our nature in a glorious and immortal manner; but de facto, Christ did not, yea the Scripture revealeth no other end of his coming into the world, but to be our Saviour, and makes his very Incarnation, and all that he did to be in reference to us: So that howsoever in a mans understanding there may be made such precise respects, yet in reality, there was no legal act of Christ's obedience, but it was servile, Phil.2. The Apostle expresseth the whole state of his humiliation, to be in the form of a servant. Its therefore in vain to dispute of an absolute power, when the ordinary power is in question. The controversy is not, Whether Christ might not have performed legal acts of obedience, that would not have been imputed unto us? But whether he actually did submit himself in that humbled manner to obey the Law for himself, or others? So that Christ's legal obedience, but not paenall or servile, is an Ens in intellectu;
of Christs active Obedience Answered.

...Its Resa in hyeme, as in respect of this controversy.

If with Piscator it be said, That this legal obedience did wholly belong to Christ himself.

I answer, That it did behove him no more to be under the Law, then to be made of a woman, yet certainly he was not obliged to be made man for his own self.

And again, There is no repugnancy, as is to be shewed, that the same obedience should be under one title due and required, and under another title or end to be wholly voluntary and undue.

2. This distinction then in a well-seasoned sense, may be approved of, that Christs obedience as it was penal, was part of our righteousness (and de facto it was not otherwise) but not as legal; though the members of the distinction are not opposite; for legal obedience may be servile, and servile legal; servile is not here taken in the sense, as we call servile fear: Christs had no such obedience, he did not obey in a servile manner, meerly out of fear; but its called servile, because it was done by him, who was in the form and condition of a servant, and it being servile obedience in this denomination it was also legal: So that this division faileth in the known Rule of Logick; The same obedience is legal in respect of the Rule, and servile in respect of the person accomplishing it.

3. This distinction is not stood to, or any ways improved by the Authors, or at least very inconsiderably in the protract of the Dispute; for when such Texts are urged, That the righteousness of the Law may be fulfilled in us; Christ is the end of the Law for righteousness, or Christ was made under the Law; They runne up not to the Sanctuary of this distinction, neither do they seem to acknowledge the impleative obedience of the Law by conformity unto it, though in an humbled manner, but mention altogether the Satisfaction of the penalty of it, by suffering the curse annexed to the transgression of it: So that all along the controversy, I can finde little use made of it; The passive obedience is often mentioned, but the servile active to the Law of
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God is very seldom; if at all taken notice of.

4. This distinction will be overthrown by their own principles, and so breedeth that in its own bowels which will destroy it self: for thus we may argue *ad homines*, Christ by his offering up of himself, satisfied the penalty of the Law; the Law hath no more to accuse, and where there is no accusation, there is an acquittance; then if so, what need was there of his active, servile obedience in the whole course of his life, What need that go to make up part of our satisfactory righteousness, when the other was enough, and took away the whole guilt of sinne? If satisfying of the punishment of the Law be enough, what needeth the active obedience of Christ either to the Moral, or to the Positive Laws concurre to our righteousness? So that this servile obedience being necessarily distributed into active and passive, whatsoever Arguments are brought against the active obedience of Christ in the sense affirmed by us, will also militate against the sense affirmed by them: Inasmuch that the truth we plead for, will quickly have the victory, if we set that opinion on one hand, which limits our righteousness only to the sufferings of Christ; and that opinion on the other hand which holds Christ's servile obedience to concurre also to make our compleat righteousness. These two will necessarily conflict so long together, that a third will goe away with the victory.

Lastly, This distinction brought in by learned opponents, doth not at all contradict that truth we plead for, and therefore is wholly impertinently brought to the state of the Question; For those that plead for the imputation of Christ's active obedience to the Law of God, either general or special, do grant, That this obedience was wholly servile and debased, that Christ was in a state of humiliation, and not of glorification, while he thus submitted himself: Therefore it may be wondered, why is brought into this controversy, seeing its acknowledged by all, That Christ even while he did obey any Law of God was in the form of a servant, all his obedience was in a debased way, and the lower he submitted himself, the greater was his love to us. Therefore
fore though once it was vehemently disputed [Vid. Suarez. in Thom. de Incar. Christi, Quaest. 20. Dif. 44.] Whether Christ be called the servant of God the Father? yet we conclude, there was no just ground for the denial of it, seeing that the Scripture speaks so positively therein.

A second Distinction comes to be examined, that is framed by some who appear against the truth we plead for; and that is of some affinity with the former, though with some difference, They distinguish of Christ's legal Obedience, and his Mediatorial Obedience; His legal Obedience they call that which was given to the Law as he was man, in the same obligation as it did reach to others; His Mediatorial Obedience they call that which he did as God-man in accomplishing our Redemption for us. But this distinction splits at a Rock, as well as the former.

For first, It opposeth those things which are the same; legal Obedience and Mediatorial obedience, as to our controversy are the same, onely denominated from several respects: The same obedience is Mediatorial, because done by him who is the Mediator, and the same is also legal, because conformable to the Law of God: Even as the same works which the regenerate do, may be called the works of the Spirit, and the works of the Law; of the Spirit, because he is the efficient and author of them, and of the Law, because they are commensurated to that as a Rule. So that this Distinction doth opponere composenda, It behoved our Mediator to fulfill the Law for us; and this Obedience is Mediatorial, as it respects the Person from whom it floweth; and legal, as it relates to the Rule according to which it ought to be done.

Secondly, As it faileth in exact distinguishing; so it is also very ambiguous, and is such a distinction that it self needeth a distinction, Tacere, negare, & obscure responderi idem sunt, is a Rule in the Civil Law; for it may be called Mediatorial obedience, formally as it comes from Christ the efficient thereof, or materially, as that which Christ did. Now its true, Christ's Mediatorial Obedience is not imputed unto us for righteousness, formally as coming from him, for so we should.
should be Mediators and Saviours, but materially, that is, what Christ did that is imputed to us, as if we had done it. So that when we say, Christ's Meditory Obedience is imputed unto us, its not the meaning, as if we were reputed of by God, as the efficient who did it, but as the subjects receiving of it, and applied to us.

Thirdly, This distinction proceedeth upon two false and rotten foundations, as if Christ in obeying the Law did act as a mere man, whereas Galat. 4. He was made under the Law, that he might redeem us from the curse of the Law, which could not be by his mere humane Nature, yea this would be to overthrow that meritorious worth which was on those actions he did for us.

And the second rotten foundation is, that the Law Christ was under when working our salvation, was not the Moral Law, or Law of works, but a particular special Law imposed on him as Mediatour: Now this is clearly confessed by that fore-mentioned Text, Christ was made under the Law, that he might redeem us from the curse of the Law; but it was the curse of the Moral Law he was to redeem us from, therefore it was the Moral Law he was made under. Besides, By what Law Christ was made a curse for us, that he was under: but he was only by the Moral Law, and not that special Law of a Mediatour, made a curse for us: Therefore the Law he submitted to, was that Law which was in common with us and him. Its true, we have granted a special command to be imposed on him, viz. to be our Mediatour, which did not belong to us, or oblige us; but we also have proved, that this Law did oblige him to fulfill all that we were bound to do, whereof obedience to the Moral Law was a very great part, and of which he said, It was written in his heart.

To conclude, the summe of this second Answer to that grand Objection is, That Christ absolutely and universally considered, was not obliged to be under the Law, no more then to be made of a woman, or to die for us. This obligation ariseth conditionally, upon his voluntary subject to such a Condition. And this (I conceive) doth clearly and fully Answer the Objection propounded, yet that
that the evidence may (if possibly) be more convincing. I shall.

In the third place Answer, by way of additional explanation to the former, in this manner, That though Christ simply and absolutely, as man, might be obliged by the Law, yet as our Surety and undertaking for us in a fiduciary manner, so his obligation was wholly voluntary and free; for we may conceive of Christ two ways:

1. As acting and obeying in his single Person.
2. As acting as our Surety and Undertaker. The former Condition is only in our understanding, and imagined as possible only; for Christ was not incarnated or made under the Law for himself, but for us: So that although we may conceive,

First, Christ's being made man and thereby an absolute obligation to obey God for himself.

And then secondly, A voluntary stipulation, and an agreement with the Father, to become obedient for us, yet this Distinction will be only in our understanding; and we shall make two signa rationis, whereof one is primus, and the other posterius. But in reality and existency, Christ never had his humane being, but it was under consideration for us. This is then that which we affirm, That suppose Christ to be made a man, and thereby absolutely obliged to fulfill the Law for himself, yet that he should enter into agreement with the Father, to obey it as a Surety, for such a term of years upon the earth, and thereby to procure Salvation for a sinner undone otherwise: This, I say, is wholly gracious and voluntary, and Christ was not obliged to it as a man. In this respect it is, that Christ is called the second Adam, because of the Covenant he is under for his people: So that as the first Adam, though he was bound in his own person to obey the Law of God, yet was capable of a new obligation for his posterity upon a new title: So that at the same time, if he had continued, his obedience would have been accountable, both to himself and to his posterity. Thus it was with Christ, if we grant, That as man he was bound to obey the Law, yet as a Surety for
for us in such a way, he did take the same obligation upon him by another title and consideration: And this truth is made evident thus: If Christ because man was bound to obey the Law, as he did, while on earth, then he was still bound to do so, while he is in heaven, because he doth not cease to be man there; and if obedience do follow upon Christ's humane Nature inseparably, as they say, then though in heaven he was obliged to do, as once upon the earth: Grant it therefore, That Christ as man was bound to fulfill the Law, yet to do it in such a manner, by way of a Covenant with the Father for such a space of time, this is that he was not obliged unto, and so this was wholly voluntary. The Apostle notably urgeth this, Heb. 2.7. Thou hast made him lower than Angels, This being this short time of his inferiority and debasement under the Law for us, is that which Christ stipulated for, and to which he was not absolutely as man obliged unto. And thus have we finished the second Objection, wherein we have been very large, because herein did seem to lie the strength of Samson, and when that is discovered, the other Objections will the more easily yield themselves.
S E R M. XLI.

A further dispute for the Imputation of Christ's active obedience.

ROM. 5. 19.

So by the Obedience of one shall many be made righteous.

We proceed to a third Argument against the imputation of Christ's active obedience; and it thus urged: If the active obedience be imputed, then the passive is made wholly useless: for seeing by that we are made perfectly righteous, and accounted of as those who have fulfilled the Law, what need any further righteousness? Thus (say they) Christ's death is made to be in vain.

But certainly the weakness and nakedness of this Argument is so visible, that with Adam, it may justly run to hide itself, for several things are to be answered. First, the consequence is wholly denied, for there is a necessity both of active and passive obedience. Christ's obedience to the Law, did not supply the virtue of his death, no more then his death did the efficacy of his obedience; so that both his active and passive obedience do concur to make up one integrall compleat legal righteousness; for the Law requiring both these, it behoved our Surety to fulfill them both: Insomuch that if we could have had a perfect righteousness conformable to the Law, de novo, and not have satisfied the punishment our debt would not have been discharged, we had still been in our sins.

But
Ate or ofyttions Agaft the

But (its replied) that righteousness is perfect or not, if we
perfect, this would be to dishonour Christ; if perfect, yea a right-

eousness of an infinite worth, then it might serve for all.

To this I answer, The whole righteousness Christ purc-

hased for us, is a full and a perfect righteousness, to which
nothing can be added to make it more perfect: yet this total
righteousness consists of parts which complete it, which parts
have their partial perfection, but not the perfection of the
whole. Neither is this any dishonour to Christ to say, that
part of his righteousness hath not the perfection of the whole,
no more then to say, his humane nature, though it was per-
fect in its way, had not the perfection of the whole person.
Every righteous act of Christ was perfect with that respective
partial perfection it needed, and altogether made a total and
full perfection. This distinction the opponents must acknowl-
dge even in their passive obedience, for why did not the
sufferings of Christ's soul bring righteousness enough, why
not any pain in his body, as well as death? did not Christ
suffer with perfection in these? was there any deficiency in
any respect? No certainly, but those partial sufferings were
perfect with their respective limited perfection, though no
single suffering did amount to that righteousness which his
whole sufferings did. Therefore we cannot properly say, any
particular work or suffering of Christ was imperfect, though
it had not the total righteousness imputed to us, because
that is properly said to be imperfect, which wants something
its bound to have: A man is not called imperfect (unless ne-
gatively) because he is not like God or the Angels, because
man is not bound to have those perfections. And thus it is
here, Christ's particular acts and sufferings singly and seve-

dally taken, were not bound to have that compleatness and
perfection, which when conjoined, they were possessed
with. This is like the Popish argument against the perfection
of the Scriptures, for (say they) they are either a perfeét
rule in the whole, or in the parts of them; if in the parts,
then one Book of the Canonical Scripture is enough, and
the other superfluous; if in the whole only, then the parts
are imperfect, because they do not sufficiently and compleat-
ly direct to salvation. To this the Learned reply, That the whole Canon is a perfect rule, perfectione totali, and the several parts, perfectione partiali: Every part hath its respective perfection, though not that of the whole Canon.

