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Pag. 96. they charge me, "He teacheth, "That the righteousness of Christ is imputed "only as to effects, with a purchase of a "conditional grant, viz. this Proposition, "He that believeth shall be saved. Gospel- "Truth, pag. 43, 44."

My words there are these: "The difference is not, 4. Whether Christ by his "righteousness merited for all the Elect, "that they should in his time and way be "certainly partakers of its saving effects; "and did not only purchase a conditional "grant of those effects, viz. this Proposition, "He that believeth shall be saved. "5. Nor whether, besides these effects "being made ours, the very righteousness "of Christ is imputed to true believers, as "what was already undertaken and de- "signed for their salvation, and is now "effectual to their actual pardon and ac- "ceptance to life; yea, is pleadable by "them as their security, and is as useful "to their happiness, as if they themselves "had done and suffered what Christ did. "All these I affirm." Pag. 43, 44.

B 2 Can
Can any thing be more contrary? They say I affirm, what I do expressly deny; and that I deny, what I expressly affirm.

Mr. Mather, in the Postscript to his two Sermons on the Righteousness of God through Faith, &c. pag. 72. faith, "My damning " Error is, He is one, that makes union to " Christ, our having this righteousness upon " us, and our being justified by it, to be " given us in way of Reward of something " done by us."

My only words, to which he twice refers, are these, "Gospel-benefits are no reward of Debt; and yet they are given in " a way of Reward: The benefits are given, " not for our Faith, yet upon believing; not " upon it as a meriting consideration, yet " upon it as that the presence whereof is " made necessary by the Gospel, this having " required Faith, and confined the benefit " to him that believes." Defence of Gospel-
Truth, pag. 362. These and other imputations I have spoke to.

You see, I say only benefits indefinitely: The thing done by us here, is only believing: And in way of Reward, is only in performance of a Gospel-promise, made to encourage and move Sinners to believe.
TO THE
READER.

T is fit, that God (whose we are) should use us to his own Purposes, however unagreeable to our inclinations the Work is, or however mysterious the Design of Providence be at present. I am sure, Peace is my delightful pursuit, though unreasonable men force me to Debates, as part of my employ. The several Books written, and Sermons studiously preached for Antinomianism, had not engaged my Pen at first, if the Leaven had not spread to the open censure of the usefullest Ministry as legal, to the hazard of the Souls and Peace of our Congregations, and to the common reproach of the Dissenters.

When a Testimony by Gospel-Truth stated was published, I resolved to cease any further progress in this affair; being assured it was sufficient to inform such as were not given up to those delusions, against which only it was designed. But Mr. Chauncy's notorious misrepresentations of my Principles, necessitated
To the Reader.

my Defence of Gospel-truth, when his Billingsgate Language would have been wholly flighted. Since then he hath published three Books, unworthy of my regard; being he was resolved to persist in mistaking the matters in debate, and must argue in a way I was sure the Judicious would contemn; and only such Simple ones be confirmed thereby, who had no Lift or Patience to read an Answer. He was followed by one Mr. Edwards, a man even of far less Judgment and equal Violence; two Pages of whose Book assured me, that reading further, was only to view an emblem of Hell, viz. hot Fire and thick Darkness. His Name-fake, the learned Author of Crispianism unmask'd, treated his Answer thereto, with the same due Pity as I have done. The War among the Angels also was written with an air of such falsity and profaneness, as cautioned any from answering it, who had not the like freedom to form an Antinomian Prayer. That unchristian Spirit all these men discover, is convictive that Christ employs them not.

The fury and arts of the Promoters and Abettors of their new Gospel (without precepts or threatenings) appearing a publick damage, as they unseasonably divided the Nonconformists, rendred me industrious to allay the Heats; but I soon found, that such as opposed the Union at first, would not quit the occasion they had framed, to keep up a Faction opposite thereto. Hence, though we got
To the Reader.

we got them to subscribe with us an Agreement in Doctrines, and therein we mutually engaged to be at Peace, and not expose each other; it was not three weeks, e'er new Books were published, and their Pulpits (without any provocation on our parts) filled with the former railings; reckoning, it seems, themselves at liberty, because they judged we thought ourselves obliged by our Subscriptions to be silent.

I, for the publick good, connived at this, and at Mr. Cole's violent censures and misrepresentations of our judgment at Pinners-Hall near twelve Months, without the least return; till at last, in a Sermon there, he proclaimed, "That Gospel-Truth stated " was just the Case of the Parable of the " Pharisee." I thought it my duty, to shew in my next turn, in the calmest words, that Gospel-Truth stated agreed in nothing with the Pharisee; and was quarrelled with, only because it urged the imitation of the Publican in his penitent Humiliation as necessary to Forgiveness, (which that Brother constantly exclaims against,) and I urged the necessity of an end to contentions. I medled not again, and forbore exposing his mysterious Nonsense, which his Books as well as Sermons ministered sufficient advantage for; though, alas, he and his Party (I know not why,) judge once vindicating ourselves from false aspersions, is an intolerable Crime in me, when his frequent, and weak as well as passionate Outcries, are very
very justifiable, even though he still imputes to us what we abhor.

For some time we were quiet, and it was my hope we should continue so; but Mr. Mother, the great Enemy to the Union, finding he could no longer instigate others to blow the flames, finds an occasion to get into Pinners-Hall, upon the Sickness of one of the six Lecturers; and there, as he owneth in his Preface, studiously and of purpose renews the Debate. Mr. Baxter and I were oft as good as named by him, and the very body of our Ministers arraigned as Socinians, and by him charged as holding soul-destroying Errors, if there be, or ever were, any in the world; as Enemies to Christ's righteousness at heart, and worse than Papists; with the like envenomed Reproaches. And with the rest of his Stuff, he, under pain of Damnation, required the people to believe, that Christ's incarnation was no part of his Humiliation, and every Believer was as righteous as Christ in Equality, and not in Similitude only; with other things, which the following Tract insists on. These he had oft in his own place preached, and long endeavoured to make our Ministry hateful to his Hearers; yet that I was silent under: But serious thoughts of the design and tendency of his open attempt at Pinners-Hall, forced me in my next turns in that Lecture, to preach the principal Heads of the following Sermons, which I enlarged into four Discourses at my own place. Yet I had that re-
To the Reader.

gard to Peace, that as I forbore all indecent Reflections, so I took no notice that any one asserted what I determine against; and had never published them, except that he had printed his, and that with the scandalous name he intends us to be called hereafter by, viz. Semi-Socinian.

Sober men justly cry out against these Debates; but I appeal to their consciences, where the Blame must be laid? Can we be faithful to Christ, to our Ministry, to Souls that need our help, or to our own Name, as Ministers, if we lay down with these calumnies and misrepresentations? Though did they only plead for their own Whimsies, I should for Peace disregard them; but to make it their daily work to prejudice the People against the faithfulest Ministry, and run them into confusion of mind for a Faction's sake, calls I think for an industrious Opposition.

If you ask, what in us is it, that they so exclaim against? I answer, It is, (1.) That tho' we own Christ's righteousness is truly imputed to us, yet we deny that God esteems us to have done and suffered what Christ did. (2.) Tho' we own, that God requires nothing of us to be a meriting legal Righteousness, or Atonement for Sin; yet we say, that God in a way of governing Grace, requires some Duty to be performed on man's part, (to which he enableth us,) whereupon he applies to us the beneficial effects and fruits of Christ's Righteousness, according to the respective Gospel-Promises;
To the Reader.

Promises; and thereby encourageth us to those Duties, and governs our fears and hopes. And this is the Heart of the Controversy; for they think no Duty, as a Duty, is ordained a means to any benefit: They own no Law, but the Law of Works, which admitted nothing short of perfect sinless obedience: And because we cannot perform that, as the meriting Condition of Life in the adjustment of Justice; therefore men must do nothing, as a Condition of enjoying any benefits in Christ’s right, by the adjustment of Grace in a way of authority: Since we cannot be wholly Sinless, it’s all as one whether we are Sincere or no. (3.) We own, that it is Faith alone is the receiving Condition of Justification; yea I add, That it’s the only express’d Condition of the Imputation of Christ’s righteousness in order to pardon: But all is in vain, because we say that Repentance is necessary to our actual pardon.

Mr. Mather falsely pretends, that their Notions are the Truth in the Churches possession since the Reformation. But I have proved the contrary by many Quotations in my Defence of Gospel-Truth; and the very judicious and learned Apology of the Subscribers of my Book hath added a greater number. I will, of Hundreds I could produce, give two Testimonies.

The one is Mr. Perkins, in his Order and Causes of Salvation, &c. Chap. 36. “Quest. Whether is justifying Faith commanded in
To the Reader.

"in the Law? Ans. It is commanded
in the Law of Faith, namely the Gospel, but not in the Law of Works, that
is, in the Moral Law, Rom. iii. 27." The Reasons are these, "1. That which the
Law revealeth not, that it commandeth
not; but the Law is so far from revealing justifying Faith, that it never knew
it. 2. Adam had fully before his Fall
written in his heart the Moral Law, yet
had he not justifying Faith which ap-
prehended Christ." He then proceeds to answer the Objections against the Gospel being
a Law.

The other is Mr. Anth. Burges, in his
Doctrine of Justification, part 1. pag. 161,
who denies, that Repentance is in a man, as a Sign only that God hath pardoned him:
But faith, "We must go further, and say,
"it's the Means and Way which God hath
appointed antecedently to Pardon, so that
"where this goeth before, the other fol-
"lowneth after." This he proves by six Ar-
guments, and the Book was printed at the
desire of the London Synod.

To these I shall only add, that Calvin oft
owneth the Gospel to be a Law, and in his
Commentaries on Jonah, Cap. iii. 10. pag. 359.
faith, "Forgiveness is free, and yet as oft
"as God proposeth Forgiveness to Sinners,
"this Condition is still added therewith,
"viz. that they repent." He gives the Rea-
sions of it, and calls it a Law, by which God
commands Repentance in order to Pardon, though not as a cause of Pardon.

I have in this Book endeavoured to put the doctrine of Justification in a plain light; though I wonder why our Brethren still say, I mean what is quite contrary to what I say. I suppose, it's because they have so long thought and represented some of our Principles contrary to what they be, that they cannot think it possible that they should be what indeed they are; or at least they will suspect us Fools and Liars, rather than seem to own that they could be so long mistaken. I request therefore, that if Mr. Mather will reply to me, he would cite my words fully, and give the Page as I have done, for hitherto my own words would have put their Calumnies to Shame: Him, while God spares me, I will attend to. He saith, "That he is not far from the place, where the weary are at rest, and the wicked cease from troubling." I wish him Repentance of the wound he hath unjustly given so many, fitter to serve their Generation than him or me; and whilst he is spared, (which I desire for Service may be long,) that he may be less unwearied in hindring and breaking that blessed Union, which promised so much Good; though I am sorry, he boasts of his own Quietness, while he createth broils and disquiet to so many: Some known to us both, he'll meet in Glory, who were comforted by the above Consideration, whilst less able to bear up under his
To the Reader.

his assaults, than by Grace I have been long strengthened to do. Nevertheless, whilst Con-
science binds me to some Sharpness against his attempt to destroy so many Ministers, as to what is more valuable than their Lives; I do from my Heart forgive him, and would rejoice to find him convinced of his mistake and misrepresentation of our Principles, that we might peaceably concur in promoting the Kingdom of Christ and our common Good, and not be the Scorn of such as glory in our Weakness.

Reader, It's worth thy notice, that there is more Safety in our way, than in the contrary; for we trust in Christ's only Righteousness for all those things and uses it is appointed to, even for Satisfaction to Justice, the Pardon of all our sins and defects, the Acceptance of our persons and all performances, the Merit of all Good, yea, and our legal and prolegal Righteousness, renouncing every Grace and Work of ours to any of these purposes: And this is all they pretend. But if it prove, that Christ never intended his Righteousness to be instead of true Faith and Repentance, sincere Love to God and Men, and Perseverance in true Holiness and Fruitfulness; and that Christ will judge us according to these, as things he required to our actual enjoying of promised Benefits in his Righteousness; they who pursue and by Grace have these, will be safer than such as neglect them; yea, Mr. Mather owneth, pag. 67. "Such are
To the Reader.