But it may be further said, Whatsoever Christ did had an infinite perfection, because of the dignity of the person, and so might be equivalent to any other things.

I answer, This will overthrow the greatest part of his passive obedience also; Why did not those drops of blood in the garden serve for death by way of equivalency, seeing there was infinite worth in them? and so that position be made good, That one drop of our Saviour's blood was enough to redeem the whole world: Certainly the answer they must give to this, we also must make use of, viz. That infiniteness of worth simply as so, is not enough for satisfaction and merit, but it must be such as is according to the Covenant and contract that is made. Now the Covenant with man being perfect obedience, and if fallen, satisfaction by suffering: That only could be compensatory, which had these substantialis in it; so that although the infinite dignity of the person might be equivalent to many accidentals in the Covenant; yet the substantialis and essentials cannot be dispensed with, but must be as it were paid in kinde.

2. We may retort on the opponents, If the passive obedience be all the satisfactory righteousness we needed, then his active obedience was wholly useless: why should they be more afraid to shut out his passive obedience, then his active? Certainly if we consider the thing seriously, as God in propounding the Law did intend active obedience, primarily, so that is most acceptable in itself: To satisfy the penalty of the Law is only occasional and accidentall: Seeing therefore God did in the first place require this of us, and through the punishment he suffered, God's end was not obtained by the Law; therefore we should rather fear to make his active obedience useless then his passive; especially seeing that his passive obedience is indeed to be looked upon as no other, then the ultimate and consummate act of his obedience begun in his life time.
Reply.

It may be said, That Christ's active obedience is not made useless, because thereby we have an excellent example and pattern of holiness to walk by.

Answ.

Its answered, That cannot be thought rationally a sufficient ground for Christ being made man, to subject himself under a Law, merely to give example: Not to say that this would make Christ's life wholly useless to all the people of God that lived before him, for he could not be an example to them, no, not properly to any but those that lived with him, on the earth, that did hear and see all the wonderfull words and works he did. Its true, he is propounded as an example; we are to be patient and full of love as he was, but yet it is a very low consideration to make this the only end of his holy life. The Socinians they will grant, that though Christ's death was not propiatory, yet it was exemplary: But we reply, This is a very mean esteem they put upon Christ's sufferings, that he should submit himself to them for to be an example only, or to witness the truth meerly. Besides, we may argue against this exemplary life only, as they do against the imputation of Christ's righteousness: Christ (say they) had not the righteousness of a Magistrate, of an Husband, of a Wife, for he was not in those relations, therefore his obedience could not be imputed to such as were in those relations. This Objection is to be answered in its time; its weakly urged against the truth we plead for, but strongly urged against such, who make his holy life usefull only, because exemplary, for seeing he left no example of his conversation in such a relation, how could he be a pattern to those that were placed therein?

Reply.

If it be further said, that Christ's active obedience is not useless, nor do they reject it, because its for our good, though it be not imputed to us: Even his birth, and his natures were for our good, yet they were not imputed to us as ours, neither was he born in our stead, or made man and God in our room. And indeed this is a main altar they catch hold upon, thinking none dare draw them off from thence. They distinguish of Christ's obedience, pro nobis, and vice nobis; or proper nor, and pro nobis: They grant that Christ's obedience was for us, that is, for our good:
This is specially spoken, and gives something to Christ as our Surety, but not enough: They make it only qualificative of his person, not constitutive of our righteousness. That this is not enough to a Surety, appeareth a pari, from Christ's passive obedience. The Socinians do all along readily grant, that Christ died for us: They say his death was propter nos, for our good, he would not have died but for us; and so they make man's benefit the final cause of his sufferings, only they will not yield, that he died in our room, that he did it in stead of us, and so suffered what we were obnoxious unto. And although they would elude those prepositions, that, and ye > and also, making them to signify only the final cause; yet the Orthodox press this, that he died as a Surety: Now he that dieth as a Surety, doth it not only for the good of another, but in the stead of another, taking the obligation of the debtor upon himself. As it is thus in his passive obedience, so also in his active. To obey the Law of God for our good only, is not enough; so one godly man may do it for another: Parents do obey God's commands for the good of their children, Magistrates for the good of their subjects; but Christ's obedience was more, it was a fidie justicia, obedience, it was the obedience of an undertaker for us; and therefore it must not only be for our good, but for our Head. Thus when the Martyrs, especially Paul, suffered for the Elect, it was tot genere different from Christ's sufferings for them; the one was only for the good of the Church, the other was in the Churches stead; so Christ's obedience and the obedience of Christians, who are commanded to make their light to shine before others, do differ in their whole kind; for a Christian's obedience is profitable unto others, but it is not as Christ is vicarious and impleitive of the Law in stead of others: Therefore this distinction comes too short; and gives not that full glory to him, which belongs to him as our Surety. This
This truth is further vexed, for its further urged by a late Writer, (Wendelin Christi Theol. lib. cap. 25.) That Christ must be only under the Law for our good, and not in our state, because though made man for our good (faith be) yet afterwards when he was made man, then he was a man for himself, and so for himself he had need to eat and drink, because he took a body obnoxious to such infirmities as ours are.

To this again we Answer, that without doubt, such a distinction is to be acknowledged in Christ, that somethings were in him only qualifying his person, and somethings were properly ingredient unto and constitutive of our righteousness. The former was to be considered only presuppositional and materialiter (as we said the Schools speak) The later formally, and immediately; of the former sort are his two natures, his Godhead and his manhood, these two were conjoin'd in one person for our good, and they did qualify his person to be our Redeemer, he must be mediocr before he can be mediator, he was God for our good, but not God in our stead; he was man for our good, but not in our stead. As it is thus to be granted in respect of his natures, so also in those actions which he did upon other considerations, then as a Mediator, for many things it behoved a Mediator to do, which yet he did not as Mediator. Thus his eating and drinking to preserve his natural life, it behoved him to do thus; for Thou shalt not tempt the Lord, is urged by our Saviour against the devils temptation for himself as well as for other men. Now his eating and drinking, though they were actiones mediatoris, yet not actiones mediatoriae: That is, though Christ the Mediator did all these things for our good, yet they were not part of that Mediatorial righteousness for which he stood engaged, only were required of him remotè and materially, as that without which he could not accomplish his mediatory righteousness. Therefore there is great difference to be made between such actions, which were requisite to keep him up in the being of a Mediator, and those that were part of his Mediatorship. Its reported of Paulinus, that he made himself a captive or servant to redeem another. Now although while he was in that sla-
very, his eating and drinking, thereby preserving his natu-
ral life, was for the good of that captive whom he re-
deemed; yet they were not imputed in the same manner,
as those peculiar works of slavery and service, which he
was bound to do every day: Or if one had undertaken to
Pharaoh, that he would constantly perform an Israelites
task for him every day, and make such a number of bricks,
though the person to undertaking must necessarily eat and
drink, else he could not labour, yet his eating and drink-
ing would not be imputed to the Israelite, as that pecu-
liar accomplishing of such a task as the Israelite was bound
unto. Thus it is in our case, our Lord and Saviour be-
came in a form of a servant for us, undertook to redeem
us by performing that work we were bound unto: Now
his eating and drinking, that was to preserve his bodily
life, and although it was for our good, yet it was not
for us in the same manner, as the obedience of the Law,
in the duties wherein he accomplished that obligation
which was upon us, let us then distinguish between those
notions which were requisite to qualify him as a Mediator,
and which were part of his Mediatorship; for though our
salvation may be attributed to both of them, yet not in
the same manner, for the former are required of him as
conditions in his person, the later as ingredients to our
righteousness: The former he did pro se, & pro nobis: The
later loco nostri. We then do grant the necessity of this di-
inction, only we blame them for making his active obedi-
ence, to be no more then a condition requisite to his being,
and to its concurrent to our righteousness no other waies,
then his natural actions, or some miraculous actions, which
he did indeed for our good, thereby demonstrating he was the
true Messiah, but he did them not as our Surety: neither
could they be called Sponsorious obedience: So that we may
speak of these things, as Divines do about the merit of Christ,
Christ (we say) hath merited the sanctification of our hu-
mane nature, but he merited not that we should be men, that
comes not by Christ's death: Its only materialiter, and per
modum substrati. This being supposed, Christ merited the
sancti-
Arguments or Objections against the Imputation

Sanctification of our natures, as also all other supernatural privileges.

2. We must not upon any terms grant that all the active obedience of Christ which he did as a man, was for himself, for this will necessarily overthrow Christ's merit for us in his life time. It will assert that Christ did not by his holy life merit salvation for us, but make it wholly in reference to himself: and therefore I cannot subscribe to that position I meet with (Buchol. W. in dispu. de obedientia &c. cum (succinct is) &c.) in answer to a fifth reason propounded, viz. That it is not necessary that Christ by fulfilling the commands of the moral Law, should merit any thing for himself or us, any more than Angels, seeing every rational creature doth by virtue of creation owe unto God, whatsoever that Law requireth of any one. This seemeth to take away all Christ's meritorious obedience for us, as in reference to the moral Law. But to discourse it more narrowly.

1. Its ambiguously spoken, that it was not necessary Christ by fulfilling the Law, should merit for us; for there is a two-fold necessity. First, Absolute and simple, and thus indeed it was not necessary, no more then it was that he should be man, or being man, that he should converse with us in that manner he did upon the earth. But secondly, there is an hypothetical necessity, which ariseth from God's ordination and appointment of him to be our Mediator, or from the stipulation and agreement between the Father and the Son, to procure our Redemption, and thus it was necessary that he should merit by his obedience for us.

2. It doth impertinently confound Angels and Christ together in this matter, for Angels they are now in termino, they partake of heaven and happiness, and so are not capable of any reward for what they do, being instated in it already; whereas Christ, though he had right to eternall glory and happiness, yet he put himself into a condition wherein he might merit for us: And therefore

3. This assertion is not clear, because it doth not distinguish of those two conditions, viatores and comprehensores. The Saints glorified in heaven, yea Christ now exalted in glory, doth
of Christ's active Obedience Answered.

...doth still retain his humane nature, and thereby is still a creature, and they do from that inward perfection obey the Law of God materially, though not formally. But there was another consideration both of them and Christ, while they were here on earth. Although it be acknowledged, that Christ, while bodily on the earth, was a comprehensor, yet it is as generally confessed likewise, he was a visitor. I will not intangle the Reader with Scholastical intricacies, that are so industriously, but unprofitably vented in this matter. This seemeth to be clear, that though Christ had a right to all happiness, and that from his personal union, yet he put himself voluntarily in such a condition, that he might be under a promise with God, which was by that stipulation mentioned Isa. 53. If he did pour out his soul an offering for sin, he should see the travel of his soul and be satisfied: And by reason of this promise, upon the fulfilling of what he undertook, he was capable of merit, if not for himself, yet for us; so that Christ though in respect of his humane nature even in heaven, he be obliged to love God, yet he is not there in a state of merit, as he was on earth, because no longer under a promise and stipulation; and thus the glorified Saints and Angels, though they love God and do his will, yet its but obedience only materially, because no more under a promise of reward, and is not so much looked upon as their duty, as it is their part of blessedness: even as to praise God, and rejoice in him is not so much considered as a duty required by the Law, but as part of that glorious blessedness they are made partakers of. Therefore that assertion is dark and cloudy, because it makes no distinction of a rational creature, whether it be in vitâ, or in patriâ, whether under a promise or not.

Yea fourthly, It puts those two things together, which are of a very different consideration, and that is Christ meriting for himself or for us: For there are some Learned and sound Divines, Calvin especially, that deny Christ merited for himself, yet I know none, till of late, that question whether he merited for man or no.
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In Answering the last Objection, is discussed, Whether and how farre, Christ was bound to Obey and Suffer for himself: And shewed that the same Arguments which are brought against the Active Obedience of Christ, make as much against his Passive.