"are thy bounden Duties, and God will " damn thee for neglecting them." It were easy to shew, how these Men contradict each other as well as themselves; but I forbear exposing them. That the Father of Light and Love would guide all of us into the way of Truth and Peace, is the unfeigned Prayer of

Thy Servant in the Kingdom and Patience of Christ,

D. Williams.

Any who consider what men I have to deal with, will excuse my frequent Repetitions, and sometimes less accurate words, as object for subject, when I would most plainly distinguish between justifying Righteousness, with its causes, and the Person partaker of it.
I. Of Christ's Obedience.

Rom. v. the last part of the 19th Verse.

—So by the Obedience of One shall many be made righteous.

The Text represents to us,

First, A saving privilege and dignity: Made righteous.

It supposes us unrighteous, ere we are made righteous; and so, subject to the Curse, till we are absolved, as well as disobedient to the Gospel while unconverted. The Word καταράθηκονται, oft, though not always, denotes an act of Authority; as Mat. xxv. 21. Luke xii. 14, 42. Acts vi. 3, &c. and thus it's properly enough applicable to the Matter before us. We are constituted righteous Juridically, and all other benefits included here in the term righteous, are authoritatively conferred; and this according to a Divine enacted Constitution: of which hereafter.

Secondly,
Of Christ's Obedience.

Serm. Secondly, The sole procuring Cause of our being made righteous: It's by the Obedience of One. This One is the Lord Jesus. He alone was capable to make fallen men righteous by his Obedience, and it's by his Obedience that Sinners are constituted righteous. Mercy prompted the recovery of miserable man: Wisdom contrived this, as a way sufficient, effectual, and congruous, to that end: God, as our Judge and Ruler, admitted and accepted this, and in his adjusted way applies it for our pardon and adoption. Faith is the moral Instrument or Condition of that application; the Gospel-Promise is the express Sign of the Divine Will, or the Instrument whereby God doth apply it: But the different Interest of each of these prevents not the appropriation of all the Causal Merit to this Obedience. God justifies, regenerates, and saves, but it's with an Eye to this, as the only procuring Cause.

Thirdly, The Subject actually partaker of this blessing: Many. They are Men, and not Devils; fallen Men, and not innocent: Many, and not simply few; nor yet all; though it's for final impenitency and unbelief that any of the sons of men remain condemned. These many are equal to the number of godly believers in all ages.

Fourthly, The futurity and certainty of many being made righteous; both which the
Of Christ's Obedience.

the Future Tense imports: Shall be made SERM.

righteous.

I. It denotes futurity. With respect

to the effect of Adam's Sin it's said, 

\[\text{αὐτῶν αμαρτολοί, they were made Sinners: There}\]

is guilt entailed on all his seed, and filth

derived to them as soon as they subsist;

yea, it is true, they were all offenders, and

corrupted in Adam, as being seminally in

him. But by Christ's Obedience, it's af-
firmed, many shall be made righteous; that

is, when it is applied, and not before.

The Elect since Christ's time, remain

unrighteous whilst unbelievers, notwith-

standing that Christ's Obedience is long

since finished; as well as all believers before

Christ's coming were made righteous by this Heb. xi:

Obedience, tho' it was not then actually 13

performed. The reason of both is the

fame, viz. That we are made righteous, not

immediately in the moment of Christ's

obeying, nor merely on the Acts done; but

upon God's applying this to us by the word

of his Gospel, and the work of his Spirit.

Therefore believing Abraham was made Rom. iv:

righteous many ages before Christ obeyed; 22.

and the Elect Corinthians were unjustified 1 Cor. vi.

all the time of their infidelity, tho' Christ

had finished his work before. The Gospel-

Promise confers righteousness for Justifica-
tion on all believers, and none but belie-

vers; tho' Christ's Obedience be that, for

which alone, when they believe, any are

C justified.
Of Christ's Obedience.

This Righteousness is offered to all hearers on the terms of the Gospel; it's designed infallibly for all the Elect: But neither offer, nor design, constitutes any man righteous. There must be another act, (even imputation,) and that terminates on no other object but the believer.

2. The words denote certainty; as if it were said, many shall eventually be made righteous by it. A may be made righteous, if they will believe, is a Mercy to Mankind above Devils: But a mere may be is too low a reward for Christ, and incongruous to an Obedience so astonishing. Strange were it, that the Lord of Life should die for Sinners, and it remain contingent, whether any of them should eternally speak his praises, or be happy by his merits. But my Text is an unerring prediction, which will be still accomplishing, till Christ shall judge the world: His seed shall see, whom by his knowledge he will justify. He will not violate the Gospel-constitution, by justifying the unbeliever, because he is elected; but the Elect shall believe, that they may be justified by his Obedience. The eternal Counsel shall be executed, in the way enacted by governing Grace. But we have further in the Text,

Fifthly, The redditive note, which refers to the first clause of the verse; ouτω, So. The Apostle had said, As by one man's Dis-obedience many were made Sinners; So, &c.
Of Christ's Obedience.

He principally intends hereby to affirm, SERM. I.

That by Christ's Obedience all his regenerate seed shall as certainly be made righteous, as Adam's natural seed were made Sinners by his Disobedience: Christ's obedience is as effectual to the one, as Adam's disobedience was to the other. Adam is said to be the Figure of Christ, ver. 14. They were two publick Persons in this respect. All men were made Sinners by Adam's Fall; all men that ever are made righteous, are made so by Christ's Obedience. This is the main scope of the Apostle's reasoning, in the parallel between the First and Second Adam: But he intends not to infer a Similitude in all things between Christ and Adam, who in so many things differ; nay, in this Chapter you have sundry instances of that difference given.

Doct. By the Obedience of Jesus Christ, God-Man our Redeemer, many shall be made righteous.

Good News to a lost world! that tho' we are undone as Adam's posterity, yet help is laid on Christ, who is mighty to save. Pf. lxxxix. 19. Zech. ix. 11. There's a way to rescue us out of the pit, wherein is no water, and to release us from that Slavery, which as to any thing in our power or purchase must have eternally continued. But what comfort doth it minister to Sinners, that the Gospel proclaims a way
Of Christ's Obedience.

Serm. way to be made righteous on its terms, a way to be made obedient to those terms; and a certainty, that many of us apostates, forlorn wretches, shall infallibly be made righteous in that way? Nor doth it a little contribute to our joy, that it is by Christ's Obedience all this is effected: This gives the strongest security, and must infer the benefits to be exceeding glorious, when the Price is so invaluable, which was paid by him who is Wisdom itself. Yea, we, since Christ's resurrection, have the advantage above the Old-Testament Saints, that we know more of the Obedience and the Person rendering it, than they did; yea, and that it is finished: Even all is actually done by him, which the offended Law-giver exacted, as satisfactory for the injury done to governing Justice by Sin, or which is meritorious of our blessedness, and of our right to all saving benefits. Well might the Angel be the herald of such News, and say, Behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people; for unto you is born this day a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord.

Should I insist on every part of the Doctrine, the Discourses would exceed the number I intend. I shall therefore confine myself to what will naturally fall under these two Enquiries.

I. What is the Obedience of Christ, by which many shall be made righteous?

II. What
Of Christ's Obedience.

II. What is it to be made righteous by the Obedience of Christ?

I Qu. What is the Obedience of Christ, by which many shall be made righteous?

Answ. By this Obedience we are to understand, All that Christ did or suffered in obedience to the Will of God for the salvation of Sinners, either in a way of Satisfaction, or of Merit. It's sum'd up in the solemn Prayer he made to the Father, I Joh. xvii. have glorified thee on earth; I have finished the work thou gavest me to do. The words indeed have the same anticipation, as is in the Lord's Supper; This is my Body which is broken for you, tho' he was not actually crucified. So here, I have finished the work, that is, I am just upon it; and all was performed in a way of obediential subjection; as if he had said, It's what thou gavest me to do, for the display of thy Glory obscur'd by Sin, and for maintaining that Glory in all the blessings thy goodness inclined to bestow on Sinners. The Word in my Text expressing Obedience is ὑπακοὴ, and exactly answers to those words of Christ, He hath opened mine Ear, and I was not re- Isa. 1. 5, bellious, neither turned away back: I gave my Back to the smiters, &c.

I shall reduce to a few Propositions, what I think explicative of this point.
Of Christ's Obedience.

Serm.

I. Prop. God is essentially just: He hath no pleasure in wickedness. From the essential justice of God it is, that there are Laws of Nature, as well as Positive Laws. Here the first necessity of satisfaction for Sin, or the certain punishment of Sinners, have their rise; though it is ratified by the Veracity of God, when threatenings are promulgated by him. God admits no violation hereof in any of his Ordinations, but accommodates them thereto; and provides for the Glory thereof, in all the revelations of his Will, and dispensations of his Providence.

II Prop. God was pleased eminently to reveal the glory of his governing justice in the Covenant of Works with innocent man. It is true, his Holiness appeared in the precept, as a rule of manners; and it was of his Goodness, that God would expressly covenant with man by promising any reward for Obedience, and increase his defence against Sin, by pronouncing the threatening.

He might have left man to that mere Light which Nature afforded, and proceeded only according to that absolute Dominion which he had over man, as his Creator and Owner. But it pleased God to take on him the relation of a Governor, to which he had a right from his Dominion. As a Governor, he enacts the Law of Works, and displays his Justice in constituting
tuting the rule, whereby he would reward and punish. Justice held the balance in adjusting the threatening and reward, or this Constitution were not a Law of Works, but a Law of Grace; yea, obedient man had not been rewarded for his Obedience, but for somewhat else; which is contrary to that of the Apostle, *Moses describeth the Romans* x 5. *righteousness which is of the Law, that the man that doth those things, shall live by them*; where he infers, that a man's Obedience had been his right to Life; to which add what he elsewhere says, *Now to him that Romans* iv. 4 *worketh, is the reward not reckoned of Grace, but of Debt.* The reward would not only have been sure from the Truth of God, (which Gospel-blessings are;) but due from the Covenant, as formally legal: It was to be a reward *strictly legal;* as being proportioned and connected by governing Justice; which adjudged, the Duty to be done would honour Justice, and answer the ends of government, to the proportion of the reward, which was promised for that duty. Were it not thus, governing Justice had no concern in the Law of Works, as to the *pre- miant* part of the Sanction, but must be confined to the *punitive* part alone. It must adjust the threatened evil in case of Sin, but not the reward in case of Obedience. Had Justice been so unconcerned in the rewards, Divine goodness might, even in that Law of Works, have promised the reward, without requiring
Of Christ's Obedience.

Serm. requiring any duty as the Condition; and consequently, there were no absolute necessity of Christ's meriting glory for us; his mere atonement for Sin being as much as would answer governing Justice, which did not adjust the reward, but the threatening against Sin only; whereas the reward was inserted and proportioned of mere free goodness. This would also weaken the main argument for the necessity of the imputation of Christ's active Obedience, for our title to Glory: For if governing Justice made not man's Obedience a meriting condition of Glory; but that the reward was of mere Grace in that constitution; it is no Violation of Justice, that we have Glory as pardoned Sinners, though Obedience be not imputed to us.

Let us then entertain thoughts of the Law, becoming that account: *The Law is holy, just, and good;* holy in its precepts and prohibitions, just in its sanction, and good in its use and tendency.

III Prop. Man by Sin injur'd the relative or reputative glory of governing Justice, and cast contempt on God's Government, and thereby became subject to the Curse, forfeited all right to the Reward, yea, became utterly incapable of recovering that right by the Covenant of Works. For *Judgment came upon all men to condemnation; and,*

*All have sinned, and come short of the glory of*
Of Christ's Obedience.

Of God: Yea, Death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned. Rom. v. 12.

IV Prop. That the Glory of governing Justice might not suffer by the saving of Sinners, there must be a Satisfaction for the offence they committed, and a meritorious Price for the good to be dispensed to them. God's Government must not be arraigned before Angels or Men, as weak: Nor would the Justice of God seem an approver of rebellion, by admitting Sin to pass unpunished; nor admit such an occasion of disobedience to his Government. By Satisfaction, I mean, that which fully vindicates the reputative glory of Justice so injured by Sin, and secures the ends of Government. By Merit, I intend, that which governing Justice adjudged proportionable to the benefit to be conferred on the Sinners.

V Prop. Sinners being utterly incapable for this, God, our Lawgiver, did ordain and admit Christ, with his consent, to be the Redeemer and Saviour of lost Sinners, by making Satisfaction for Sin, and Meriting the forfeited Blessings, and much greater for them. Hence it is said, he was appointed. This was an act of the Lawgiver, as above the Law; but it was not, by the Law of Works: Yea, God dispensed with the Law of Works, in admitting Christ's Sufferings and Obedience to be satisfactory and
Of Christ's Obedience.

Serm. I. and meritorious for offenders. That Law knew no vicarious obedience or punishment: The Soul that sins, must die, and not another for it, was the language of the Law. Divine Grace and Sovereignty here exert themselves, to answer the ends of the Law, by substituting a Saviour of lost Souls.

VI Prop. It was in the Covenant of Redemption, wherein it was adjusted and agreed, what should be thus Satisfactory and Meritorious, and so effectual to save Sinners. See Isa. liii. 10, 11, 12. Ps. xl. 6, 7, 8. Zech. vi. 13. Job. xvii. 4. The Parties in this Covenant, are the Father and Spirit on the one part; and the Son on the other. Whatever Christ suffered in time, and all the Obedience he yielded, were terms proposed to him, and accepted by him. In that Volume were recorded, what his Work and Rewards were to be; and of the latter, the Salvation of his members is a part. What he herein submitted to, he became obliged as an act of faithfulness to perform. Whatever was herein promised him, he had a right to receive, and did accordingly claim. By this compact, he agreed to be a Subject and Servant; and hence the Law of Mediation did commence as binding. By this compact his Obedience and Sufferings became a Satisfaction, that otherwise had been ineffectual.

Satis-
Of Christ's Obedience.

Satisfaction imports a refuseableness, antecedently to an agreement: And hence we may perceive, that though what Christ paid was a full equivalent, yet it was not in all things the same in kind, as man was obliged to. True, Justice took care, that all was inserted into this Covenant, as Christ's Work, which was necessary to the reparation of its Glory: And hence the great Essentials of the Law of Works were inserted, as Articles to be performed by Christ, viz. sinless Obedience as a man, which is the sum of the Precept, and Death the substance of the Threatning; and these to be done and suffered in the Human Nature. Nevertheless some things in the Threatnings were incompetent to him; as spiritual Death, the hatred of God, &c. And many Precepts were not agreeable to his circumstances, all which were omitted: Nay, many things, which the Law of Works never enjoin'd on men, were necessary to be done by the Redeemer, and therefore were superadded. From this Covenant ariseth the immediate obligation of Christ to all his Obedience, as well as the rule and measure of it; and from this his Title to all the Reward, much of which the premiant Sanction of the Law of Works never contained, and could never give a right to.

No doubt, that in this Covenant were adjusted the terms of the application of Redemption to men, which the Gospel-Covenant
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Serm. nant doth enjoin; which, I suppose, the Assembly mean, when they join the Covenant of Redemption, and the Gospel-Covenant together; and say, "it was made with Christ, as the second Adam:" But they cannot intend, that Christ obliged himself to perform personally all the Terms of the application of his purchased benefits to us, as he did the Terms of the imposition of those benefits. He bound not himself to repent and believe for us, tho' he did to die for us; yea, and as Surety of the Gospel-Covenant he engaged, that the Elect should repent, believe, and persevere: But yet the benefits should be applied to men upon their personal believing; and they are required by the Gospel so to believe, and become themselves federating Parties in the Gospel-Covenant. This runs throughout the Assembly's Confession and Catechisms. As when they say, in the larger Catechism, "Faith is required by the Covenant, as a Condition to interest us in Christ:" And again, "That we may escape the wrath and curse of God, due to us by reason of the transgression of the Law, God requireth of us Repentance towards God, and Faith towards our Lord Jesus, and the diligent use of the outward means, whereby Christ communicates to us the benefits of his Mediation." You have the same in the lesser Catechism: And they oft tell us, of Promises
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Promises made to Graces, &c. by which, Serm. and much more, it is plain, that Conditions are required of men.

VII Prop. Satisfaction being to be made for innumerable Sins committed, and not only forfeited Blessings, but even greater, being to be merited, and that for many; the Obedience of Christ must exceed what the Law of Works enjoined on mankind, as the condition of its reward.

What was necessary from every single man for himself, could not by legal Justice be sufficient from one man for all others that omitted it: Now the Law required obedience to its precepts from every single man. That could not merit the reward for Sinners, which was but necessary to an Innocent man's title to the reward: But what the Law required was necessary to Innocent man's obtaining the reward, though he had not sinned before. That which was by governing Justice adjudged but proportionable to a less reward, could not merit a greater reward: But whatever the Law of Works required, was but proportioned to its lesser rewards. Lesser I call them; for though I allow them to be an eternal Felicity in another world, yet these were not Union with Christ, nor such a degree of Conformity to his Glory, &c. much less did they include the rewards promised
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I. misred to Christ for his Obedience, as a Name above every Name, all Judgment and Authority, with many more, all which are the reward of Christ's Obedience. As to Expiation of Sin by punishment for Reconciliation with the offended God, the Law enjoins no such Duty, nor hinted such a thing. Its Threatning was eternal Death, as eternal: Eternity was an ingredient into the misery of every Sinner, and can be removed by nothing but the Lawgiver's dispensing therewith, upon Considerations equally vindicating the glory of Justice, as this Eternity of Sinners torments would do: And it must be equivalent, not only to the eternal woe of one Offender, but at least of all those Sinners who escape it.

Consider these and the like things, and see, if the Law of Works (which all men were perfectly to obey,) did enjoin all that Obedience, which Christ was to yield as the condition of his reward, of which man's Salvation is but part; especially when it is a reward adjusted by strict governing Justice, abating nothing of the meriting Price thereof. I mention these things, to let you see the danger of confining Christ's Obedience, to the idem of what the Law enjoined on man, or promised to him. Alas, we should be infinite Losers thereby; we could at best expect no more Happiness, than what the Law of Works promised. Nay, I think, a Redemption of Sinners in
Of Christ's Obedience.

in a way of Justice, would be more exceptional than some Persons think, who dare much, because they see too little. A Suretiship of Christ, confined to what the Covenant of Works includes, would be an uncomfortable Doctrine.

But the Obedience of Christ was not only super-equivalent to all that man was to do by the Law, but equal to all the reward promised in the Covenant of Redemption. The Dignity of his Person, the things he did and suffered, and the Intenseness of his Obedience; his Unobligedness to do or suffer these, but on the account of glorifying God by satisfying for Sin, and opening a way for exerting Grace to Sinners; with many more, concur to aggrandize his Obedience: Of this more elsewhere.

And if it be objected, Will not the Dignity of his Person let in all happiness to us by a Suretiship, in the mere Covenant of Works?

I answer, No: But yet I ask, Where doth the Law of Works require this Dignity in the person obeying? Or, How can it put such a value on what it requir'd not, and how can it impute that Dignity to us which it never exacted? And if it could, Where are many of those forementioned rewards promised in its Sanction? And if they be not so included, How can that Covenant convey a right to them?
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SERM. God hath better contrived for his own Glory, and for our Good, for which we should for ever praise and adore him. He hath taken the essentials of the Law into the Covenant of Redemption, and added these to other superadded articles; promising Christ a seed, and their utmost felicity, as also rewards to himself in the human nature, if he performed these articles. These Christ undertook, and performed to a tittle. And what Christ hereby acquired, he is dispensing in a Gospel-way of Grace, and yet of Government: And blessed be his name, he is our Surety, that we shall not violate the Terms of the Gospel-Covenant; and a Witness for God, that we shall obtain the good promised in the said Covenant.

VIII Prop. Our Redeemer did fully vindicate the glory of governing Justice from the injury offered by Sin, and caused his Government by his Obedience to appear venerable, notwithstanding all the forgiveness and blessings which Grace should bestow in Christ's right upon any Sinners.

Forgiveness is a mercy, which the Devil foresaw not; and besides, according to God's methods with himself, he could hardly suspect it possible, because he knew God would not reflect on his own Justice or Purity, nor prostitute his glory as a Governor, nor hazard the ends of Government,
Of Christ's Obedience.

Of Christ's Obedience.

ment, by pardoning Delinquents: He there-fore tempted man with confidence of his final Ruin, if persuaded to transgress. A Satisfaction by an equivalent, he understood not: But infinite Wisdom triumphed over Satan's wiles, and spoiled his glorying over his captive prey. God finds a way of Forgiveness, without tempting any to offend the more; and appears exactly just, whilst yet he shews as much pardoning Mercy as the offenders needed; yea, makes Sin appear more awful, and his Government more sacred, by the Satisfaction on which he pardoned, than in the Punishment of all that had transgressed. Hence he is said, to declare at this time his Righteousness, that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus. The Apostle had before affirmed, That the pardon of Sins committed before Christ's coming was on the account of Christ's Propitiation, as well as of those since: And upon this he adds, That in the Propitiation whereby any Sins were remitted, God appeared righteous whilst he pardoned; though he justifies the Believer, yet he appears gloriously just in that Propitiation whereupon he justifies.

IX Prop. The Lord Jesus thus glorified God as he satisfied and merited, by perfectly obeying the Will of God, and by the whole of his Humiliation, especially in offering up himself an atoning Sacrifice
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Serm. Sacrifice by death upon the Cross. His active and passive Obedience concurred in the whole of Redemption.

1. He perfectly obeyed the Will of God. Whatever was adjusted as his Duty, he performed: He made the authority of the Lawgiver manifest, and exemplified the perfect purity of the Law. He was habitually holy, without defect and blemish; and actively obedient, to the extent and spirituality of the Precept. He was holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from Sinners: He fulfilled all Righteousness; not refusing Obedience to the Institution ministered by John the Baptist. He fulfilled the moral Law; yea, he observed the ceremonial Law, and filled up every Relation wherein he stood. He not only did, what we are to do; but whatever act of Obedience was consistent with his circumstances: He pleaded no exemption because of his Dignity; nor waved any thing as too mean or difficult. An accurate observance of the Divine Will ran, as a constant Line, through his whole Life, according to the various opportunities presented to him: And every act of his Obedience was filled with that love, zeal, and alacrity, as might prescribe instruction to the highest Angels; and convince them, how just, meet, good, and excellent a thing the profoundest Obedience is, when God in flesh was thus observant. Thus he made the Law honourable, and thereby the Lawgiver.

2. He
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2. He was humbled, and suffered the utmost punishment, which Justice required, and God proposed, for the expiation of Sin. He was Incarnate, and therein emptied himself. He was a man of sorrows, as if they made up his constitution; and was acquainted with grief, even with the inwards of it, as his familiar. He endured reproach, so as to cry out, it hath broken my Heart. So low was he brought, as to express his state by those words, I am a worm, and no man. He was beholden to others for necessaries; which he seems to have felt, in the commonness of that passage with him, It is more blessed to give, than to receive. He received comfort by the ministry of Angels. How oft was he blasphemed, and mock'd by men, grieved by his followers, and deserted by his friends? His Blood was often shed; when circumcised, when scourged and crowned with thorns, when fasten'd to the Cross with nails, and at last when pierced with the spear and his heart-blood let out. And, Oh! the direful Agony, which so amazed him, forced clots of Blood, and rendered him sorrowful even unto death. God hid his face from him; and a death, in the manner of it accursed, as well as shameful, he tasted and endured. He lay in the Grave for a time, after he had thus waded thro' a Sea of blood, shame, and terror. Alas! Who can tell what he underwent, whose...
Serm. Sentiments of all must give them a weight
I. beyond our conjecture? One so glorious,

How astonishing a sight was it, to see
Christ hang upon a Cross? The purposes
designed by it, must be answerable to the
wonder: And so we shall acknowledge,
when we understand the justice and purity
of God, the evil of Sin, the harmony of the
Divine Government, the value of Pardon
and eternal Life, the honour of the Me-
diator, and the influence of his Obedience
on myriads of Angels.

At present, we see the Pardon of Sin
made consistent with Justice. Our Lord
endured the Punishment of Sin, that God
might be glorious, whilst the believing
Sinner escapes. By this, God declared the
Righteousness of his Government, whilst he
glorified his Grace in saving transgressors.
Christ's being obedient even unto Death, ho-
nour'd the Law above all that men could
perform in their condition; yea, sets it above
contempt, when the Penitent is forgiven
his greatest enormities: So that God as our
Governor, receives such Glory by Christ's
Subjection, as that it suffers nothing by the
impunity and happiness of all who are
saved. Yea, a dying Christ is more fit to
awe every one against Rebellion, and to
dispose to the exactest Obedience, than any
other consideration.
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For the further clearing of this Point, Serm.
I shall propose three Enquiries.