R o m. 5.19.
so by the Obedience of one shall many be made righteous.

A lthoough it seemeth farre more probable that Christ merited that great Exaltation of himself, as Mediator, which the Scripture do much speaks of by his humiliation here on earth, and yet even that exalted glory he did not so much look upon as his good, as the Churches over which he was thus constituted to be a glorious Head. No doubt but while on the earth he was King and Head of his Church, as the Orthodox maintain against Socinians, yet after his Resurrection there was a further possession of glory then before,
fore, his body that formerly was passible, being now made glorious. As for the glory of his Divine Nature he doth not pray for the possessing of that, John 17. seeing he had it from the beginning with the Father, but onely for the manifestation of it. But his Mediator glory, that he was fully invested into upon his Resurrection, and this seemeth more consonant to Scripture, especially that known place, Phil. 2. 9. Wherefore God hath highly exalted him, &c. For although it is true, that the phrase may denote no more then a meer consequence, or the order that was appointed between his obedience and glory, yet the whole context doth rather favour that Exposition, which makes it as a reward merited by his obedience; and indeed, if we grant, that stipulation and agreement between the Father and the Son, concerning the redemption of man-kind; I cannot see how it can be denied, that Christ merited for himself, seeing the Father promised him not only a seed and inheritance, but his glorious Dominion and Majesty thereby, although (as was said) even this glory of Christ did tend to our good and comfort: Neither hath that Argument any strength to the contrary, That Christ by the personal union had right to all, and so no glory or blessedness could be denied him; for its no absurdity to say, That Christ might have right to this glory upon a two-fold Title; 1. By personal Union. 2. By obedience: Even as the sonne of some great Monarch may have a right to his Kingdome both by inheritance or succession, and then further by conquest overcoming his subjects, who have risen up rebelliously against him: and this makes more for the glory and honour of Christ, that he would be lifted up to this glory by his humiliation, when it had been no robbery to have taken it otherwayes. It was not then out of indigency or necessity that Christ would partake of this glory in a meritorious way of obedience, but by voluntary condescension, the more to commend his love to us therein. Howsoever let Christ's merits for himself be wholly laid aside, yet that he should not merit for us by his holy life, but only in his death, I think is such a Novelist that the Church of God, though under many declensions and eclypses, scarce ever
ever was infested with; for who can perswade himself that
Christ should be made man, made under the Law, and be in
such a state of humiliation about thirty years, and not all
that while he meriting for us, but in that short time of his
death? Is it not strange, that he who was made man to be
our Mediator, yet should perform no Mediatorial act, till
the time of his sufferings? Certainly the Scripture represents
Christ our Mediator in all that he did, as well as in what he
suffered; for although some things in his life were but acces-
fory and adjuvant, yet the principal and main things of his
life were constitutive of our righteousness; neither do we
advance Christ as we ought, if we look upon his obedience,
not as fide-jusfforial, but singly and privately for himself. Hence
Phil. 2, 6, 7. the Apostle takes notice of all that obedience of
his, which he shewed even from the beginning of his being
in the form of a servant, until the death of the Cross; and
Heb. 10, 7. There that will of his, which he had upon his
coming into the world, is made the foundation of all that
after-obedience which he shewed until the oblation of him-
selv. And here in my Text, the Apostle attributeth our right-
eousnesse to his obedience indefinitely and universally with-
out limiting it to the time of his death. Hence also in Isai.
53. where there is so clear a Prophecy of his Mediatorship,
mention is not onely made of his sufferings, but his holy life,
By his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many, ver.
11. and ver. 9. he had done no violence, neither was any deceit
in his mouth; And the Apostle Peter considers, That it was
the just who suffered for the unjust, 1 Pet. 3, 18. I see it dispu-
ted by Divines, Whether Christ performed any Mediatorial
acts before his incarnation? [Vide Rivet. in Hosea, cap. 12.]
The Question is not, Whether the fruit of his Mediatorship
did not extend to all before Christ's birth? For all the Or-
thodox confesse that: But, Whether he could perform any
acts of his Mediatorly Office, till he was made man, seeing
he was Mediator in both his Natures, and its acknowledged
that in respect of his Priestly Office he could not do any
Mediatorial acts, but in his Prophetical he did? But now
we see it disputed, Whether Christ when made man did exe-
cute
cute Mediatorial acts till the time of his oblation? and not only disputed but concluded, That the holiness of his life was not meritorious for us. Certainly, that place John 17.4, might be enough to convince, where Christ faith, I have finisht the work shou'd gavest me to do, relating to the whole obedience of his life, as well as respecting his death, and therefore having discharged his whole work, he prayeth for his glorification.

I shall add one thing more worthy of consideration, if this be admitted as true, That Christ did not merit for us by his active obedience to the Moral Law, because he was subject thereunto for himself as a creature, Whether this once yielded unto will not also overthrow the merit of his Passive Obedience? For Durand. [lib.3. Distinct. 21. Quest. 2.] a Schoolman of no mean note, doth upon this account affirm, That Christ did not satisfie the Justice of God by his death, properly and exactly, because his humane Nature having received so many mercies from God being a creature, that it could never recompense God enough for itself in respect of those favours received. He proceedeth upon this Rule, That there is the same reason of obligation, for satisfaction in respect of sine committed, and of recompence in respect of benefit received. He that cannot exactly and rigidly do the later, cannot rigidly do the former. Now Christ as man received those inestimable mercies and favours both of Nature and Grace, as the personal Union, habitual Holiness, &c. that he could not requite this goodness of God to him: Thereupon he maketh a distinction of satisfaction, answerable to that which the Schools have of merit. A Satisfaction de condigno, when there is a just and equal proportion between the fault committed, and the satisfaction proffered; or a satisfaction de congruo, which is, when there is no just proportion in this case of offence, only the friendship and love of the party injured, doth accept of that which of itself is not equivalent.

This distinction is much like that of Vorstius his Divine acceptance which he speaks of in this case. Now observe the ground why he makes Christ's satisfaction by his passive obedience
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dience to be no more then a satisfaction de congruo, or a mercifull acceptation of that as equivalent, which is not so indeed. It is upon this ground, because Christ as a man received such benefits from God, that let him do or suffer never so great things, yet he could not compensate for the benefits he himself received. According to that of Aristotle, which he alledgeth 8o Ethic. That no man can render equivalent to the gods and his parents. I do not examine the truth and solidify of this Argument, only I desire the opponents to answer it by their principles, and this will appear still the more effectual against them, if that Position be acknowledged, which some Divines of great note affirm, That God by reason of the supream dominion and power he hath over any creature, may impose exquisite and unspeakable torments on a rational creature per modum simplicis cruciatus, though not per modum pæna, which doth necessarily presuppose sinne. To be sure, we see God from his dominion he had over Job, exercising of him with wonderfull sorrows and anguishes; and although Job was not without sin, yet they were not inflicted for sinne, but upon trial; If then God may without any wrong lay any trouble upon the creature, as a creature, and that is bound patiently to bear it, yea and all those sufferings cannot be equivalent to that goodness and love of God which the creature partaketh of; Would not the refractory man say, That whatsoever Christ as man suffered, yet because in those sufferings he was supported and corroborated by God, he could not merit, because what he had was received from above, and so he was by way of thankfulness obliged to return it to God again.

Again, There is another Position by the same Schoolmen, which will much presse the adversary, and makes against the passive obedience, as well as the active, and that is from the necessity of Christs death; for this he affirmeth [Lib.3. Distinct. 17. Quest. 1.] That Christ would naturally have grown old and died, as other men, if so be that he had not been violently put to death; He grounds this upon that acknowledgement, that Christ took mans nature upon him in a pasible way, and so all those defects which do necessarily and
and indeclinably concomitante mans nature in such a way. Now then I thus argue, If Christ taking our passible nature upon him, was obnoxious to death, as well as to be hungry and thirsty, and to be weary, then there was the same obligation upon him in respect of death, as of obedience to the Law, and as his being a rational creature did necessarily oblige him to obey the Law; so being made man like unto us in all infirmities (save onely excepted) he was also obnoxious to a necessity of dying.

If to all this it be said, That though it be granted, Christ was obnoxious to death, yet not in such a manner, and so circum-stanctiated, and in that respect it might be satisfactory.

It is as easily answered, That though Christ as man was obliged to the duty of the Moral Law, yet that he should submit himself to it in such a manner, for such a determinate space of time upon the earth; this was wholly free and voluntary, and so in this respect might be meritorious for us. I intreat the Reader to take notice, that I do no wayes approve of this Discourse of Durands, onely its brought ad hominem, to have them seriously weigh, Whether the same principles that deny the meritoriousnesse of Christ's active obedience, do not also tend to the overthrow of the Satisfactory Nature of his passive, for the falseness of this Schoolman's position lieth in this; as if Christ's Satisfaction in the vertue of it was meerly of man, and not of him who was God as well as man; and therefore though a pure meer man suffering, could not satisfie God, among other reasons, for that of Durands, because all his support and strength he had from God; yet he that is God as well as man is by that infinite worth redounding from the person to the actions he did, fully enabled to make exact and compleat Satisfaction. This false supposition maketh others also deny the imputation of Christ's active obedience, as appeareth by the Authour of that Book, called, The Price of Mans Redemption, where he distinguisheth Christ's legal obedience from his Mediatorial, and makes that to be done by him as a man, as if Christ's actions did not come from him as he was a person,
God-man, though the formal principles by which they were effected, were either his Divine or humane Nature. Although therefore it be granted, That Christ as man was obliged to the Moral Law, yet what action he did in reference thereunto, being the action of him that was God as well as man, it was of infinite worth for us, especially it being intended and applied by our Saviour for that end.

Before I finish this particular, it will not be altogether impertinent to consider, what is the true Doctrine about Christ's death, whether it was natural, or meerly miraculous?

Some (you have heard) affirm, That Christ because he took our passible Nature upon him, would have died, though he had not been violently put to death. For (say they) as the Personal Union did not prohibit a violent death, no more would it a natural; and as it was no reproach or dishonour to Christ to die a violent death, no more would it have been to die a natural one.

Another late Writer, [Pinch in, Price of Redemption] among other new and wonderful opinions, asserts this also, That Christ's death was wholly miraculous, that all the Romans and Jews could not put him to death, but he did voluntary dissolve that union of the soul and body himself; so that he did not by those pains die as other men from the principles of nature, but by his own voluntary concurrence. But this is directly contrary to Scripture, Acts 3. 15. 1 Thessal. 2. 15. where they are charged expressly to have killed Christ, and that as they did the other Prophets. Its true, there were many wonders about Christ's death, and in some sense it might be said to be miraculous, but not so as therefore it should be denied to be also in some sense natural: Therefore the truth lieth between these two extremes; for though Christ took our Nature upon him with the principles of death, yet it may not be said, he would have died naturally, if they had not crucified him; for that is said to be future, not which is to be so according to the second and inferior causes, but what is according to the singular Will and appointment of God:

Now
Now God had appointed his death for no other end but to be by way of a voluntary oblation for us, which it could not be if it had been the tribute of Nature: Neither do the principles of dying argue death necessarily, for Enoch and Elias were in mortal natures, yet they did not actually die, and at the last day many shall not die, but have an equivalent change: Even as we may say, The body of Christ in the grave could not putrifie or corrupt, because of God's singular will about the speedy Resurrection of it; for its said, He would not suffer his holy One to see corruption: So that its unjustifiable to say, Christ would have died naturally, if he had not been put to that violent death; and though Christ was hungry and weary, yet we never read that he was sick. Nay, Divines say, he could not be any ways capable of any bodily sickness. But yet on the other side, it's an error to say, Christ's death was wholly miraculous, that by the punishment of the Cross, with the pains thereof, there was not a natural death. Neither could his enemies kill him; for although this be true in respect of his Divine Nature, so that he could have hindered all the men of the world from killing of him: So that in respect of his Divine Will, he said, He had power to lay down his life, and to raise it again; yet seeing his Divine Nature did leave the humane Nature in its operations to itself, without which our Redemption could not be accomplished; in this dereliction his death did proceed from natural principles, even as his hunger and weariness. Its true, Christ did not die against his humane will, for with that he willingly accepted of the death imposed on him; yet for all that we may not say he killed himself, or was his own executioner. And thus much occasionally.