I Enq. Were Christ's Sufferings a part of the Obedience of Christ, whereby we are made righteous?

Anf. The Sufferings of Christ were a part of the Obedience of Christ, whereby we are made righteous. No Precept could try his Obedience more, than that he should make his Soul an Offering for Sin. Herein he out-did the Loyalty of all Beings. For the proof of this point, I shall give you some further Evidence, that Christ's Sufferings were a part of his Obedience.

1. Whatever was endured by Christ was enjoined him in a way of Authority, upon supposition he would be Redeemer. He agreed to be a Subject and Servant: And he learned what Obedience was, even by what he endured; and still acknowledg'd an Authority over him as Mediator. This Commandment, says he, I have received of my Father: And, Not as I will, but as thou wilt, were his words, when the human nature hinted so much reluctancy, as expressed the Cup to be truly bitter.

2. Christ's Sufferings were endured by him in a way of Obedience: He obeyed, in whatever he endured. The Lord God hath opened mine Ear, and I was not rebellious; I gave my Back to the Smiters, &c.
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Serm. And when the hour of his Sufferings was come, he shews the most obediential regard, and says, 

I. Thy will be done: So that he was obedient unto Death. The Law of Mediation enjoined it, and his Will exerted its true consent, even giving up the ghost.

3. The efficacy of Christ’s Sufferings much depended on their being acts of Obedience. For had they been against his Will, or had he repented after he had first agreed, men had failed of Salvation. Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he faith, 

Lo, I come to do thy Will, O God: By the which Will we are sanctified, through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all. The Will of God appointing and accepting this atonement, and the Will of Christ obeying and freely performing what was appointed, are what we are saved by. The obedient heart of Christ in all, gives a power thereto. Hence there’s a Stress laid on his voluntariness in his Work; and we are told, He gave himself; and offered up himself. He testified this, in being the Priest that offered himself, as well as the Sacrifice that was offered.

These being such amazing instances of Obedience, tended much to glorify God’s Government. How sacred is that authority, and how binding are its mandates, when the Son of God in Flesh will observe them, even when they require such Sufferings to be endured and submitted to?
These are harder precepts, than Angels or Men were ever called to obey; and therefore how cheerful should they be in observing such Commands, as be less humbling and difficult; especially when the authority of God’s precepts are founded in his absolute Dominion over them? But Christ could be under no Law, till by his own consent he was willing to be a Subject. I infer then, that if Christ’s Sufferings were a part of his Obedience, then we are made righteous thereby; or we are made righteous by only some part of his Obedience; which I suppose you’ll not affirm. Again,

4. Christ’s Sufferings are a part of his meriting Righteousness: And this will both prove, that they are part of Christ’s Obedience, and that we are made righteous thereby; unless any should surmise, we are made righteous by somewhat of Christ’s, besides his Obedience; or, that his meriting Righteousness doth not conduce to make us righteous. Now that Christ’s Sufferings are a part of his Righteousness, might be demonstrated many ways; as, (1.) They were part of the condition, whereupon Christ had a right to men’s Pardon and Salvation. (2.) Christ pleads and proceeds in the virtue of his Sufferings. (3.) We are expressly said to be justified by his Blood. (4.) They are meritorious of what blessings
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Serm. blessings we receive. But these things will be insisted on in the third Enquiry.

2 Enq. Was Christ's Incarnation a part of his Humiliation?

Ans. Christ's Incarnation was a part of his Humiliation. To argue this point with evidence, I must mind you, that the subject of this proposition must be taken as it naturally lieth. I would think it of no use to you, and in itself a vain question to ask, Had Christ assumed our nature in another State than it is since the Fall, or had Christ become incarnate in another manner, than by being conceived in the womb of the Virgin; whether then his Incarnation had been a part of his Humiliation? Though I know, some Popish Schoolmen ungroundedly affirm, that Christ would have taken our nature into union with him, if Adam had not fallen, (and so there would not have been that place for his Humiliation,) yet I think it not hard to prove, that for the Eternal Word to become Incarnate in any manner, would have been a great Humiliation; and there must have been somewhat that would have rendered it so, or he would not have assumed our nature. But we have nothing to do with such Chimeras. Christ was Incarnate; he hath assumed our nature; and the Word of God tells us, in what manner
a part of his Humiliation.

he assumed it, and to what ends, and in Serm. what State. Therefore we must in our I. Question speak of Christ's Incarnation as it was, and not as it was not; and which ever way it be decided, every one must confine his conceptions according as the Subject in the Question is stated, unless they will deceive others and themselves.

I shall offer these Reasons to prove, that Christ's Incarnation was a part of his Humiliation.

1 R. The Word of God in express terms affirms this, Phil. ii. 7. But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a Servant, and was made in the likeness of men. Let us for the better apprehending the force of this Text, consider, [1.] The Context. [2.] The words in the Verse. [3.] The Objection that may be offered to enervate it, from ver. 8. For if the Context tend to prove, that Christ's Incarnation was a part of his Humiliation, and the Text in plain words affirm it, and there be nothing in the whole against it, the Proof must be express; only let me give you the 7th verse as it is in the Original, which by our translation is darkened. Christ emptied himself, taking on him the form of a Servant, being made in the likeness of men.

[1.] Let us consider the Context. The Apostle had commanded self-denial, charity, and humility, ver. 3, 4. This charge he inforceth
Serm. inforceth by Christ's example, ver. 5. Let this mind be in you, which was in Christ Jesus: And that he might give this instance the greater advantage, (1.) He shews the glorious dignity of Christ as God, ver. 6. Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God. He was equally glorious; he that assumed our nature, and suffered in it, was as excellent, and the beams of his Glory as illustrious, as God himself; being of one essence and nature with God, and having no other nature besides his Divine. And (2.) He then proceeds to tell them, how this glorious One humbled and debased himself, ver. 7. of which presently; and therefore lets them see, how meet it was, that they should not grudge at denying themselves, or being most lowly and humble, when Christ, so infinitely more glorious, was content to become so low and mean, as to take our Nature, and suffer in it. You see the Context requires, that whatever is affirmed in this seventh verse must refer to Christ's Debasement, or it cannot answer the plain scope of the Apostle's reasoning; which is, to persuade men to be self-denying, from this example of Christ's humbling himself.

[2.] The words of the seventh verse are next to be considered, He made himself of no reputation, εαυτὸν ἐκένων. This is the first Expression; and if you regard the derivation of the word, it amounts to this: He ren-
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rendered himself such, as if his perfections and glory were vain or useless. The word is consonantly translated, I Cor. ix. 15. Make [my glorying] void. It's rendered by Tertullian, Se exhauit, &c. And Beza thus explains it, Quae ex omni seipsum ad nihil reedit: Of all, he made himself nothing. Zanchius raiseth it higher, Se evacuavit omni gloria, & aequalitate cum patre: He emptied himself of all glory, and equality with the Father. Indeed who can comprehend the utmost of this Exinanition? Now these words must refer to his Incarnation, as what let in, and made him capable of, all the subsequent Sufferings. The next words are, And took upon him the form of a servant; or, taking on him the form of a servant; xocCuv. Wherein was this? I answer, In taking our nature. For by assuming this nature, he became God's Servant, and subject to his authority, as if not his own master; tho' a Servant to man he never was. He that was in the form of God, that is truly so, was in the form of a Servant, that is truly so. This is the sense which the next words confirm; And was made (or being made) in the likeness of men, Not likeness, in opposition to the reality of the human nature; but a conformity in nature, and the natural operations there-of: He assumed our very human nature. I hope then, the plain order and import of the words appear to be this: The Lord Jesus
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Serm. Jefus did greatly empty and humble himself in taking our nature, by the very assumption of which nature he was a Servant. And left you should think, that by being a Servant is meant, some servile debasement after he assumed this nature, and not his mere Incarnation, the Apostle explains it yet more: Being made in the likeness of men, is added after the form of a Servant. Nay, left any one should deny his Incarnation to be part of his Humiliation, by inverting the order of the words; he proceeds, ver. 8. And being found in fashion (or in habit) as a man, he humbled himself: As if he had said, Being thus emptied and debased in taking our nature, and being to observance in a State common with other mere men, he went on to undergo those sensible Sufferings, which his human nature rendered him capable of enduring. Which leads me,

[3.] To the Objection from ver. 8. Being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, becoming obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. From whence may be objected, That his Humiliation is confined to his dying in the human nature, after he had assumed it. To which I answer, That Chrift's dying was indeed a great part of his Humiliation, but that doth not argue that it was all his Humiliation. Chrift's death, and lying in the grave, finished his Humiliation; but it doth not follow, that...
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was the beginning of it. His Incarnation Serm.
did begin it, tho' he proceeded to con-
sume it by obeying unto death. And
exequies, or emptying himself, which is ascri-
bled to his Incarnation, doth as truly ex-
press an Humiliation, as ἐπανυφόν, which
we render humbled: Yea, the former de-
notes a far greater Humiliation, as to the
significancy of the word. To conclude
this; I cannot conceive, how the Apostle
could more expressly assert, that Christ's
Incarnation was a part of his Humiliation:
Nay, he seems to lay a very great stress
upon it; and variously expresseth Christ's
assuming our nature, as that wherein the
wonder consisted most. Oh that he, who
had a glory shining equally with the Father,
should so submit to the with-holding of it,
as to be made a man! Let me mind you,
that the Socinians will thank any man, that
denies the sense I give of this Text.

2 R. Christ did in his very Incarnation,
in obedience to God's command, volun-
tarily submit to the concealing and sus-
pending of his manifestative Glory, that he
might be capable to suffer the utmost Pu-
nishments he had engaged to endure.

This argument will appear in greater
strength, if we consider it in its several
parts; [1.] By shewing what a concealing
and suspending of Christ's manifestative
Glory there was in his very Incarnation.
[2.] That his submitting and enduring this,
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Serm. in obedience to God, and for the ends he thus assumed our nature, was truly a degree of Humiliation. After which, [3.] I shall answer an Objection that may be offered against the Son of God being capable of being humbled.

[1.] There was a great suspending and concealing of Christ's maniféstative Glory in his Incarnation. Our nature was taken as an obscuring veil, and in the manner of assuming it, that veil was exceeding thick; which will appear in these things.

(1.) Christ was conceived in a woman's womb, and there was he confined the usual time: He was born, and spent part of his time in the unaclive state of infancy and childhood: He was capable of growing in knowledge. This points to the manner of his Incarnation: And is there no concealment of his Glory herein, no laying it aside? Oh, for God-Man to be at any time unaclive as an Embrio, or child in the womb! for him to be born of a woman, for him to pass through the incapacities of infancy, and the like necessary consequences of the manner of his Incarnation! Sure here's a Suspension of Glory. Eve was formed in a way more glorious: Whereas the Apostle notes it of Christ, that he was made of a woman, made under the law.

(2.) Christ in his very Incarnation assumed the human nature when in a low state, yea after the Fall, and subject to many
many effects of that Fall. It was not a glorious body, a spiritual body, a body clothed with immortality; but a body subject to hunger, thirst, weariness, yea death itself. The Apostle leaves a remark on this: *2 Cor. v.*

we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him so no more.

Further, what a veil was it, that he assumed our nature after man had sinned, after he was condemned, and part of the Sentence executed? Yea, there was need of an extraordinary way of Generation, to prevent the propagation of guilt, and defilement to him. Our Lord was subject to grief, fear, trouble, temptations from without, &c. and to the same infirmities as we fallen men are, *Sin only excepted.* And *Heb. iv.*

was all this no Humiliation? His mere Incarnation was his assuming a body, in the frame and habit whereof these infirmities had actual place; and not a body exempted from these: He was in the likeness of *Rom. viii.*

sinful flesh.

(3.) The Apostle includes in Christ's Incarnation his Inferiority below Angels: *We see Jesus, who was made a little lower Heb. ii. 9.*

than the Angels, for the suffering of death, &c. Though his Exinanition in assuming our nature be not all, yet it is a great part of his Minoration, as taking a nature below the Angelical; though he could soon raise it above Angels, when he had assumed it, and finished his work therein; and hence some
**Christ's Incarnation**

I. It is plain, that the human nature in itself is below the Angelical; and therefore in taking this lower nature, he was so far humbled, and went so far further from his Glory. And then,

[2.] Christ's receding from his Glory, in taking our nature in this state, and after this manner, in obedience to God, and for the ends for which he assumed such a body, was truly a degree of Humiliation. That

Heb. x. 5. Christ should become man, was one article submitted to by him: It was a Debt, he paid; it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren. He was Incarnate, and that in the very described manner, that he might be capable of enduring those full effects of Sin; that he might taste Death for every man, and might be tempted, and the like. Had not he assumed our flesh, he was not capable of enduring these: Yea, had he not assumed our nature in a humbled state, and submitted to a veil on his Glory, the world would have been dazled with his brightness above the Sun's, and none have dared to blaspheme or assault him. But our Lord was thus Incarnate; his human nature was in this humbled condition, and not in an exalted state, when he assumed it, and begun not to be humbled afterwards: He laid by his Glory, when he put on our flesh in his conception; and therefore he prays, *Glorify me with the glory*
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glory which I had with thee before the world was. And the Apostle reckons it as a degree of his Humiliation, that he was made of a woman, made under the law. Yea, I Gal. iv. 4. think it might be demonstrated, that the Lord's quitting the Display of his Divine Glory in his conception, birth, and the whole time of his life, was the greatest degree of his Humiliation. And what can exclude his Incarnation, especially in such a manner, from being a part of his Humiliation, unless this following Objection? for it was, in a way of obedience, an obscuring of his Glory, and this to abasing purposes. This leads me therefore,

[3.] To consider the Objection that may here be offered, How could the Divine Nature be humbled? To which it is enough to answer, That it was the Eternal Word, or the Second Person that was humbled, as far as his Incarnation obscured his Glory, in the way above described. For, (1.) The Divine Nature essentially considered, could neither be humbled, nor exalted; nothing can add to, or take from it. (2.) Neither could the Divine Nature feel or resent Sufferings, in the same manner as the human nature; it was not capable of Passion. Yet, (3.) The Eternal Word was capable of laying aside his manifestative Glory, and of subjecting himself to do so, in obedience to the Father, and pursuant to his Covenant-undertaking, and to make himself capable
S E R M. capable of drinking the whole of the Cup, by being clothed with such flesh, and that in a manner so obscuring of his Glory. It's more strange, that this should be questioned by such, who ascribe to Christ acts properly mediatorial before his Incarnation.

3 R. C H R I S T for his very Incarnation, among other things, received authority as a Reward: For the Father hath given him authority to execute judgment, because he is the Son of man. If you say, He was not capable of such a gift but as the Son of man, even that argues a degree of Humiliation; that the Person to whom all was due by virtue of his Divine Essence, should assume another nature to be capable of this as a gift. But the words express his being the Son of man to have a causality, ἄνθρωπος κατὰ προσωπος. Authority is a reward for his Incarnation, among other things: And if this be rewarded, it must come within the compass of his Humiliation; for all Christ's meritorious acts come under the consideration of his being humbled, and the Acts of his exalted State are not properly meritorious.

I M I G H T add other Reasons; as, from the dependent state to which Christ became subject, by assuming our nature; and from the way how the Glory of Christ's Person added to the value of the Sufferings of the human nature, &c. But I think what is already offered is sufficient.
Yet if it be objected, That if Christ's Serm. Incarnation was a part of his Humiliation, then he is in a state of Humiliation in Heaven. I answer,

(1.) That Christ's continuing in the Nature he assumed when he hath exalted it, may not be a part of his Humiliation, and yet his assuming that nature was a part of his Humiliation. The act of assumption is one thing, and remaining united is another: The nature in a humble state, as it was when he was Incarnate, is one thing; and that nature in a perfected glorious state, as it is now in Heaven, is another. Christ doth not in Heaven assume our nature de novo; but remains united to that nature which he assumed in the womb: And the state of this nature is now glorious, whereas he took our flesh when it was inglorious. A Prince may humble himself in marrying an ignoble, deformed, fickly Beggar; and yet it will not follow, he humbleth himself still, because he lives with her as a Wife, especially if he hath ennobled, beautified, healed, and enriched her.

(2.) Saying, that Christ's human nature is exalted in Heaven, is an acknowledgment that Christ was humbled in taking our nature in the manner and condition he assumed it in. Would Christ's body be in an exalted State, if it were in the form it had in its first conception? Yet so it was, in the moment of his Incarnation. Were it exalted,
Christ's Incarnation

Serw. exalted, if still to be born? Yet so it was, when Christ assumed it. Would he be in an exalted state, if still an Infant or Child? Yet this was necessary from the manner of Christ's Incarnation. Would this nature be exalted, if still subject to weariness, pain, grief, hunger, shame, temptation, and death? Yet such was the frame and habit of it, when he assumed it. This vast difference in the state of Christ's body in Heaven, and when he became Incarnate, may convince us, that Christ humbled himself in assuming it; unless you will suppose, it was first a glorious body, that is, when he took it; and after he assumed it, it was deprived of that Glory and humbled, and then again exalted: But such conceits I pass by.

(3.) I might add, Though the exalted body of Christ be now a more fitted medium, whereby the Divine Glory is exerted and manifest, and also the glorious purposes, attained by the Hypostatical Union continued, do compensate it; nevertheless the human nature is in a sense at present some veil upon the glory of Christ, as the Eternal Word, notwithstanding the exaltation of the human nature. See 1 Cor. xv. 28. But these things are so beyond our comprehension, that an humble Reverence doth best set limits to our thoughts. But what hath been insisted on, without enlarging on this, may suffice to give us jufter thoughts.
thoughts of ourselves as men; at least so as not to surmise, it was no act of Humiliation in the Lord of Glory to become man, by being conceived and born; for him to be a Child, to assume flesh subject to weariness, pain, sorrow, faintness, temptation, death, \\
\&c. for the Creator of the world to assume into a personal union with himself, the lowest sort of intelligent Creatures; and for the Lord of Glory to become a Subject and Servant.

I shall conclude this Point, by giving you the Westminster Assembly's judgment in their lesser Catechism: "Q. 27. Wherein Assembly's Humiliation consisted? A. Christ's Humiliation consisted in his being born, and that in a low condition, made under the Law, \\
\&c." You see, that they thought Christ's being born was a part of his Humiliation; and not only the miseries that followed his being born, nor the low condition wherein he was born. And in their larger Catechism, Q. 46. "The estate of Christ's Humiliation was, that low condition, wherein he, for our sakes, emptying himself of his Glory, took upon him the form of a Servant, in his low conception, and birth, life, death, and after his death till his resurrection." And Q. 47. "Christ humbled himself in his conception, in that being from all eternity the Son of God, in the bosom of the Father, he was pleased, in the fulness of time, to become
**Serm.** "become the Son of Man, made of a woman of low estate, and to be born of her, with divers circumstances of more than ordinary abasement." You see, his very becoming the Son of Man, and his Conception whereby he was Incarnate, were parts of Christ's Humiliation. But further, it may be enquired,

3 Enq. Did Christ by his Death and Sufferings merit any thing, and that for us?

**Anf.** Christ by his Death and Sufferings merited, yea even saving blessings for us. And here, [1.] I shall premise somewhat that may tend to clear this. And then, [2.] I shall prove the thing I affirm.

[1.] Let this be premised, That on the one hand, Christ's death and sufferings may be conceived of, first as satisfactorily, and then meritorious; while on the other hand, Christ's active obedience is to be conceived, as first, fit to be meritorious, and then satisfactory. The reason of the former is this; Had not Christ's death and sufferings been for to make satisfaction, God had not admitted them, or delighted therein, as the merit of any benefit; nay, God would have looked at them with dislike, instead of accounting them a meet Price of blessings. The reason for the latter is; That had not Christ's
Sufferings meritorious.

Christ's active obedience been perfect, and so fit to merit, it could not satisfy, or be a recompence for man's disobedience, by vindicating the injured Glory of God's righteous government. Imperfect obedience had tempted creatures to offend, instead of atoning God for the offence. And now,

[2.] I shall prove, that Christ's death and sufferings did merit greatly, and that for us. Short hints will suffice to confirm a position so plain.

1. That for which Christ was rewarded, both as to himself, and as to us, did truly merit, and that for us: But Christ was rewarded, both as to himself and us, for his death and sufferings; &c. Now, that Christ was rewarded for his death and sufferings as to himself, is past question. For with respect to these the Apostle says, Wherefore God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name above every name. The Covenant of Redemption adjusteth this; Christ claimeth this oft as of Right, and the Father is oft said to perform it as of Justice. And then, that Christ was for his death and sufferings rewarded as to us, is as evident. All the saving benefits we receive are part of Christ's Reward, and are dispensed as such; For thus it is declared, He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied; by his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many; for he shall bear their iniquities: Therefore will I divide him
Christ's Death and Serm.

I. Him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong; because he hath poured out his soul unto death, &c. I shall presently instance the saving blessings, which we receive for the sufferings of Christ, as the procuring cause thereof.

2. That which is the Price of our Redemption, did merit for us: But Christ's death and sufferings were the Price of our Redemption; &c. For, as the Apostle says, Ye are bought with a price: And, Ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, but with the precious blood of Christ, &c. And of the Church of God, it is expressly said, that he hath purchased it with his own blood. You cannot doubt, but that by which we are redeemed and bought, did merit; the just God was a detainer of us as guilty offenders, until Christ by his death made reparation to his Glory.

3. That which is part of the righteousness of Christ for which we are justified, did merit for us: But Christ's death and sufferings are part (at least) of the righteousness of Christ for which we are justified; Rom. v.9. &c. For we are justified by his blood. It's by this blood, as the procuring cause; this was the Propitiation: Hence his blood is said to cleanse us. I hope you will not doubt, that that of Christ, for which we are justified, is at least a part of Christ's Righteousness.
4. If Christ's poverty merited riches for us, then his sufferings merited for us: But Christ's poverty merited riches for us; &c.

For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, 2 Cor. viii. that though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich. He was Owner of all things, but for a time he quitted as it were his claim, to acquire treasures for us, who had forfeited all: He had not a cottage of his own to lay his head in, that he might purchase mansions for us.

5. That, in virtue whereof Christ intercedes for, and gives out the saving blessings we receive, did merit for us: But it is in the virtue of his death and sufferings that Christ intercedes for, and gives out the saving blessings we receive; &c. He is entered, as we read, into the holy place, or into Heaven itself. There he presents the offering he had finished on Earth; that is, in the virtue thereof he claims and expects the blessings, promised thereto and merited thereby: The dispensing thereof is committed to him; and each of them is given to us, and received by us, in the express virtue of that offering. I shall enumerate some, and shew that each is assigned to Christ's death and sufferings. Pardon and Sanctification are expressly said to be derived from hence: For we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins;
Christ's Death and Sufferings

Serm. 44.

I. Sins; which blood was shed for the remission of sins: Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate. Reconciliation too is owing to the same cause: You hath he reconciled, in the body of his flesh through death, to present you holy, &c. Yea, eternal Life, the sum of all promised good, is granted on the same account: That by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first Testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance. And can you now suppose, that we have Remission, Sanctification, Peace, and an eternal Inheritance for Christ's death and sufferings; and that his Intercession for these and other blessings, is in the virtue of his blood; and yet his death merited not these?

6. I might add further, what the Apostle says, that by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified: Which must not only prove, that Christ's death and sufferings merited for us, but that all saving blessings are under their influence, as the meritorious cause thereof.

If after all it be objected, That Christ's Death and Sufferings were but the paying of a Debt, and therefore merited nothing. I answer,

(I.) Was not our Obedience a Debt? Yea it was so, more properly than our Sins or
Sufferings meritorious.
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or Punishment. Sins are metaphorically called Debts, but they are not things we owe to God, but are the neglect of that obedience which we owe to God, and to oblige us to punishment. Punishments too are called a Debt, not as what God owes to us as a Debt, or we to him, but as what we are obnoxious to for disobedience, if God is pleased to inflict them: But yet he is not so obliged to punish us, as to ex-empt him from a pardoning Right in the way his infinite perfections will adjust. If the Objection then will prove, that Christ's death merited nothing, because it was the payment of a Debt; then it will more fol- low, that Christ's active obedience mer-ited nothing, for that's as much at least the paying of a Debt, yea more properly. The confusion which this word Debt hath induced weak men into, especially as a pecuniary Debt, in the doctrine of Satisf- faction, I shall afterwards be necessitated to speak to.