That which I chiefly intended, is to examine, Whether some Arguments that militate against the Active Obedience, do not also rise up against the Passive. And we may take notice, That Bernard (Epist. 190) writing against Abiurardus, the first that ever appeared to deny the Satisfactory Propitiation by Christ's death, making it onely exemplary, doth oppose him, not onely by asserting the redeeming power in Christ's death,
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deadh, but the imputation also of his righteous obedience: Hence are those expressions, *Assignata est ci aliena justitia:
qui carrit suâ, Another's righteousness is assigned to him, who wanted one of his own. Again, *Justum me dixerim
sed illius justitiâ; quanam ipsâ? finis legis Christus ad justitiam omni credenti, I will call myself righteous, but by his righteousness; And what is that? Christ is the end of the Law for righteousness to him that believeth. Lastly, That it is very clear, Si mea traducta culpa, cur non & mea indulta
justitia? & sanc mihi tuitür donata, quam si inherens, If Adams sinne can by traduction be made mine, why not righteousness be also indulged and imputed to me? Certainly righteousness thus given is more safe than what is inherent. This righteousness is not onely to be limited to his death, but to his whole conversation in the world for us.

Object. 4.

It's time to hasten to a fourth Argument, and that is thus managed, If Christ obeyed the Law in our stead, then we are not bound to obey it, for a two-fold obedience to the same Law is superfluous.

Answ.

But this will not hold the respondent long; for its readily granted, That obedience is not required of us to the same end, and for the same purpose that it was of Christ: Christ obeyed the Law for our Justification, but we by way of gratitude, and to testify our thankfulnesse: Even as in the Passive Obedience of Christ, Christ suffered pains and death to atone and reconcile God, nevertheless we die, and are exercised with many afflications, but not to the same end for which Christ suffered: his sufferings were propitiatory, but so are not ours.

Reply.

This Answer is true and solid, yet there is endeavour to demolish it; For (say they) We are not bound to the obedience of gratitude, if Christ hath fulfilled all obedience for us; For the Morall Law requiring gratitude, and Christ fulfilling that for us, we cannot be obliged to Obedience either in respect of Justification or Gratitude.

Answ.

To fully satisfie this, It's not so safe to acknowledge Obedience
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dience a duty onely by way of Gratitude, but that simply its required by the Law still as Obedience, Love as Love, Zeal as Zeal, &c. Onely these are not required as ingredients to our justification, but as the means and way wherein onely we can be partakers of the benefit of Christ's active Obedience. For although Christ did fulfill the Law for such who are his, yet this is not imputed and accounted immediately unto every one, but its applied in that way and order, which God hath appointed; and that order is to communicate the benefit of his active Obedience to none but such, who shall by faith receive him, and obedientially walk in his commands; For Christ did nothing for us to encourage sinne, or nourish security. And thus it is in his passive Obedience, Christ laid down his life as a ransome and price for his, yet not so as they are thereby immediately acquitted from all guilt, but the efficacy of it is communicated unto such as take the way he hath prescribed; so that neither active or passive Obedience of Christ, do any good but to such who apply it in that way God hath commanded: The effects of Christ's death being not immediately accomplished upon any, but mediately according to those instituted means he hath required.
Serm. XLIII.

More Objections Answered, and the Doctrine cleared from Antinomianisme.

Rom. 5:19.

So by the Obedience of one shall many be made righteous.

I hasten to a fifth Argument, which indeed is not so much an Objection as a calumny: for this innocent truth of the imputation of Christ's active obedience is arraigned for manifest confederacy with that Antinomian dotage, and poisonous doctrine, that God seeth no sinne in Beleevers. Yea its positively asserted to be as genuine issue of the doctrine we plead for, as Ismael was of Hagar: And it is not an enemy that doth our Doctrine this wrong, one of the Jesuitish profession; but even a familiar friend: Though its a wonder men should be in earnest, when they object thus; for certainly they must with the Adder, stop their ears that they may not hear what the Orthodox say in this matter.

Object. 5.

They discourse thus, If Christ's perfect righteousness be made ours, so that we be as righteous as Christ is, then God seeth sinne no more in us, then he doth in Christ.

Answ.

To this several things are responsible. 1. There is a calumniating mistake interposed in the Argument, as if it were asserted, That a man by imputed righteousness, is as righteous as Christ. This is the frequent reviling of our Doctrine, by Popish
Popish Writers. The Orthodox renounce any such consequence, and will not suffer such a Viper to fasten on them. It's one thing to say, that the righteousness of Christ is imputed to a believer, and another thing that he is as righteous as Christ. For 1. Christ's righteousness is not imputed to us, according to that latitude and infinite worth it is in Christ, but according to our necessity and want. 2. Christ's righteousness is in Christ personally and inherently, and so denominateth him from an intrinsical ground, but it is in us only by imputation and account, and that according as we receive it by faith, which is imperfect and full of wavering. 3. Its in Christ efficiently, so that he is the Author and procurer of it. It is in us only as the subjects who do receive it. This and much more is to be said to manifest the weakness of that position (We are as righteous as Christ.) But more of this in answering the Popish Argument.

2. In answer to this charge, we say, that the Socinian doth in like manner argue against satisfaction by the passive obedience of Christ in his death; for thus they argue, Where the whole debt is paid, there remaineth no more debt, but Christ by his death hath paid the whole debt, therefore there remaineth no more. What is this, but that God can see no sin in that for whom Christ hath satisfied? for sinne is the debt and all that is discharged; God will not require the payment of the same debt twice. Thus (say they) the doctrine of Christ's satisfaction opens a door to all impiety, and makes all holiness needless. Now what is answered to this in behalf of the passive obedience, may as truly and fully be improved likewise for active obedience.

But 3. we may say to the opponents, Why do they not pull this beam out of their own eye first; for this if it be a chain of iron, will binde them as well as any. They themselves do acknowledge a satisfactory righteousness by Christ's death; and upon this account they plead against the active obedience, because when the penalty of the Law is removed, and all sinne of omission and commission satisfied for, there remaineth no more accusation of the Law; the Law is perfectly satisfied, and therefore can no more condemn. Then certainly,
certainly, where the Law cannot accuse, there sinne cannot be imputed: So that the two opinions about active and passive obedience differ not in this, Whether the Law be perfectly satisfied, and an infinite atonement made, but only Whether the passive doth solely concurre, or active and passive both.

Therefore in the fourth place, the true and solid Answer, to vindicate the Doctrine of active and passive obedience from such uncharitable consequences, is, That the imputation of Christ's doing and suffering for us, is not absolute and immediately taking place, without any order or means, but God hath so ordained the communication of this rich and infinite treasure, that whatsoever believeth and walketh holyly is made partaker hereof; and therefore this righteousness is received ad modum recipientis: now the faith of the best believer is subject to paralitically shakings, every one may cry our, Lord I believe, help my unbelief. The cruise we bring is not large enough to hold all the oyl, for as Divines say, even of the blessed and glorified Saints in heaven, though made perfect, yet that they do not know, love, or rejoice in God, comprehensively, as much as God injoyeth himself: How much more is it true, that no godly man in this life, who hath imperfections mingled with all his graces, can truly and fully receive Christ, quoad ultimum quod sic, so that no more of Christ is to be received? Though therefore the righteousness imputed be perfect, yet the receiving and participation of it is imperfect; and as we say in sanctification against Papists, Though good works in respect of the Spirit of God or grace from which they flow are perfect, yet in respect of us, who do subordinately act, they receive imperfection; so though the obedience of Christ, as it is accomplished by him be every way perfect, and hath no sinne in it, yet as we receive it there is much imperfection in us, and so God must needs see sinne in us, while we do stretch out our hands to lay hold on it; Though by the imputation of Christ's righteousness, then this weakness is so covered, that it is not imputed to us. Therefore when the Antinomian would illustrate their dangerous opinion, as flowing from Christ's imputed obedii-
ence, from a similitude of a red glass, by which every thing in the glass is represented to be red, and nothing then can appear otherwise then red, so God seeth nothing but the righteousness of Christ in his people, and therefore no sinne, but they are as righteous as Christ. This halteth down right, and is not to the purpose, for therefore doth the matter contained in a red glass seem red, because the medium is indisposed, there is not a fit medium to convey the species of the object, so that in such seeing, the visive faculty is deceived, and apprehends things otherwise then they are: But we cannot without blasphemy attribute such imperfections to God, for God seeth all things as they are with an intuitive knowledge; there cannot be any indisposed medium to his eye; to him darkness and light are all one, therefore he cannot but see the imperfect graces, and other sins of his people which are in them, notwithstanding this imputation: only he doth not so see them, as to punish them being already satisfied for in Christ. But the Antinomian doth not only deny a judicial seeing of them, but even an intuitive: Of which errour I have elsewhere spoken more largely, (Vindic. Legis.)

2. Though Chrifts perfect obedience be imputed, God doth see sinne in Believers, because this righteousness is not inherent in them. Therefore they confound imputation and inherency, who would gather thorns of this Vine, and turn this fift into a serpent; If so be that imputation did take away the inherent filth of our natures, then God would no more see sinne in us, then he doth in the glorified Saints of heaven. But with this imputation is consistunt these reliques of corruption, which sometimes also are very active, and which God takes notice of in his people, and for which he doth in his life chastice them: Though therefore the imputed righteousness of Christ be as truly ours, as if it were inherent, yet it is not inherent, and so what corruption doth abide in us, God cannot but see it. And that this may be the more transparent, let us call in the

Sixth Argument, which is an arrow out of the Popifh quiver, although seconced by others, If Chrits righteousness be made ours formally, as if we had his righteousness, then are we

Objec. 6.
as righteous as Christ, then are we Mediators and Redeemers. Yea this is seconded by those who do not Romanize. Christ's righteousness is Mediatorial (so its pleaded) fitted, and proper only for him, who is God and man, so that it is incommunicable to any man; its high presumption for any mortal man, to conceive it appeareth in Christ's Rebus: This is transcendent robbery to make our selves equal with Christ, &c.

Thus at large Popish Writers, and others expatiate in the decrying of this imputed righteousness, grossly mistaking all the while the sense in which this imputed obedience is maintained; and therefore let us Answer the Objection united together, though from different Authors, with different principles.

First, To be made formally righteous with Christ's righteousness is an ambiguous and deceitfull expression; and certainly the opponents seem to take formally in a Physical sense, as a form inwardly denominating a man, as a man is said to be wise by wisdom, to be healthfull by health. Thus they attribute to us, as if we asserted a man absolutely just in our selves by such an imputed righteousness. Whereas this sense is wholly renounced by Protestant Writers, as a contradiction, therefore many Learned Authors refuse the word formally, and say, Christ's righteousness is the matter of our Evangelical righteousness, which received by faith, we are thereby made righteous: Although there are very worthy and pious Writers that do grant, the word formaliter, for they say, this formality is not in us, but in reputazione divina, so that we are not to conceive of it as a Physical, but Civil or Legal formality; as when it is said a prisoner is acquitted, the formality of this lieth not in any thing inherent in the prisoner, but in the Judges absolution: So when a believer is constituted, First, It is not by any thing infused in him, but what is accounted by Covenant through Christ unto him. And if men were not captious in this sense, we might safely and roundly affirm, that by Christ's obedience imputed to us, we are formally made righteous; for even amongst the Papists themselves there are acknowledged extrinsical forms that do give a denomination to the object, as when such a thing
thing is said to be known or seen, here is a denomination from an extrinsic call form, yea its the general opinion of many Schoolmen, that a man might be accepted of by God, graciously, though there be no inward change or infusion of holiness in him: Now in such cases supposed, a man would have been said to be accepted of and beloved by God from a meer extrinsic call respect; So that the foundation of this mistake lieth herein, that they will not distinguish between an absolute physi Call form, informing its subject, and a moral, relative, state in a man, which receiveth its denominations from some extrinsic causes. It may then, if the phrase be understood civiliter and legaliter, not physic, be granted that we are made formally righteous by Christ's obedience imputed unto us; although to avoid needless contentions, which men are so prone to make, for peace sake, it's called rather the matter of our righteousness. Secondly, And though this be granted, yet it doth not follow, that we are as righteous as Christ, for the reasons briefly mentioned before, and now more properly to be insisted on.

For first, This is not imputed to every believer, according to the dignity and worth that it hath, as formally abiding in Christ, but according to the necessity and exigence of full man; so that it is to be conceived in the manner of an universal and infinite Treasure, which makes rich every poor man interested therein, though not one of them hath all the Treasure communicated to him, but respectively and distributively for his use; Or as the Sunne filleth every starre with its proper respective light, yet is not thereby made as glorious as the Sunne. So that Christ's righteousness, as in Christ, and as imputed, differ; for it is in Christ as the subject naturally recipient of it; it is in us according to our necessity, that partake of it by faith.