(2.) Christ's death and sufferings were acts of Obedience in Christ, and so they me-rited. Our undergoing of punishment would have been no act of obedience in us, but an involuntary enduring of vengeance: It was not by a divine precept made our Duty, but by the sanction rendered due to us, There was a threatening whence it must be endured, but no commandment that made our being punished an obediential act in us.
Serm. Is it an act of our obedience, to die a spiritual death, or to be hated and abhorred by the Lord? Yea, is being eternally damned a Duty performed to God by the tormented? But whatever our Lord Jesus suffered, was obedientially and voluntarily endured: It was God's commandment to him, and was in him an act of the highest obedience to God; he pleased God therein:

Joh. x. 17. Therefore, says he, doth the Father love me, because I lay down my life; and the Apostle Phil. ii. 8. says expressly, He was obedient unto death. His willing subjection to God's authority and design herein, was that which gave life and energy to his sufferings. Truly Christ's dying was the highest act of obedience; and what we call his active obedience, yields no instance that equalleth this. It followeth then, that if Christ's obedience could merit, then his death and sufferings merited, because they were strictly acts of obedience: His very enduring them was obediential.

(3.) Though death was due to us as Sinners, yet death was not due to Christ, but as it was to be satisfactory and meritorious. It was thus proposed to him by the Father, and thus consented to by himself. He was to bear it as a punishment for the satisfaction of governing Justice, and to merit the Pardon of Sinners; his sufferings were a pardoning price. He had committed no crime, and therefore deserved no punishment,
Sufferings meritorious.

ment, nor needed any pardon. But he was willing to bear the punishment of our crimes, that thereby he might merit our forgiveness, in a way consistent with the perfections of God, and conducive to the glory of Divine Government. Hence it is said, The chastisement of our peace was upon him. It was upon him as a chastisement for our peace, as its designed end. 'Tis true it was for sin, or it had not been necessary, nor yet a punishment; but yet it was to purchase our salvation, or he had not submitted to it.

(4.) The immediate efficacy and operation of Christ's sufferings upon us are owing to this, that they are meritorious. Christ's death must be satisfactory to God, or he would not have accounted it meritorious of peace to us, nor granted us benefits on account thereof. Provoked Justice, and the injury done to Divine Government by sin, stood in the Sinner's way, yea stood in the way of all merit for good to us. There must be a propitiation for sin to God; and this being made to God, it's accepted as a ransom and price by him; and so it operates on the Sinner in a way of merit, consequential of that satisfaction. We are redeemed by Christ's blood, as a redeeming price; we are saved by it, as meritorious of Salvation: Though it was also offered as an atonement, and supposed to be so, ere
Ser. I. Life could be granted to men for the sake thereof.

(5.) It were a great reflection on the Father, and upon Christ, as well as destructive to Sinners, to suppose, that Christ by his death and sufferings merited nothing for us. God is strangely represented, if he will have his innocent Son die for Sinners, and yet his death not be allowed meritorious of the release of Sinners. We conceive not, of Christ according to his wisdom, that he would make his soul an offering for sin, and not thereby purchase the release of Sinners in his way. And as to the concern of Sinners, What avails it them, that Christ died to honour Justice, if their pardon, adoption, and glory, be not merited thereby? If we should conceive, that Christ died for us, and yet thereby merited not that we should not die, but live; it would infer, that Christ's satisfaction did no more than make it consistent with God's glory to save believers, but not certain that God would save those that believe. I say, believers, because Christ died to purchase salvation absolutely, for none but them that would believe; though he purchased faith for the Elect, (whereby their happiness is as sure, as if absolutely purchased,) and the serious offers of salvation on the terms of the Gospel for all men that hear the Gospel.

I hope,
Sufferings meritorious.

I hope, these considerations will induce Serm. you to conclude, that the death and sufferings of Christ are meritorious of saving blessings for us. Though I grant, Christ's active obedience was meritorious, yea, and in a very proper sense satisfactory too; yet if it were necessary, (which it is not,) that we must confine the merit of salvation to either his active or passive obedience, I should esteem it abundantly safer to confine it to his passive obedience; as Piscator, Wendelin, Gataker, Pitcairn, and many of our greatest Divines, have done.

I shall contract the Application of what you have heard, and leave the Improvement of such Inferences as these to your minds.

I. How great and awful an Evil is Sin! Besides the defilement which it brings, the debasement of our rational nature by it, and that obnoxiousness to punishment which attends it, we have seen, how contrary it is to the holy Nature of God, and what an injury to the glory of his Government. This is that provocation, which essential Justice required an atonement for, and the Wisdom of God saw necessary to punish in the most awful manner in his very Son. What an offence was that, which when his boundless Grace made him willing to forgive, yet his other Perfections would not admit to pass unpunished,
Christ's Obedience

Ser. nished, that the Government of God might receive no damage by man's impunity? The agony and death of our Redeemer as convincingly testify the Evil of Sin, as the howlings of the damned, yea in many respects far more: This is that, of which without shedding of blood there is no remission; yea, for which the blood of Christ alone was a fit propitiation: The blood of him alone that was God, could wash it out of God's books, and fetch its Stain out of our consciences. Whatever wonder is displayed in the method of Redemption, proclaims the odiousness and disorder of Sin. Let us then humbly bewail our past offences, wonder that we can make a mock of Sin, be in distress till our pardon be sealed to us, watch and be afraid of all Sin for the future, and be restless while this worst of Evils hath any room in our hearts, or any advantage to break out in our lives.

2. The governing Justice of God is strictly exact, and his authority sacred: God is infinite in Mercy, but not to the least detriment of Justice; he bare a good will to the Elect, but will not eclipse his throne in forgiving them. He will be just, even when he pardons. His Son must obey in our nature, if we neglect or fail to obey; his Son must die in our flesh, if we offend, and yet obtain remission. Angels irre- mediably perish for their rebellion, having no God in their nature to atone for them. If sinful Man escape, it's by a satisfaction made.
made by Christ in their nature, as their Serm. Sponsor: But more of this afterwards. I.

Let us reverence his laws, tremble at his threats, submit to all he prescribes, and serve him with reverence and godly fear; for our God is a consuming fire.

3. How amazing is the Love of the Father, in giving his Son for us; and as astonishing is the Love of Christ in giving himself for us! The Indignation of God against Sin, and the Love of God to Sinners, contend in this instance. God takes occasion to display his Love, while he vindicates the honour of his Justice: For God commendeth his love towards us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. He doth herein not only assure us of his Love, but gives to Angels and Men an instance of the Infiniteness of that Love of his. By this, beyond any other, he proclaims how much he can love. Can you question it, when you consider him so provoked by Sin, when you weigh the dignity and dearness of his Son to him, the humble state he was to enter into, and the astonishing miseries he was to endure in that state; and this for vile Worms, for careless and resolved Enemies! Well might the Apostle say, Herein is Love, not that we loved God, but that God loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins. Alas! all the creatures Love to God is not worth the name of Love, in com-
Serm. parison with his Love to us. How should I
this aggravate our unkindness, raise our admiring thoughts, heighten our esteem, unite our hearts to him, render him the object of our supreme delight, and render our obedience to his commands exact and pleasing, yea join'd with the greatest zeal for his glory and serviceableness to his interests! The Father's Love must not be overlook'd, which too many are guilty of, by representing him to their minds as only exacting satisfaction from Christ, not minding that he provided and gave Christ to make that satisfaction.

Our blessed Redeemer's Love is alike wonderful and unaccountable. He was not ignorant of what attended his undertaking, when he subscribed it; he knew all the abasement of his humble state; he understood all the bitter ingredients of the Cup, how deep every nail in the Cross was to pierce, what impressions Divine Wrath would make, and what an eclipse his own veiled Glory would occasion: But yet his Love was sufficient to take on him all this weight, and carry him thro' the utmost of his undertaking. His kindness was not quenched by floods of sorrow, nor his heart changed when he felt the most: With the bitter Cup in his hand, he embraced them, for whose sake he was to drink it; when Jesus knew that his hour was come, having loved his own, he loved them

Joh. xiii.1
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them to the end. What care took he of Serm. them? What allowance did he make for the weakness of their flesh? How kindly doth he assure them of eternal mansions, with that pathetick accent, If it were not Joh. xiv. 2: so, I would have told you? How earnestly did he pray for them? How soon doth Joh. xvii. he visit them, without upbraiding them with their sad desertion? &c. Yea, our blessed Jesus retains the same affectionate heart towards us in Heaven, after all he endured on Earth: He ever lives to make Heb. vii. intercession for us; as if that were the very 25 business and end of his living. How precious should Christ be to us? to us to live, Phil. i. 21! should be Christ; his dominion we should acknowledge, and obey his law, who so dearly bought his Government. Let us be Rom. xiv; entirely resigned to him, and with joy endure the utmost for his name; for we are redeemed by his blood. Let us be careful and studious to imitate him; as what expresseth our esteem of him, and most answers the great ends of his undertaking: Rom. viii. 29. Tit. ii. 14.

4. That forer punishment denounced in the Gospel against such as neglect salvation by Christ, is exceeding just. Of how Heb. x. 29: much forer punishment, suppose ye, shall be be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing? &c. It's equal, that
that they die in their Sins, notwithstanding the remedy, since they refuse it; and that the Wrath of God abide on them, who despise his reconciling Love. But that is not all, the Gospel proportions its Threatnings to the aggravated Sins of unbelief and impenitency: That we will not come to Christ for the Life he purchased by his death, is worse than our first forfeiture of Life. By this, we trample on Christ as odious, and esteem his Blood profane and vile. We spurn at the tenderest Bowels, and contemn the richest Grace. We approve of our Apostacy, and hug our chains. We downright tell God to his face, I chuse to be damned, rather than be saved by Christ. Can any think it strange of such, that their fall should be the lower, their flames the hotter, and the reflections of a tormenting conscience more penetrating? It is in flaming fire Christ will take vengeance on them that obey not the Gospel, who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power. The Blow intended for such, is too great for a created Instrument to give; and therefore it will be immediate, by the presence of the Lord; yea it will be so awful, as shall make the power of God's Arm glorious in inflicting it. The instance must undoubt-edly be marvellous, by which God intends to glorify any Attribute; and thus we may be sure, that sore indeed will be that misery, by
by which God will get eternal glory to Serm.

the strength of his Power, in making I.

wretches miserable. Oh! tremble at Gos-
pel-Vengeance, and credit Gospel-Threat-
nings; lest you be made to feel them, and thereby Christ become not only useless, but also terrible to you! What will your case be, when he shall avenge his despised blood, and execute that which is the con-

demnation! And know, Oh obstinate Sin-
nor, thy ruin is as sure, as it is dreadful. For, how shall we escape, if we neglect Heb. ii. 3:

great salvation? There is no possibility of escaping, thy own awakened mind be-
ing Judge. Hath God a dearer Son to give for thee? Will God be a Liar, and be perjured for thy sake? Can't thou hope for this? as thou must, since he hath so often declared, yea sworn, that the im-
penitent unbeliever shall never enter into his Rest. Undo not thysel by hopes, with-
out any Word of God for them, yea so ex-
pressly against his Word, of which so many thousands already feel the certainty. Thou must obey the Gospel for Salvation, or its forer vengeance thou shalt eternally undergo.

5. The Faith and Joy of a sincere Christian are well grounded, notwithstanding his many offences, and great for-
feitures. Our Sins are many and great; can God forgive them? I am exceeding unworthy; how shall God deal with me
56
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SERM. as his child, or admit my wearing a crown of glory? Can I expect this, or have any joyful hopes concerning it? Truly these are necessary Challenges, if the price of salvation be unknown. But consider, O Soul! that thy pardon and eternal glory are purchased by the Obedience of the Son of God in our nature, and secured to thee by the Covenant made and ratified in the virtue of Christ's blood. Thy Sins have not dishonoured God, above the Glory which redounds to him by the sufferings and merits of thy Redeemer. That was done and suffered by Christ, which in the balance of Justice more than compensates whatever is to be forgiven thee, or is promised to thee. No Perfection of God is aggrieved, by any thing the Gospel grants to the persons it designeth. Art thou a godly believer, tho' a weak one? Even thou mayest rejoice in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, having now received the atonement.