Secondly, Its in Christ as the efficient, and he that doth work it; it is in us as the passive subject for whom its prepared, insomuch that its abhorrent from all reason, to say, that because Christ's obedience is imputed to us, therefore we are Redeemers and Saviours; but in a passive sense, therefore we are redeemed and saved: Insomuch that none say

though Christ's righteousness be imputed to us, yet we are not as righteous as Christ. 
Arguments or Objections against the Imputation

Christ's obedience is imputed unto us, in such a sense as that we should be said to be the efficient of that righteousness, but that we should be the passive subjects receiving the benefit of it. And indeed if there be not some kind of imputation of what Christ suffered for us, how can it be said, that Christ died for us, that he was a Surety for us. This is so evident and clear, that Bellarmine himself confesseth that Christ's merits are imputed unto us, because they are given to us, and we may offer them up to God the Father for our sins, because Christ took upon him the burden of satisfying God for us, and reconciling us to the Father: In this sense (sith he) the Protestants opinion would be right; though he addeth, Quamvis modus loquendi in Scripturis, & Patribus, aut narrum, aut rarissime inventiatur: Which latter clause makes the whole saying like new wine in the old bottle, it breaketh and narreth all. Only thus farre we have a confession, that Christ's satisfactory righteousness is so given to us, that we may offer it to the Father for our selves. Now will it follow that because its given to us, therefore we are as righteous as Christ, and we are Redeemers?

In the third place, consider, That there is a distinction between the obedience it self, and the manner of application of it: though the obedience imputed be of infinite worth and dignity, yet the application of it is in a finite and limited manner. If a Jewel of rich price be laid down for many captives, there is a great difference between the price of the Jewel and the application of it: The application of it is particular and respective, not according to the whole worth of the Jewel, for one man, especially this application being made with much imperfection and weakness. But to lay the axe to the root of the tree, that it may never grow more.

Lastly take notice, That this whole Argument is built upon the sand, for in Christ there is his Office, and the righteousness acquired or purchased by his Office: Now we do not say, his Office is imputed to us, nor so is his Mediatory obedience, as its the execution of his Office imputed to us, but the righteousness he merits and obtains by this; so that though Christ be our Surety, yet we are not thereby made Sureties:

That
That is ridiculous to say, the debtor is made a Surety, because the Surety undertakes for him. Christ's Office of Mediatorship is incommunicable, but the righteousness acquired by it is to be communicated to every member of his. Therefore we grant it would be blasphemy for any to conceive he appeared in Christ's robes: In this sense, we justly blame the Papists for making Angels and Saints Mediators: They hold Christ merited and satisfied, that we might merit and satisfy: This is to hold the imputation of Christ's Mediatorial Office, unto a creature, which no doubt Christ is jealous of; but the truth we plead for is as distant from this as light from darkness. Its not the Office, nor the executor acts thereof that are imputed to us, but that righteousness which is the effect and fruit of these. And this may more then suffice for this Objection.

In the sixth place, its objected, That the active obedience of Christ cannot be imputed to every believer for their legal righteousness, because Christ did not perform such a righteousness as was fitted for every person and every relation. Christ would not act as a Magistrate, how then shall a Magistrate have righteousness imputed? Christ did not perform the duties of many relations, such as a Wife, a Servant, &c. and therefore how shall they stand justified by the legal obedience of Christ, when that righteousness of his was not conformable to that part of the moral Law which concerned them in their relations? To this also I may add a further Objection, though of the same affinity, Infants dying need not the imputation of the active obedience of Christ, for seeing no actual obedience was required of them, therefore they needed not the imputation of such a righteousness.

To Answer this, first take notice also, that the Socinian doth thus argue against the passive satisfactory obedience of Christ, which yet the Learned opponents do cordially abominate; and what Answer they would shape to their Objection, will serve for this. The Socinian argueth, Christ did not die as a Surety in our stead, for then he must have suffered all that we ought to do; but he did not suffer eternal torments: and as for a temporal death (faith he) then he was bound to suffer as many individual deaths, as every man was
to die. Therefore in the second place, it is truly Answered, that as Christ in suffering death for us, was not thereby bound to suffer every kinde of death or sickness, which yet is the curse of the Law for sinne, but death in the substance of it, so neither was Christ bound to obey for every relation, but its enough that he fulfilled the Law by loving of God, and his neighbour, which is made the summe and substance of the Moral. If a Surety pay the debtors summe of money he oweth (suppose an 10016) in gold, and not in so many several shillings or other pieces of silver, he is by the Civil Law discharged of his debt. As therefore it would be ridiculous to say, that a man afflicted with the gout, or troubled with any other infirmity, could take no comfort from Christ, in respect of sinne the cause of it, because Christ never had any such distemper or pain; for its enough that by his death he overcame sinne in all the particular effects of it. Thus every Christian in his several relations may support himself from that obedience which Christ did perform to the substance of the Law: for as in his sufferings, the dignity of his person made up the accidentals by equivalency, especially in such things as were inconsistent with his person, as despair, &c. so in the accidentals of obedience, the dignity of Christ's substantial obedience did make compensation; especially in such things as were incompatible to his Mediatorship: As to be a woman, or wife, to be a temporal Magistrate, these things were not consistent with that Office of a Mediator, he had undertaken: and seeing by the adversaries themselves it is acknowledged, that love is virtually and eminently the fulfilling of the Law, what need any further dispute? If it be said, that the Law holds no ἀναλογίας, it must have eye for eye, &c. will not this overthrow his passive obedience as well? for what he suffered was not every way idem, or the same which the Law required: But the weakness of this will be discovered in the next Objection, only what hath been said for several relations, the duties whereof Christ never performed, will also answer the doubt about infants, Christ obedience being communicated to every subject, according to the necessity of it.
Serm. XLIV.

More Objections Answered.

Rom. 5. 19.

So by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.

Meet with a seventh Objection against the Imputation of Christ's active Obedience in the sense contended for, which is managed in this manner, This Doctrine (it is said) Suppose us to have been in Christ, at least in a legal title, before we did believe, or were born, and that not only in a general and conditional sense, as all men, but in a special, as the justified. And to this purpose it is again urged, That this opinion seemeth to ascribe to God a mistaking judgment, or to esteem us to have been in Christ when we were not, and to have done and suffered in him, what we did not.

To Answer this, First, by the way, I fear a snake is in this grass, else I cannot understand that passage; All men are in Christ in a general and conditional sense; I doubt if this be opened, some viperous brood may be discovered: Will not this make Christ a conditional Head, and his death a conditional death? and so if closely pursued assert at last, That though Christ died, yet not one man might be justified. Besides, Is there any condition required in the person to be justified, that is not the fruit and effect of Christ's death? Did not Christ die to sanctifie us, as John 17. 18. as well as to justifie
Arguments or Objections against the Imputation

Are not faith and repentance purchased by Christ's death as well as Gospel-privileges? Did Christ die for believers, if they did believe; for true penitents, if they did repent? I might enlarge my self in this, to shew how useless and helpless this Assertion is, either doctrinally to evade any difficulty (for which yet it seemeth at first it was invented) or practically to give any true solid comfort, doubting about the particularity of the benefit by Christ's death: But this would be to err from my scope.

In the second place therefore I come to the Argument, as relating to my work in hand; and here I must freely acknowledge, that I see not the least shadow of any such consequence, viz. That the Imputation of Christ's actual obedience doth suppose us to be actually justified in him before we had a being. Its true, the Antinomians they use to make such non sequiturs, but not so much, as I remember, from Christ's actual obedience, as his passive. Therefore some of them urge, That because it's said, God laid on him the iniquities of us all, and bore our sins upon the Cross, from that time every believer was actually justified (though others of that way carry it as high as to eternity it self: ) So that this is no more a genuine issue of the Doctrine of the imputation of Christ's active obedience, then of his passive; and indeed if it could be fastened upon either, it would more consonantly follow from his passive obedience. Hence the Socinians argueth from the Doctrine of Christ's death as a ransom and price, that all men shall be saved; For (say they) when the price is paid, and accepted of, its injustice to afflict the Debtor any more.

But thirdly, There are eminently learned men, that are deservedly reckoned in the number of the Orthodox, that do positively hold, That the members of Christ were formally justified in him, before they had a being; as we say, All were formally made sinners in Adam, before they had a natural being. Though I have elsewhere modestly given in reasons for my dissent herein, and as yet am not convinced to approve of it, or subscribe to it.

Therefore in the last place, the true and proper Answer is,
That though Christ's active obedience be imputed to us, yet it is in such a way and manner as God hath appointed: Even as although Christ died for the remission of our sins, yet this is not actually applied to any, but in the Method God hath ordained, so it is with his active obedience, for these effects of his death do not flow from it by way of a natural resultancy, for then all would be justified, all would be saved, but according to that ordered way which is appointed in Scripture: So that in this particular the passive obedience and active are all one; neither doth this Argument oppose one more then the other: Neither can any mistake be attributed to God by the opinion of active obedience, more then passive; for God doth not account these things as ours, but when they are ours; when God looks upon us as fulfilling the Law in Christ, it is a truth, and we do so; only its by a civil and legal account, or rather its by that gracious Covenant which the Father made with Christ our Surety, by which means we may in ordine gratia, say of Christ, which Christ said in ordine nature, of his Father, All mine are thine, and thine are are mine, though with much disproportion and dissimilitude.

The eighth Objection deserveth more serious consideration, viz. That the opinion of imputation of the active obedience of Christ, supposest Christ to have paid the Idem, and not the Tantundem, whereas its thought, that Christ only paid the value, and not the same debt that was due.

But first, I cannot see the naturality of this consequence, yea its thought by the Opponents the clean contrary; for we heard one Argument objected against this active obedience, was, because Christ did not perform the duties of all several relations, not of a wife, or a servant, or a Magistrate; and therefore such an imputation could not justify those who were so related; for the Law requireth that of them, which Christ never did. Thus you see this Doctrine of Christ's active obedience is assaulted, because it doth not make Christ pay the Idem, and yet how it is arraigned, for making Christ to pay the same, and not the value.

2. I conceive it is very dangerous to assert, That Christ paid.
paid the same rigidly every way, as also to affirm, that he did no ways pay the same, but what was equivalent: That Christ did not rigidly pay the same in every respect is plain, because he died but one death, whereas every sinner was bound to die his particular death, so that Christ was to have died as many deaths, as they in particular, had not his own served for all, and so his death was but for a season, not eternally, whereas that which the sinner should have suffered would have been eternal. Now eternally duration was equivalently made up by the dignity of the person. Thus it was also for Christ's active obedience, those particular duties which were required in several relations, were equivalently made up by his summarily obedience in his love to God and man, it being impossible that this love Should be diversified in all respects; for Christ could not be a man and a woman, a servant and a Magistrate at the same time: So that as he was tempted like us in all things, sinne onely excepted, thus he did obey like us in all things, onely such things excepted, that did suppose such an imperfection as was incompatible with his Mediatorship, or else did include an impediment or hinderance of it. It is then granted, That in circumstantial or accidental, as also in such things which would have argued either sinne or some impediment to his mediatory Office, there was not the Idem paid, but the Tantundem, and necessity compels to this, for he could not in such a condition have accomplished our redemption. But if we speak of the Substantials and Essentials, which the Law required or threatened, then we must take heed of a Tantundem, lest it prove no satisfaction at all at last; for grant that the Law in the threatening part, and in the preceptive part, was not substantially completed by Christ, then what need any Satisfaction at all? Justice was to be satisfied, because the Law was to be satisfied: if then the Law be abrogated or changed, so that the penalty required is not necessarily to be born, nor the duty it commanded necessarily to be fulfilled, I see not thus why Christ's death should be called a Satisfaction: Therefore it is we speak of the Substantials of the preceptive and comminative part of the Law, we must hold that Christ paid the Idem, I do
do not mean numero, but specie, the same in kinde that the Law required of us; and therefore it was, that though Christ in his Agonies did sweat drops of blood, yet this was not Satisfaction, because the Law required death; and thus though Christ died, yet his death could not be equivalent, or in the room of active obedience to the Law, because that required actual righteousness, as well as bearing the penalty. Again, If Christ did not pay the same in kinde, but Tantundem, then the verity of the Law, and the veracity of the Law-giver falls to the ground; Why is it that the Law is said to be established, that no iota or tittle of it shall passe away, unless because though it be not fulfilled in us, yet it is in our Surety? Why is it said, That none can be justified by the Law, but because the Law still requireth perfect and compleat holinesse? we must not then think that the Law either in the preceptive or threatening part is changed and altered from what it was once: Furthermore its of necessity, that Christ must pay the Idem in the Substancials of the Law, because the learned Opponents do grant, That God did not abrogate or repeal that Law, In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt die the death: If then it was neither abrogated nor repealed, but admitted of a relaxation, then certainly the Idem in specie was paid by Christ; and if this be granted in the penalty of it, in respect of Christ's passive obedience, I confess I cannot yet see why it should not also be yielded in respect of the active obedience; For why should that Law stand immoveable, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things the Law required, and therefore Christ must be made a curse, and not that Law also, Do this and live, and therefore Christ must do this as well as suffer this for us, if we would live: And this will be still the more undeniable, if we consider, that Christ came into the world as a Surety for us: So that what he did, though it was out of grace and favour to us, yet he was pleased to make it his obligation and debt for us, ere he would discharge it. As for that crambe so often boiled, That if Christ paid the Idem, then he must despair and suffer the worm of conscience, &c. We have answered enough already; onely we may adde, that if it be thorow-
ly considered, despair as it is a sinne, is not in the damned in
hell, neither can it be: for if we take it privatively, as oppo-
site to the grace of hope, in which sense it is a sinne, so the
damned do not despair, for there is no promise of grace to
them, and so its not their duty to hope, being they are now
no longer under the day of Salvation; so that their despair
is not a sinne. Indeed if we take despair negatively for being
without all hope, so they do despair, but that is not their
sinne, seeing God hath manifested there is no more hope for
them; but part of that eternal misery which is in hell. There-
fore it is not necessary, that if Christ suffered the threatning
for us he should despair.

But in the second place, It was necessary Christ should
suffer the threatning for us, so farre as it could be without
sinne, for otherwise he could not be our Mediatour, but he
himself would have needed a Mediatour: Now to despair
privatively is a sinne, and Christ could never be in a Condi-
tion wherein he could say there was no hope for him, be-
cause as he had power to lay down his life, so also to take it up
again; and as for the spiritual death of sinne, which was in
the threatning, it could not stand with the holinesse and
perfection of Christ to bear that; neither was it necessary,
seeing that we did bear that in our own persons, being by
nature dead in sinns. The summe is this, That there was a miti-
gation in that threatning, though the Law said, Thou shalt
die, yet it did not exclude another, it was not thou, and no
other in thy room: therefore the wisdom of God found
a way, whereby the Law for the matter of it might be pre-
served, and the mitigation was in respect of the person; so
that alius solvit not alius solvitur, its another that dischar-
geth the debt, but it is not another debt if we speak of sub-
stantials.

To clear this, one doubt may be moved, If Christ did
thus satisfy the Law, and so the justice of God, then it was ne-
cessary that he should do or suffer no more then the Law required,
but Christ's satisfaction was superabundant, and able to save
more then it doth save, and was more pleasing to God in the way of
obedience, then all our sins did displease God in the way of disobedi-
ence.
of Christ's active Obedience Answered.

The Answer to this is, That if we respect the substance of Christ's obedience and sufferings, he did no more than the Law required; The love of the Father would not suffer that more sufferings should be imposed on him then Justice required: but if we regard circumstantial, as the dignity of his Person, and the cause of his sufferings, or servile obedience, so he did more then the Law required; for the Law did not require that the man who died should be God also, or that he should be without sinne, who thus suffered. Its true, The Law of a Mediatour required so, but that was not incumbent on him as Mediatour, which did not belong to us, and therefore the Apostle sheweth, Romans 5, that the grace of God by Christ, in respect of Justification is farre more then the sinne of Adam in respect of condemnation.

In the ninth place, Against this imputation of Christ's active obedience, is objected two things, First, That by the same reason our sinnes should be imputed to Christ, and so he constituted a sinner, as we are righteous. And then secondly, This would make two formall causes of our Justification, viz. Remission of sinne, and Imputation of righteousness.

But we need not insist long on these; for the first is frequently agitated in the controversy between Papists and Protestants, and is already sufficiently discussed, so that there needs not much after disquisition. For

First, Though our sinnes be imputed to Christ, yet he cannot properly be called a sinner, because to be a sinner in the common ordinary use of the word, doth denote some inherent pravity and pollution. Thus when sinne is defined to be a transgression of the Law, it supposeth the subject in whom it is to erre from the Rule: Some denominations are from extrinsecall respects; some from intrinsecall motives; and thus for the most part the word sinner connoteth some inherency of deslement: Even as learned men observe, when they speak of the penal infirmities of Christ's Nature, they say not contraxit, sed assumpset, he assumed them, not contracted them, because to contract an infirmity, doth properly...
ly and rigidly denote so to take a thing, as to take the curse of it, and the natural inherent connexion of sinne, and such penalties. But to assume humane infirmities, that denote thoneely he did partake of them in what manner and measure he pleased: Therefore because the word sinnes doth commonly found in our ears, as one that hath some pollution inexistcnt: Hence the consequence of denomination to be a sinner, may justly be denied to imputation of sinne, for this would confound imputation and inherion, making them the same thing.

But secondly, If we will not manifestly confront plain and direct places of Scripture, we must needs grant, That our sinnes were imputed to him; for though Isa. 53. 2 Cor. 5. ult. 1 Peter 2. 24. speak not of the word Imputation, yet they speak plainly the sense of that we mean by it in this controversy, Our sinnes are laid upon him, he bore our sinnes, He was made sinne; and if this were not so, Why, or, How could Chrift die, and that in such an accursed manner by the Law? Death and curses are the wages of sinne; now these fell not upon Chrift for his own sinne, therefore it must be for imputed sinne; And thus though that exposition be granted, he was made sinne for us, that is, a Sacrifice for sinne, yet it will evince this truth, for he could not be a Sacrifice for sinne, or be a Surety to expiate it, if it were not laid upon him, and he reputed of as so in his sufferings, though in himself holy and unspotted: So that as it is with us, though we have the imputation of Chrits righteousness, yet inherently we have filth, and the remainders of corruption; so though our sinnes were imputed unto Chrift, yet inwardly and inherently he was absolutely holy and innocent.

Thirdly, Whereas it is said, That with us imputation and inherency do not differ in reality, but only quoad modum, he that is by imputation righteous, is as truly and as really righteous, as he that is inherently so; and therefore Chrift must be as truly and really a sinner by imputation, as if it were by inherion, its readily answered, That there is not the same reason of imputation of sinne to Chrift, as there is of his
his righteousness unto us; for sin was imputed to him, one-
ly according to his will, as a Surety to destroy and overcome
it; Therefore he bore them, not so as to abide on him, but
as to take them away: Even as he touched the unclean per-
son (not as others, who thereby would be made unclean)
but to remove and take away the leprosy: But the righte-
ousness of Christ is communicated unto us, so as to abide
on us, and to constitute us righteous thereby, Christ then
being our Surety, and so undertaking the debt of our sin,
to discharge and cancel it, he cannot be thereby reputed a sin-
er, but a vanquisher and conqueror of sin; and by this we see
the weakness of that additional and auxiliary Argument, We
are by Adams sinne imputed, made formally and truly sinners,
Why then should not Christ by our sinnes imputed? for every
eye may see a vast difference between the imputation of A-
dams sinne to us, and ours to Christ: To Christ it was impu-
ted, so that by this imputation he was to remove it; and he
assumed this imputation voluntarily, thereby to destroy it;
whereas Adams sinne is not only imputed to us by a natural
necessity, supposing Gods antecedaneous appointment, but
it is also so imputed to us, as to abide on us, to continue up-
on us. The summe is, That though our sinnes be imputed to
Christ, yet he is not thereby constituted a sinner, as if for
himself he suffered, or had offended God by this imputa-
tion.
S E R M. XLV.

More Objections answered, with Antidotes against Prejudice.

R o m. 5.19.

So by the Obedience of one shall many be made righteous.

As for the second branch of the Objection propounded, viz. That this is to make a two-fold formal cause of our justification, I have already sufficiently answered to the pretended absurdity thereof; yet that there may be full and heaped measure, I shall superadd, so that (as they say) Man-tisse loco, I further answer,

First, That from the Doctrine of the imputation of Christ's active obedience, it doth not necessarily follow, that there must be a two-fold formal cause of our justification; for there are eminent and learned men, who do clearly and fully assert the imputation of Christ's active obedience, and withall affirm, That remission of sinne is the effect and fruit of this imputation, adding withall that our whole justification consists in our remission of sinne, the fruit of imputation, and that imputation of Christ's righteousness, is not a part, but cause of our justification: So that with these, this Argument is as easily rejected, as it is obstructed.

That solid and learned Author Wallaeus (Epistol. ad Dureninum.)
being asked his judgement about Piscators opinion, as also the imputation of Christ's active obedience, makes a threefold opinion amongst Writers in this point.

First, Of those who hold the imputation of Christ's passive righteousness, and the effect thereof, remission of sinne, the first part of Justification; and the imputation of Christ's active righteousness, the effect thereof is acceptance to eternal life, and this is made the second part of Justification, and this opinion he saith is Beza's.

The second opinion holds the imputation of Christ's active and passive righteousness: The effect whereof is said to be remission of sins, which is our whole Justification. This he ascribeth to Calvin.

The third opinion affirmeth, the imputation of Christ's passive righteousness onely, the effect whereof is said to be the remission of sinnes, which with them also is our whole Justification. And this is Piscators.

Now Wallaeus, though he thinketh the first and the second do not oppose one another, yet he adhereth to the second, as that which he judgeth most simple, and not too subtilly distinguishing causes and effects about Christ's death. So that we see by this, that learned men may hold the imputation of Christ's active obedience, and yet not make Justification to have a two-fold formal cause: For (say they) our Justification consists onely in remission of sinnes, which is the effect of the said imputation. And by the way, you may take notice of the weakness of that Argument so much insisted on by many, That Calvin did not hold the imputation of Christ's active obedience, because he made Justification to consist wholly in remission of sinnes: For it may be granted, That Calvin held both, and yet did not contradict himself, making the imputation of Christ's active obedience to be the cause; and remission of sinne, which he affirmeth to be our whole Justification, to be the effect thereof. Although (as I have shewed formerly) I cannot see any absurdity in asserting a two-fold formal cause of our Justification, provided that they be not of a different nature and consideration.

To conclude this matter, We do not say, That Christ's a-
Active obedience and passive, are the formal cause of our justification; but the matter that is imputed to us thereunto, and indeed to speak properly, if we call them the formal cause, yet we cannot exactly say, of our justification, but of our Evangelical righteousness; for justification that is an action of God, which requireth a righteousness. This righteousness being Evangelical, consists of the active and passive obedience of Christ, which by the Covenant of grace is made ours, and God dealeth with us accordingly.

That I may at last come to an end, I shall encounter with the greatest, and most difficult of all their objections; and if this may receive a true and solid answer, all the rest will fall in that.

This, The Law bindeth either in respect of obedience, or in respect of penalty. If there be no obedience to the Law, yet if the penalty be satisfied, then the Law can no more accuse, then we must needs stand justified: So that they will grant, Christ is our righteousness, they acknowledge the Law must be satisfied, and that is (say they) by Christ's passive obedience; for if Christ's death hath taken away the guilt, and yet we not accepted to eternal life, then there must be a medium between a man just and unjust, and that when the subject is properly capable of one of the contrary qualities, which is said to be as absurd, as if one thing were required to make a straight, and another thing not crooked.

Two considerable points are in this objection, and therefore made two distinct arguments by some.

The first is concerning the latitude or extension of the obligation of the Law, whether it bindeth to obedience and punishment disjunctively or copulatively.

The second is, when all the penalty is removed by a satisfactory righteousness through Christ's death, Whether thereby ipso facto, without any imputation of a further righteousness, there be not an immediate right to eternal life.

For the former part Eckhart the Lutheran, who wrote a peculiar book against Piscator in this controversy, doth therein (Resp. decim. Arg.) shew, That Piscator did disclaim that argument (though most of his fellows fervently
propugne it) and grants, That the Law doth require both of us; obedience, as being our Lord and Master; and punishment, as being our Judge, who is to punish transgressors.