HAVING answered the first Question, What is the Obedience of Christ, by which we are made righteous? I am next to consider the second Question, What it is to be made righteous by Christ's Obedience? which will be the Subject of another Discourse.
SERMON II.
Of being made righteous by Christ's Obedience.

Rom. v. the last part of the 19th Verse.
—So by the Obedience of One shall many be made righteous.

II Qu. What is it to be made righteous by the Obedience of Christ?

Answ. There is hardly a word in Scripture of so various acceptations as the word Righteousness. But I shall confine myself to what the Spirit of God designeth principally in the Text. To be made righteous by Christ's obedience is;

First,
How righteous

Serm.  First, To be made free from condemnation, as if we had not sinn’d, and to be entitled to acceptance with God and eternal glory, as if we had kept the whole Law; and both for the sake of Christ's righteousness imputed to penitent believers for pardon and adoption. It is not, to be made men that never sinn’d, for that's impossible; nor to be esteemed men that have personally kept the whole Law, for that were false; both which the blessedness by pardon doth demonstrate; our forgiveness shews our disobedience. Or being thus made righteous is,

Secondly, By the Merits and Spirit of Christ to be made obedient to the Gospel, at least in those things which Christ hath graciously appointed to be the Conditions of our actual enjoyment of saving benefits, as the effects of Christ's sole righteousness.

In the first sense, we are made righteous in our justification, which is a forensic act, and infers a relative change of our State from guilty to pardoned, from non-accepted to accepted, and from being void of right to have a right to the eternal inheritance. In the sense of the second particular, we are made righteous, partly in our effectual vocation, and partly in our progressive sanctification and perseverance. This is by the efficiency of the Spirit of Christ, inclining and enabling us to the perfor-
by Christ's Obedience.

performance of the respective Gospel-conditions: He enableth us to believe for justification, to repent for Pardon, to persevere in faith and true holiness for the possession of eternal Glory. And both these are by the obedience of Christ. His satisfaction and merits have a causal influence on both, though these effects be produced in a different manner. We must not limit our being made righteous by Christ's obedience, below our being made sinners by Adam's disobedience; as far as Adam made us sinners, so far Christ makes us righteous, or the reddition is improper. We are as truly absolved by Christ's obedience, as we were made guilty by Adam's disobedience; and we are as truly regenerated by Christ's obedience, as we were depraved by Adam's disobedience. In the first sense, we are made free from the curse of the Law due to us as Sinners; in the latter, we are preserved from being impenitent ungodly infidels, to whom the Gospel doth not give a freedom from the curse, but leaves all such under the sentence of the Law, yea, and denounceth greater punishments against them. By the first we have a full righteousness to stand before God in, notwithstanding the exactness of the Law of innocency, and all our faults and defects. By the second we are rendered the objects or subjects of that full righteousness according to the Gospel-promise, which is the
How righteous

SERM. instrument whereby God bestows it. But II. hereof more fully in due place. I shall insist most on the first point.

FIRST, To be made righteous by Christ's obedience, is to be made free from condemnation, as if we had not sinned, and to be entitled to acceptance with God and eternal glory, as if we had kept the whole Law; and both for the sake of Christ's righteousness, imputed to penitent believers for pardon and adoption.

I shall endeavour in the shortest way I can, to comprehend the nature and the parts of this particular under the following Propositions.

I Prop. All men are unrighteous by nature: There is none righteous, no not one. We are all transgressors, and therefore each is liable to vengeance: For all the world is become guilty before God; and he might have arrested, and executed Judgment upon all of us. When innocency ceased, the sentence of the Law took place; and obnoxiousness to misery inevitably followed. This includes a forfeiture of Right to happiness by the Law of works: And to be sure, if it condemns us by its threats, it cannot reward us by its promise; disobedience putting us past a possibility of perfectly obeying, which was the condition of its reward. Therefore by the deeds of
by Christ's Obedience.

By this Law, Sin is not only known to be Sin, but Sin is known to bring damnation, and to bar us from happiness. Hence, though Christ's obedience was perfect according to the Law, yet it is not by the Law that God pronounceth the believer just, but by the Gospel. For righteousness comes not by the Law; and no man is justified by the Law.

Exh. Be affected then with that unrighteous state, wherein you all once have been, and the impenitent still remain. Is it a small thing, to have been Rebels against the holy Law of your maker? Can you make a light account of being under the curse, which comprehends the utmost misery? This, as a flaming Sword, keeps thee from the tree of life, and with irresistible power binds vengeance on thee, whilst thou art Christless. Divine wrath points to thee, as the obnoxious person; and in the mean time, thou hast no claim to God's favour, no title to God or any saving blessing. In this state the best of you once were: And what Grace was it that rescued you out of this extremity? Who can enough adore it? But what is the
How righteous

Serm. the stupidity of such among you, that can
quietly sleep in an unrighteous state; yea, and so long despise and refuse deliverance from it? Hell is your due every moment; and should you die in this condition, as you may without farther warning, neither the mercy of God, nor the merits of Christ, will prevent eternal torments.

II Prop. God is so righteous, and so jealous of the glory of his government, that his richest mercy admits the pardon of no offender, nor will grant any saving benefits to such as in the least fail in their obedience, but on the account of a Righteousness, at least exactly adequate to what strict governing Justice did enjoin and prescribe. It must be a righteousness of obedience, as perfect as the Law-precept required of men; it must be a righteousness of satisfaction, by bearing a punishment equivalent to what the Law-threatening denounced against sinners. And because this Law in its precepts and threats was a Law to men, and they were men that transgressed; therefore Justice required, that the obedience should be yielded, and the punishment suffered, by and in the human nature. Hence even the Son of God must take our flesh, if he would be a Redeemer. The satisfaction must yield as much glory to Justice, as the Sin forgiven did injure it: The merit must be proportioned, in the Scale of Justice,
to the benefit to be conferred, and that upon Serm. offenders; which render'd what was ap
pointed to Christ, to be above what the Law required of men. Of this I have spoken somewhat already, and shall have reason again to enlarge. *His righteousness* is Rom. iii. declared, and he appears just, when the *justifier* of him that believes in Jesus. *Sin must be condemned in the flesh of Christ, by Rom. viii.* his dying a sacrifice for it, *that the righte-
ousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit.*

Exh. Adore the Authority and Justice of God, notwithstanding his pardoning Mercy. The Atonement speaks it, neither is it debased by all the displays of his Grace. We are as subject to God, as if he had never spared us; and he is still as just, as if all mankind were to be damned. If you despise his Dominion, you shall find the edge of his Sword; if you reject the Atonement, the severity of his Justice will in-
stance itself upon you. See then, that you not the Lord to jealousy.

III Prop. No grace, nor act of the best Saint can be a satisfaction for the least fault, or a righteousness meritorious of the least benefit. All Saints have sinned; yea, sins and defects adhere to their best duties. Our exactest actions cannot atone for a past crime; because they are no more than what's
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Serm. what's at present due from us. Imperfect duties cannot merit; because they are not, in the estimate of governing Justice, proportioned to the lowest benefits: A reward of debt can be to none, below him that never sinned and perfectly obeyeth; though a reward of grace is promised to the upright. When we have done all we now can do, we are unprofitable servants; and by the Law of works, the iniquity of our holy things were enough to bring us under condemnation.

Exh. See your need of a greater righteousness than your own, and submit to the way of its application. Be not as they, who being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, submitted not themselves unto the righteousness of God. They, not knowing the righteousness, which God had contrived and appointed for the salvation of fallen man, proudly thought, they could by a tale of Works, made up with operose costly sacrifices, merit life at the hands of God; and with this conceit they despised a crucified Christ as needless, refused to believe in Christ for Justification by his merits, and went on in impenitency, as above the necessity of Pardon by his blood: Which impenitent persisting in rejecting of Christ, was their non-submission to the righteousness of God. Oh the danger of a heart too proud, and a will too stubborn, to stoop to
to Christ and his Gospel! Alas, our own Serw.
garments are too scant for a covering; and if we accept of a whole Christ, we shall be naked, notwithstanding the large-
ness of his robe. *His stripes will not heal* 1 Pet. ii. us, if we return not to this Shepherd and 24, 25.
Bishop of our souls. A righteousness to procure acceptance, or to merit Life, we cannot work out: But blessed be God, Christ is the end of the Law for righteousness to every Rom. x.4;
one that believeth; the end of the ceremonial Law, as what the types signified; the end of the Law of works, as being the scope and issue of it; for if it had been perfectly obeyed by Man, right to impunity, and its reward, was the utmost which that Law could confer on innocent man. And blessed be God, Christ hath by his obedience merited both these; and all that will truly believe, shall in Christ's right be entitled to both; though for any thing wrought by them, they could never attain either impunity or glory. If you peruse the following verses you will find, that God hath put us past all solicitousness concerning the sufficiency and certainty of a Christ, who hath a fulness of righteousness for the salvation of sinners: But the thing incumbent on us to be solicitous about, is, that we comply with the Gospel, that we may be saved by his righteousness. *If thou shalt confess with Rom. x.
your mouth the Lord Jesus, and believe with thine heart, thou shalt be saved; for with the*
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Serm. the heart man believeth unto righteousness.

II. and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation. Without these, neither his coming to die, nor his resurrection from death, will avail us to salvation. Oh then, accept of Christ, and yield up yourselves to him, and to a due and faithful confession of him as your Lord.

IV Prop. Christ, by the gracious dispensation of God as our Law-giver, was admitted, and in our nature did so fully answer the demands of governing Justice, as that, to its own very Glory, it admits the Grace of God to exert itself, in forgiving believing sinners, and in conferring on them saving benefits in the righteousness of Christ. It was not so small a matter, as most account it, to bring Justice and pardoning Mercy to consist; to honour the Government of God, and save believing sinners, who before were sentenced to die. But having spoken to some part of this Proposition in my former Discourse, I shall reduce it to these particulars, which I shall briefly hint at.

1. It was in our offending nature that Christ answered the demands of Justice, tho' it was not in our person. For God sent his Son in the likeness of sinful flesh. If without this, it had been possible to vindicate the Government of God in general; yet without assuming our nature, it would not have
by Christ's Obedience.

have been a vindication of the Government of God over men in particular; the sufferings had not been a satisfaction for human offences, as human.

2. **Nothing** was abated to Christ, that governing Justice exacted; the substantials of the Law were inserted into the rule of his active and passive obedience, and Justice adjusted his work to his wages. There's no common nor special benefit promised, or given, on the account of his obedience, to any, but the value of his obedience is proportionable thereto; though yet the benefits much exceed what Adam forfeited; and therefore his obedience must transcend what was enjoined man by the Law of works.

3. God's Government and Justice were not only vindicated by Christ's obedience, but greatly honoured. Oh the lustre cast on God's laws hereby! Never did the authority of God's precepts appear so royal, as when God in flesh so accurately obeyed them; even so far as to die for sinners. Never was the awfulness of God's penal sanctions so discovered, as in the tears, the sweat, the agony, and blood of his glorious and beloved Son. There's no such instance of the riches of God's premiant sanction, as in the rewards which our Saviour received. How exalted is his human nature above Angels! and how great are his rewards in his members! Yea, there's no blessing given to
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Serm. to lost man, but it’s on his account. What
an attesting Echo have you? when on his
saying, Father, glorify thy name! there
came a voice from heaven, saying, I have
both glorified it, and will glorify it again.
Christ spake his part but just before, when
he had inspected the united force of terrors
just besetting him: Now is my soul troubled;
Father, save me from this hour! but for
this cause came I unto this hour: As if he
had said, “As heavy as it presseth, as awe-
ful as it is, yet Father, glorify thy name!
“Abate nothing that will make for thy
“honour, however my flesh trembleth,
“and my soul is distressed: Be thou great,
“however low I must be brought: Spare
“not for my crying, and abate nothing
“that will tend to make thy Authority fa-
cred, and thy Justice exact.” The Fa-
ther answers, “I have pursued the interest
“of my Glory hitherto, in thy debasement,
“poverty, contempt, forrows, shame,
“temptations, and torments, which are
“now just a finishing; my Sword is giving
“its utmost blow; and then I will be glo-
“rious in exalting and rewarding thee: I’ll
“get my remunerative Justice as great a
“name in thy triumphs, as my punitive
“Justice hath acquired in thy debas-
“ments.” So Christ explains it after-
wards: Now shall the prince of this world
be cast out; and when I am lifted up, I will
draw all men to me.