The true and solid Answer indeed to the former part is, That if we speak of man abiding in the state of integrity, so the Law did require only obedience; for punishment it could not demand any, seeing there was no transgression, but if we consider man fallen, so the Law requireth both obedience and punishment; obedience properly and immediately, but punishment occasionally and indirectly: whereas as then its said, That if the Law be satisfied in respect of the penal part, that then it requireth no more, and hath all the righteousness it expresseth, that is not upon any terms to be admitted: For Christ while he satisfied the Law in dying for us, did not answer the primary and principal end of the Law, which was To do this and live; but by his exact and perfect conformity unto it. So that this Argument proceedeth upon a mistake, as if it were all one to the Law, whether the debt of obedience, or the debt of punishment were paid; for certainly its the debt of obedience the Law doth principally aim at, and when the debt of punishment is paid, the debt of obedience is not thereby abrogated; for if it were so, then a man could not be said still to sinne, because Christ hath satisfied the punishment: But its so clear, that none ever yet denied it, that we do sinne, and whence is that? but because of that debt of obedience, which the Law still requireth. Neither is a man just by a bare suffering of the punishment of the Law, as is to be shewed.

Come we then to that which seemeth to be so hard a knot, that cannot be untied, and that is, If Christ's blood doth cleanse us from all sinne, then there needeth no imputation of a further righteousness, for seeing man's nature is a subject immediately susceptible, either of righteousness or unrighteousness, as the air is of darkness or light; if so be all his sins be so washed away, that his unrighteousness is removed, then it must necessarily follow, he is accounted of by God as righteous.

This hath exercised the Orthodox, so that they have given different Answers.
Some distinguish of sinnes. There are sinnes of omission and sinnes of commission: Now (say they) by Christ's death we are freed from the sinnes of commission, but not omission; the sinnes of omission are covered by the active obedience of Christ. But I shall not adhere to this, partly, because the Scripture speaks universally, when it faith, our sinnes are purged away by the bloud of Christ; and partly, because in every sinne of commission, there is something of omission. I shall not here discourse that opinion of Cajetan, and some other School-men, affirming, That the formal nature of a sinne of commi-
ッション, is some real and positive thing: Only I shall at this time take it for granted, That in every sinne of commission, let it be conceived never so positive, yet there must be an intervall, a privative omission of some rectitude that ought to be in it.

Others they distinguish of the guilt of sinne, they make it two-fold, the one is pæna damnii, as we deserve by it to be excluded from heaven; the other pæna sensu, as by it we deserve all misery to be inflicted upon us: Now (say they) by Christ's passive obedience the guilt of sinne, quoad pæna sensus, is taken away, and by his active obedience the guilt of sinne, quoad pæna damnii is removed: Neither, they say, is this Objection to the contrary, That in every rational creature this two-fold respect of guilt is always conjoinied to-
gether, for this is from Gods Decree without, and so they are thereby inseparable, yet for all that distinct. As a Captive that is freed out of prison, and restored to his former honours; or a child offending his father, upon reconciliation hath his punishment removed, and his right to the inher-

itance bestowed on him.

In the third place, there is a distinction made concerning Christ's death. It is (say they) to be considered either qua pœ-

na, as a punishment, or qua actio, as an action proceeding from the love of God: Now if we consider it in the former respect, so its said to purge away sins of commission, and the punishment of sens; if in the later, so it takes away the sinnes of omission, and removeth the punishment of losse. But although there is truth in these distinctions, yet because the Scripture speaks abso-
lutely and plainly in this matter, I think it not convenient to intangle
intangle the truth with these perplexities; nor to make so many distinctions and parcels in what Christ did for us; but look upon the whole course of his obedience, the last act whereof is eminently demonstrated in his death, as that which is the matter of our righteousness: So that its not necessary to adapt deliverance from sinne and hell to his death, or interest to eternall life and glory to his obedience: For although its plain, that those are two distinct mercies in themselves, as hath been shewed, and might have been separated one from another; yet now supposing the appointment, and blessed order which God hath established, they can never be disjoyned, and so no wonder if one be put often for the other. Although (I say) this be plain, yet the Scripture speaking of things as they are, and not what they might have been, and so not distinguishing, where yet in intellectual abstractions we may make a difference (as appeareth in expressions about God's providence respectively to evil actions, attributing them unto God indefinitely, when yet in our understanding; we must necessarily distinguish between the action and the obliquity of the action) its more consonant to the Scripture custom, to say, that by Christ all sinnes under every differential respect, and all guilt under any notion is fully washed away by the Lord Christ. Neither may we limit this either to his obedience in his life, or to his sufferings at his death, but unto the whole course of his subjection unto the Law of God; so that the full and satisfying Answer to this Objection is, That its granted, all sinnes of omission and commission, as also all punishment, whether damnification or sense is removed by Christ's bloud; But we say, That by Christ's bloud, or his death, is not excluded, but necessarily included all his other parts of active obedience. This Interpretation we have already vindicated sufficiently; and certainly that place, Philip. 2. where Christ's obedience is mentioned even unto the death of the Cross, doth compell a man to acknowledge that not only obedience in his death, but all his former antecedaneous obedience even unto death, is part of that satisfactory righteousness which Christ obtained for us: So that this
doth still deceive the learned opponents, that they look upon Christ's death as oppositely to his active obedience, whereas the Scripture takes notice of it as the last and most signall act of his obedience conjunctly with all his former expressions thereof: So that we are not from thence to compute this Mediatory obedience, as if hitherto he had been obeying for himself, but to behold the ultimate consummating thereof in his death. The Summe of all this is, That Christ's active obedience disjoyned from his passive, is but part of that righteousness the Law requireth of man fallen; and also his passive obedience separated from his active is still but part: Therefore that we may have a compleat and full righteousness, it behoved us to have such a Surety who did perform both the debt of obedience, and also the debt of punishment for us.

So that from the Answer thus delivered, there is no necessity of falling upon that debate, Whether there be a middle estate between justus and Injustus, (viz.) non justus; yet because its so vehemently urged, I have already said enough to that matter; only let me add, That the removing of sinne, and bestowing righteousness, is not like the taking away the crookedness of the line, and making it straight; for its plain, that is done by the same phisical motion; whereas I have shewed, That God might have pardoned sinne to a man, and yet not bestowed upon him such eternall Glory as he hath promised; So that eternall Glory followeth upon the pardon of sinne, not by a naturall causality, or resulfancy, but by the gracious appointment and order of God, or if there should be some naturall concomitancy, yet that instance would not fitly resemble it, but this, When a man opens the window, and lets in light, the opening of the window, and the introduction of light proceed from two different principles, though the one followeth necessarily upon the other: So that let it be granted, That if sinne be removed, righteousness must necessarily come in, yet that doth not follow, that its by the same motion: No, there may be one principle to remove sin as the obex and impediment, another to introduce and communicate the righteousnesse it self.
If still it be urged, That a solution of the punishment of the Law is righteousness enough,

I answer, First, Let us not be afraid, lest we be made too rich, too righteous in Christ. Why should we be so industrious to straighten the righteousness Christ hath obtained for us, when the scope of the Scripture is to lengthen and heighten it as much as may be?

Secondly, Even amongst men, none do account a meer suffering of the punishment of the Law, the righteousness of it; especially, when there are many superadded favours and privileges of Grace promised to him, that doth not offend; Christ died not onely to redeem us out of prison, but to invest us with all glorious dignity and honour. Now the taking of the punishment doth not by a natural consequence entitle to all that honour and dignity that the Scripture promiseth.

Lastly, This is not wholly inconsiderable, that if the paiment of the punishment of the Law, be all the righteousness Christ hath purchased for us, then we had a more noble and perfect righteousness in Adam, then Christ hath recovered for us, when yet Romans 5. the Apostle makes the Grace and Gift by the second Adam, farre transcending the sinne and guilt which came by the first Adam. The consequence is clear, because Adam's righteousness was a positive, and full conformity to the Law of God: But the righteousness Christ hath purchased for us, according to the sense of the Opponents, is onely a penal righteousness; The punishment is thereby removed, but obedience is not introduced.

Thus we have examined wherein the strength of those that dissent in this Point doth lie: Did I apprehend any thing else material, I would not wave the discussion of it, for its truth and the glory of Christ that we should aim at in these conflicts.

Now because not Arguments, but prejudices do sometimes obstruct the truth, I shall conclude all with some few Antidotes against them. As first, In the deciding of this controversy attend not the specious, and fair pretences of humane reason, for every Antidotes against prejudice.
every thing of Christ is paradoxall to that; His Natures, his Offices, and his Passive Obedience in a satisfactory way to Gods Justice; and as the Socinians decry it as a thing against reason, for an innocent man to suffer in stead of a nocent; so they do not leffe exclaim against a righteousness, because of anothers righteousness. This both Papists and Socinians rise up against, whereas we do not say, That a beleever is righteous, because Christ is righteous, but because his righteousness, being our Surety, is made ours by Gods accounting of it to us; neither is it against presidents either in Scripture or humane Authours, to have vertuous and laudable actions of some men, meritorious unto others that relate unto them.

Secondly, Consider whether this Doctrine doth not indeed give more Glory and Honour to Christ; For seeing he came into the world as a Surety for us, and so not under his own personall obligation, but a voluntary assumed one, The more he did for us, the greater was his Glory: and as it would not be honour enough to him to say, He died for our good, unleffe we affirm, in our stead: So neither that he obeyed the Law for our good, unleffe also we affirm, in our room.

Thirdly, Let this be seriously weighed, as hath been often hinted, Whether the same Arguments that destroy the active obedience of Christ, would not, if managed in a further way seem to overthrow the passive. Its farre from me to charge such consequences upon many of the learned Antagonists, onely its seriously to be considered, Whether that necessity which is pleaded for by the Orthodox in respect of Christs satisfactory passive obedience, will not also as strongly interpose for his active: Doth not the Law of God, the justice of God equally relate to one as well as the other? And

Lastly, Doth not this provide more for the full consolation of a beleever? Are a godly mans temptations only about the punishment of the Law, who shall satisfie that, and not for the pure and holy obligation of the Law, who shall answer that? Let us be afraid to take off in the least manner, either from Christs glory, or the beleever's comfort.
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## An Alphabetical Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abraham.</td>
<td>Adam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The similitude and dissimilitude between Adam and Christ, 348</td>
<td>Accept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether Adam did or could have transgressed the Moral Law, 352</td>
<td>Different opinions about our being sinners by Adam, 354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gods Accepting of man two-fold, General, Special, 195</td>
<td>Adams sin ours, not only by Propagation but Imputation, 355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusations.</td>
<td>Afflictions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusations from God, the Law, the Devil, Conscience and Men, all taken off by Justification, 125</td>
<td>The necessity of them, 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action, 48.</td>
<td>Their usefulness, 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether any one Mediatorly Action of Christ sufficiently satisfied God, 98,413</td>
<td>Anger.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That all the Actions of unregenerate men are sins, 187</td>
<td>Of the Anger of God against sin, 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appetite.</td>
<td>Of spiritual Appetite to the doctrine of Justification, 161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N n n Baptist.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
<th>Condition.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Of Baptism, 144</td>
<td>Whether works are a Condition, or a <em>Causa sine qua non</em> of a mans Justification. 217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptism.</td>
<td>The nature of a Condition in a Covenant. 228</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| O | That it is a *Causa cum qua*, not a *Causa sine qua non*, ibid.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C</th>
<th>Conscience.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Of Baptism, 89</td>
<td>Of the Consciences perswasion of Gods Righteousness, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ.</td>
<td>The accusations of Conscience, 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Of peace of Conscience, 128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corruptio of Nature.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Of the Corruption of all men, 178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of the Covenant of God made with Adam, and how far all mankind was included in it, 355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of the Covenant between God and Christ, 376</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D</th>
<th>Death.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Of Christ's Active and Passive Obedience. See Obedience and Imputation. 97</td>
<td>The Death of Christ sufficient for all, 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of Christ crucified.</td>
<td>Whether it was Natural or meerly Miraculous, 426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of Christ's Title to Kingdoms while in the state of Humiliation discussed 390</td>
<td>Of Christ's Deserion, 323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Devil.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**B**

- **Baptism.**
  - Of Baptism, 144

**C**

- **Christ.**
  - Christ's Obedience, whether it were due to God for himself, or for us, 89
  - See Obedience.
  - Its infinite worth. See Satisfaction.
  - Whether the infinite Dignity derived from the Person of Christ to his Actions be a Physical entity, or a Moral relation, 97
  - Of Christ's Active and Passive Obedience. See Obedience and Imputation.
  - Of Christ crucified.
    - It was a demonstration of Gods justice and anger against sin, 53
    - Christ's Title to Kingdoms while in the state of Humiliation discussed 390
  - Command. See Law.
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A Justification
Active,

Passive,

Lawful,

Sinful,

Absolute,

Comparative,

In foro Dei
Conscientiae,

Universal,

Particular,

Of the Person,

The Cause
Before God,

Men,

Baptismal persons grown up,

From Eternity,

Declarative in time,

Absolute,

Conditional,

First,

Second,

Also Distinguish between

The works of that Righteousness the Law requireth
And the Righteousness of works,

Christ's fulfilling the Law,
And our own Evangelical Obedience,

A Legal Obedience,

Servile Obedience,

A perfection, and

The perfection of the whole

Christ's obedience it self, &

The manner of Application of it,

And the Office of Christ,
And the Righteousness he merited by it,

Absolute pardon, and

Acquired by Satisfaction,

Divine Nature.

The Divine Nature in Christ did not always put forth such glorious and resplendent effects as it could do,
### THE TABLE

#### E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effects</th>
<th>Whether Justification be a natural effect of believing, or comes it merely by the Divine appointment or institution of God, 179</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Effects of God's Mercy and Justice</td>
<td>Forgiving, Forgiveness. Of God's Forgiving and mans, and how they differ, 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eternity</td>
<td>That the whole nature of Justification is not comprehended in Forgiveness of sin, 162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eternity not of the Essence of death, but accidental, 73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### F

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faith</th>
<th>Whether the Form or Nature of Justification be twofold, 133</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faith as a work excluded from justifying, 122</td>
<td>Forgotten. In what sense Christ was Forsaken, 322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of a weak Faith, and a strong, 132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Faith justifies, whether in an active or passive sense, 137, 224, 250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The difference between Faith and other graces in respect of Justification, 223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of the Instrumentality of Faith, 224</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That Faith as it is a work, or the sedere, is not imputed to us for our Justification, 238</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith imputed for Righteousness, the several interpretations of it, 241</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The true one asserted, 251</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of the object of Faith, Adequate and General, Principal and Specific, 243</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of Faith's two-fold effect, 244</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether Faith may be called an instrumental cause of Justification, 256</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### G

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOD</th>
<th>See Righteousness. Of the just and righteous Nature of God punishing sin, 104</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOD without Accidents, Parts, or Composition, 13</td>
<td>Whether he might pardon sin without Satisfaction, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>His absolute Power, 14</td>
<td>His love to Righteousness in the creature, 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And Sovereignty, 30, 31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>His Righteousness.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GOD

- **See Righteousness.**
  - Of the just and righteous Nature of God punishing sin, 104
  - Whether he might pardon sin without Satisfaction, 14
  - His love to Righteousness in the creature, 19
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>His will a Law to himself,</th>
<th>33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Of his willing of sin,</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Good.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good things Natural,</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Works, See Works.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immanent.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether Justification be an Immanent or transient act of God, 137</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Imputed.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That Justification though Imputed yet is a real privilege, 135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How faith is said to be Imputed, 141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That a believer's righteousness is Imputed, 285, 295</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The signification of the word Imputed, 286</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinne may be Imputed two ways, 287</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many ways good may be Imputed to a man, 288</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Imputation.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of the Imputation of Christ's righteousness:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The need we have of it, there being nothing in us wherefore God should account us righteous, 289</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But the contrary, ib.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That it is relative, 290</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yet real, ibid.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concerning Imputation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The Thing, 291</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Cause, 291</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The Effect, 291</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Its term from which, and to which, 292</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That its contrary to carnal reason, yet acknowledged by all Christians in one sense or other, except Socinians, 293</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N n 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>That it makes not a man as righteous as Christ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>Of the Impartation of Christs sufferings for our Justification,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>And of his active obedience,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338</td>
<td>The Arguments against it answered,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382</td>
<td>Impotency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>Of mans utter Impotency in respect of Justification,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>The Causes of Justification,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>The final Cause distributed into the finis cuius, and the finis cui,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>What Justification is,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ib.</td>
<td>The significacion of the word,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>The Justice of God declared in our Justification,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Fully satisfied with Christs obedience,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Whether punitive Justice was so natural to God, supposing sin to be, that he could not remit it without satisfaction,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Justified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>That a man is Justified in the same manner and way in the whole progress of his life, as at first,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>That a man is not Justified by inherent righteousness,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Nor by works of the Law done by meer natural men,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>Nor by the works of the Law done by the grace of God,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>Nor by works as a Condition, or a Causa sine quanon,</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
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<td>Justification by the Law a non ens</td>
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<td>Whether it be an Immanent, or a transient Act of Gods, ib.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The time when a man is Justified,</td>
<td>Whether Christ fulfilled the Law obedientially for himself, or for us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not from Eternity, but when he believes, ibid.</td>
<td>How it could be called a Law or command imposed on Christ to die for us, seeing his death did depend on the wicked and corrupt wills of other men, 401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God, i.e. all the three Persons Justify a man, ibid.</td>
<td>That we are bound to obey the Law notwithstanding Christ's obeying of it, 418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The freeness of it, ib.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meritorious Cause of it, ib.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of it, 125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answering all accusations, ib.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether Gods &amp; of Justifying be nothing but the grant of it in the Gospel, 129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In what sense it may be said that Justification is completed at one instant, and in what sense iterated 130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether to affect the Impuration of Christ's two righteousnesses do not infer two formal Causes of our Justification, 445</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The usefulness and excellency of the Law, 213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of Christ's obedience to the Law. See Obedience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## THE TABLE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Necessity.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Necessity distinguished, Two-fold</td>
<td>804 418</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Obedience.

Obedience of Christ, how far for himself, and how far for us, 89, 386

A censure, and yet an allowance of the terms Active and Passive Obedience, 341

That the Obedience of Christ is not to be limited to that which Divines call Passive, 330

Passive Obedience, See Sufferings.

That Christ while on the earth, did truly and properly Obey God the Father, 330

The difficulty of understanding it, ibid.

In what sense he did so, 333

Of the Imputation of Christ's active obedience, 338

The Novelty and Pedegree of the contrary Doctrine to the Imputation of Christ's Active Obedience, 341

And the Differences that are among the adversaries to it about it, 343

Also the Differences that are among the Asserters of it, about it, 346

Arguments for it, 347

Arguments against it, answered, 382

Whether Christ was bound to Obey his Parents and the Civil Magistrate, as other men are, 388

That in that Law of Obeying Parents there was a great difference between Christ and other men, 388

The necessity of both Active and Passive Obedience, 411

### Objections.

Objections against the Imputation of Christ's righteousness answered, 305

And against the Imputation of his sufferings in particular, 312

And against the Imputation of his active obedience, 382

### Obligation.

An Obligation may arise two ways

Omission.

Of sins of Omission, 169

Original.

Of Original corruption, 182

Own.

Of mans Own righteousness, how prone all men, are to set up a righteousness of their Own, 157
Herein is a portion of a page from a document discussing the concepts of God's providence, pardon, and justification.

The text reads:

"...That it is but a part of justification, that a man is often pardoned, but not often justified..."

"...That the righteou... may be in a Poor Condition, and yet God be righteous..."

"...That it was necessary our Redemption should be by way of Justices, and it is a Real Privilege..."

"...The Power, Providence of God..."

"...And ye God is just though he..."
That God's Righteousness appears in three things, 13. Is vindicated from many objections, 15. How many ways its taken in 16. Whether Christ Repented and bore all the Reproof, Comfort against them, 12. Of the Righteousness in Angels and men as a demonstration of 8. That the Righteousness that is in God's word and works, 10. That the Righteousness of the best people, 24. That all men have lost their Righteousness in which man was created, 18. That the Righteousness of the best will not justify them, 24. The necessity of having a Righteousness, 18.128

Of Reward of merit, 3. Of the Righteousness of Gods word and works, 10. That the Righteousness of the best people, 24. That all men have lost their Righteousness in which man was created, 18. That the Righteousness of the best will not justify them, 24. The necessity of having a Righteousness, 18.128

The Regeneration of Baptifmal Regeneration!

Remijfttn. See That a corrective or relative justice in God is Natural and Ejection to him 182.34 Check mentions

See Satisfaction and Objection 281

Whether Christ Repented and bore all the Reproof, Comfort against them, 12. Of the Righteousness in Angels and men as a demonstration of 8. That the Righteousness that is in God's word and works, 10. That the Righteousness of the best people, 24. That all men have lost their Righteousness in which man was created, 18. That the Righteousness of the best will not justify them, 24. The necessity of having a Righteousness, 18.128

Of Reward of merit, 3. Of the Righteousness of Gods word and works, 10. That the Righteousness of the best people, 24. That all men have lost their Righteousness in which man was created, 18. That the Righteousness of the best will not justify them, 24. The necessity of having a Righteousness, 18.128

The Regeneration of Baptifmal Regeneration!

Remijfttn. See That a corrective or relative justice in God is Natural and Ejection to him 182.34 Check mentions

See Satisfaction and Objection 281
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Sacraments.

The efficacy of Sacraments,

Satisfaction.

Of Christ's Satisfaction to Divine Justice.

Arguments for it; 57
It lessens not the grace of God 65
Hinders not but necessitates good works in us, 68
Who was Satisfied, or received the price, 69, 67
The difference between merit and Satisfaction, 85
What is required to proper Satisfaction, 68
That Christ's Satisfaction had all the properties of merit and Satisfaction, 85
Was copious? 91
And plentiful?

Perfect, 93
And more Satisfactory to God than all the sinnes of the Elect are displeasing to him, 95
Whence the obedience of Christ became so Satisfactory, 97
Whether Christ paid the Idem or the Tandem of what was due, 441

Satisfie.

That no meer creature could Satisfie God's Justice for sinne, 99

Scripture.

Scriptures seemingly opposite to each other about God's righteousness reconciled, 29

Seek.

Why God Seeks to man first to be reconciled, 56

Sin.

Gods hatred of sin, 23
Gods providence about it, 39
That sin is aggravated by Christ's Death, 78
Sorrow for sin, 13

The malum Creature, 96
And
The malum Dei of sin, 96

Its infinite Evil and Guilt, 102
Whether God could pardon it without Satisfaction, 104

Omission, 169

Sins of Commission, 173

That Col sees sin in believers, 433

Sins.

Whether the imputation of ou
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sins to Christ make him a sinner,</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether Christ Suffered the same that we should have done, or that which was equivalent</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How due and voluntary his Sufferings were</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That Christ's Death was a peculiar, extraordinary thing</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The several Errors of men about Christ's Sufferings</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Difference between Christ's Sufferings, Agonies, and ours</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the fear of Death was not the eminentest part of his Suffering in his soul</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How far and in what respects Christ was of God forsook</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That in his Sufferings he sustained two Persons, his own, and ours</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That Christ was our Surety</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And what he was to do as such</td>
<td>ibid. &amp; 375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The several Errors of men about Christ's Sufferings</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Difference between Christ's Sufferings, Agonies, and ours</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the fear of Death was not the eminentest part of his Suffering in his soul</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How far and in what respects Christ was of God forsook</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That in his Sufferings he sustained two Persons, his own, and ours</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That Christ was our Surety</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And what he was to do as such</td>
<td>ibid. &amp; 375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sins to Christ make him a sinner,</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether Christ Suffered the same that we should have done, or that which was equivalent</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How due and voluntary his Sufferings were</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That Christ's Death was a peculiar, extraordinary thing</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The several Errors of men about Christ's Sufferings</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Difference between Christ's Sufferings, Agonies, and ours</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the fear of Death was not the eminentest part of his Suffering in his soul</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How far and in what respects Christ was of God forsook</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That in his Sufferings he sustained two Persons, his own, and ours</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That Christ was our Surety</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And what he was to do as such</td>
<td>ibid. &amp; 375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trinity.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How all three Persons in the Trinity were concerned in Satisfaction for Sin</td>
<td>69,75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Union.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>Union with Christ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>Will.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>The Will of God about Sinne.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Zaleucus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**THE TABLE.**

- That it is impossible to be justified by the Covenant of Works, or Works of the Law, 200, 207. & 222
- Or by such Works as are done by the grace of God, 203, 219
- Or by Works as a Condition, or Causa fine quæ non, 217
- That good Works follow Justification, 229
- Go before Salvation, 230
- And need a Justification, 232

---

**Word.**

- Of God's providential Government of the World, 7

---

**Wrath, See Anger.**

---

**FINIS.**
Errata.
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