4. Though
by Christ's Obedience.

4. Though all was fulfilled by Christ, when he was appointed to it, yet it was by a gracious dispensation of God, as Law-giver, that Christ was allowed to work this righteousness for the salvation of sinners. The Law-giver is above the Law: And tho' the Law knew no Sponsor, whose obedience should procure pardon, and save the guilty; _alius_ was _alius_ in its account; _noxa caput sequitur_, is its language; the punishment must fall on the sinner, it could appoint no other to bear it; and imputing to the sinner what another endureth, is above its dialect: Yet God, the Law-giver, had not signified his whole will by the Law of works. He had reserved a Prerogative, whereby he could secure the glory of his Government, and spare the Rebel; satisfy Justice, and not destroy the Sinner; and be as glorious in forgiving, as in punishing. To him the satisfaction was made, and by Heb. x. 7: him accepted. And hence the sinner is not free, as soon as the satisfaction was made; but it's _when_, and on what terms, the Law-giver and Sponsor would adjust; yea, and the release comes to the sinner as a _forgiving_ act.

Exb. Adore the Wisdom and Grace of God. Oh! what Grace, that would transfer the punishment! What Wisdom, that contrived a way to place it so, that God should be satisfied, and yet his Grace be free! The Sinner saved, and yet not tempt-
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S E R M. ed to rebel! The Sufferer repaid in Glory,

II. suited to what he did and endured! The 
Redeemed kept humble as pardoned; tho' the Pardon was granted on a valuable price! The Gift so bestowed, as to exert authority, and necessitate diligence; and yet nothing done on the Receiver's part to purchase the Gift, or to rob Grace of its Glory! It's comprehensively expressed by 

the Apostle, In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace; wherein he hath abounded towards us in all wisdom and prudence.

V Prop. T H E righteousness of Christ in all respects is perfect and compleat, yet Christ's righteousness is variously denominated from those different respects. However variously we conceive thereof, it's every way perfect; it's chargeable with no defect, nor subject to any challenge.

1. I T is perfect, if you consider it as a mere conformity to the preceptive part of the Moral Law, in which respect it is the same as holiness. He was holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners. He was habitually holy, above Adam; yea, above 

Joh. i. 14. Angels; none so full of grace and truth, as he: No mind so filled with light, in actu primo, even from the very beginning; no heart so inlaid with the divine image, and so inflamed with love, as his. He had the Spirit
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Spirit without measure: He had no taint of evil in his constitution; even in the womb, he was that holy thing; and when the Tempter assaulted him with the most skilful violence, he had nothing in him. He super-eminently obeyed to an iota, all that was required of him, or competent to his Person; and this, without any defect in the manner, and to the utmost extent of the precept. Thus compleatly holy was Christ; which holiness went into the matter of his righteousness, and is often called so: He gave God his utmost due, as a holy Law-giver.

2. It was a perfect righteousness, as the performed condition of the reward promised him in the Covenant of Redemption. Whatever was promised to Christ, either for himself or his members, was promised upon certain conditions; some of which were a due undergoing of the bitterest sufferings threatened in the Law of works, others were included in that of his active obedience. A penal Sanction in case of his failure, had no room in the Law of mediation, because of the impossibility of his non-performance; and therefore, a right to impunity is of as little concern: But Christ's active and passive obedience, became formally a compleat righteousness; as what he did and suffered, was an exact fulfilling of the condition of the reward in the Sanction. He took our nature, he made his soul an offering.
Serm. offering for sin, he honoured the Law, he glorified God, he did all the work which was given him to do, and drank the dregs of the Cup, which was appointed him to drink: In a word, he fulfilled all righteousness; even all that, for which he was to be exalted, or his seed made happy; nothing was omitted by him, or abated to him.

3. This righteousness of Christ, as the performed condition of the Reward, was a federal righteousness, above what was to be man's righteousness by the Law of works; which could not be, but that the conditions consented to by Christ in the Covenant of Redemption, were other, and greater, than what were required of Adam by the Covenant of works. I shall give you a few of many instances of conditions, appointed to Christ in the Covenant of Redemption, above what the Law of works required. The Law of works did not require the Person obeying or suffering, to be the eternal Son of God in our nature; but the Covenant of Redemption required this. Should I name no more, this would fully prove the point. But I add, The Law of works did not exact an Obedience above what innocent Adam was able to perform; but the Covenant of Redemption did this; and Christ so obeyed in our nature, (not needlessly,) as must fill the Angels with admiration to see themselves outdone. The Covenant
by Christ’s Obedience.

venant of works did not exact Punishment even to death, from the same person as still yielded perfect obedience; but the Covenant of Redemption did this. The Law of works did not require, or appoint a vicarious punishment or obedience from a Sponsor for others, but limited both to the persons originally subject to the Law; whereas the Covenant of Redemption appointed this. The Law of works did not command the Sufferings of any, as a reconciling Propitiation; but the Law of Mediation did this. My reason for that is, The Law of works did, by its threats, denounce vengeance against Sin; but this was not by a Precept, upon obedience whereunto the Sufferer could merit peace and reconciliation: Whereas the Law of Mediation appointed Christ’s death for a propitiatory offering, and in dying he yielded the highest act of obedience to a Precept; and this, to make Reconciliation. The Covenant of works did, as a condition of impunity and reward, enjoin obedience to no Law, but that which Adam was under, viz. the Law of works, and the Positive one, prohibiting the eating of the Tree of knowledge of good and evil: But the Covenant of Redemption required obedience to the Ceremonial Law, &c. The Law of works appointed no more obedience than governing Justice, as such, had suited to the rewards of that Covenant: But as the Covenant of Redemption had far higher re-
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Serm. wards, so it ordained suitable conditions.

II. The Law of works appointed no obedience after Sin, as a meritorious condition of obtaining forfeited benefits; but the Covenant of Redemption did this.

We may easily perceive, that the conditions prescribed to our Redeemer, much differ'd from those the Law of works required; and since Christ fulfilled all these, his federal righteousness exceeds that which the Law of works prescribed. If you ask, Why Christ's righteousness must thus exceed what the Law of works ordained? I answer, It is because it is a greater thing to redeem an offender, than to continue an innocent person's right to impunity: And it is more to purchase greater blessings for one that hath forfeited all good, than it is to continue lesser blessings tho' with some addition, to one that hath not forfeited: Yea, and reconciliation is more difficult, than maintaining peace before any enmity.

4. Christ's righteousness was perfect, as it was his adjudged just right to the rewards promised him, for performing the foresaid conditions. The dueness of the reward to Christ in a way of strict Justice, is his righteousness, or jus ad præmium. It was to him a reward of Justice, and not of Grace; because Justice proportioned the conditions to the reward, and the reward to the conditions: If it were not so, governing Justice never glorified or disco-
by Christ's Obedience.

To finish this point, consider, (1.) The reward to which Christ hath a right, includes all that was promised to Christ, or to others, on the account of his satisfaction and merits. It not only includes, that he should be exalted, and have a name above every name, with whatever glory or homage was to be rendered to him as a Saviour: But it comprehends all by the Father promised, and by himself bequeathed, to his members; as Justification, Adoption, the sanctifying Spirit, Perseverance, and eternal Glory to his regenerate Seed; as also Regeneration and Faith to all the Elect, that they may be raised to be a Seed to him, and be united with him. (2.) The Lord Jesus was solemnly adjudged to have performed all the conditions, and to have a legal Right to all this reward. His righteousness was adjudged to be perfect, and he (as 'tis foretold,) was justified. God by a Voice declared this; but it was still more manifest in his Resurrection, and yet more in his solemn enthroning in the heavens, where he is set at the right hand of God: Yea, he had authority given him to execute his own right.

Exh. Rejoice and glory in the Perfection of Christ's righteousness. You see, that in all respects it is compleat. The Law of Redemption prescribed such terms, as became God's essential Justice to propose:
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**SERM. pose: To these governing Justice annexed**

**II. a due reward, upon performing the condi-

tions:** And the perfectly holy Jesus had a

right to all the reward, and was solemnly

adjudged to have performed the conditions,

and to have that Right to the reward. So

that his Right is founded in a full perform-

ance of the conditions, which includes a

full conformity to the Law of works, yea,

and what far exceeds it. In this then we

may glory; there is no blot in his perform-

ance, there is no flaw in his right. Can

Sinners need any more, than this applied?

for it will serve to all the purposes it's de-

signed to. Oh Christian, honour it, by

laying the stress of thy hopes and comfort

on it, and clearing thy interest in it above

all good: It answers guilt, and weakness;

yea, and thy want of all things, except that,

without which it cannot be applied to thee,

nor its effects attained, viz. a penitential

Faith. When thy Body roteth in the grave

because of Sin, thy Spirit will be safe and

eternally live, on the account of this righ-

teousness: Thou mayest cheerfully venture

thy Soul upon it.

VI **Prop.** The Lord Jesus is, and al-

ways will be, possessed of this righteousness in his own Person. In the Lord have

lighteousness and strength: And with re-

spect to this it is said, our Redemption is in

Christ, by which we are justified. The

meriting
meriting acts are over, as acts, but the Merit never ceaseth. His sufferings are past, but the Righteousness acquired thereby remains. Nor is it only their virtue simply that continues, but the righteousness or right founded thereon abideth. He hath a right to Faith for all the Elect who are yet uncalled; he hath a title to Pardon for all true believers; he hath a right to eternal Glory for all persevering Saints. There is our Right best secured. It is for the righteousness that is in Christ, that we are acquitted and adopted; and on it, as in him, we must still depend.

Exh. Sinners and Saints, look to Christ as having in him a full righteousness. Let this commend him to your acceptance and trust. Sinners, you need him on this very account, to answer for your unrighteousness: All his offers and calls should have power with you from this very motive, he hath a perfect Righteousness: It were else in vain, to believe in him; it were to no purpose, to repent and turn to him: Were not he by this righteousness mighty to save thee, an answer to his call might not be expected. But know with assurance, that he is a Fountain deep enough for thy uncleanness. The Sun of righteousness hath healing in his wings, and peace and glory in his power. You may trust the promises, by which the Gospel allureth you to Christ; for, as amazing as the Good is which they con-
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Serm. contain, they are by his righteousness, in him, Yea, and in him, Amen. But take care of separating his person from his righteousness: You must accept of him, as a whole Christ, if you hope for good by his righteousness; and your Faith must be directed to him in a firm dependance, and entire subjection, or he'll be to you as unuseful, as if he had not this fulness of righteousness.

VII Prop. All Graces and saving benefits are dispensed to men in the righteousness of Christ. By his Satisfaction, he rendered it consistent with the perfections of God, to visit blind Souls with his light, and to surprize the dead with spiritual life. On Christ's account, the Spirit descends, to strive with the rebellious, and awake the sleepy: His regenerating influences are the effects of Christ's merits, he acts as the Spirit of Christ. I do not mean, that Christ's righteousness is imputed to men in order to the working of Faith in them, as it is in order to Pardon; you may as well say, it's imputed to men in order to the preaching of the Gospel to them, for that's an effect of Christ's righteousness: But these are the result of a divine constitution, wherein Christ is acknowledged, but no right in men supposed. The first Grace is absolute, and an arbitrary act, as to any claim the sinner hath. Tho' Christ hath a right
right to the Elect's being brought to believe, yet he transfers not his right to the Elect, who till they believe are not united to him, and so are aliens to his righteousness. But God hath an eye to the Merits of Jesus, in all his grants and gifts from first to last, from the least to the greatest. When he forgives Sin, it is a rendering to us what Eph. iv: is purchased by Christ's blood; it is a giving forth of what he hath bought: We are made Kings and Priests, as a proper reward to Christ, and as a testimony to his righteousness.

Exh. Say of every saving benefit, and of all graces, this I receive, because the Lord Jesus hath a full righteousness. The Heavens had been Brass as to vital influences, but for this; the Word had been a dead condemning Letter, but for this: My Sins had been eternally sealed up among his treasures, Pledges of his Love to my Soul I had never found, my Prayers would have been excluded audience, christian Hopes and Comforts I had not intermeddled with; but that Christ is righteous, yea, perfectly so. But because his righteousness is great, I have found Healings when wounded, Strength when weak, my Prayers have had frequent audience; God hath not refused me communion with himself, mine iniquities are removed as a cloud, I joy in God's favour, I glory in his fulness, and have lively hopes to be ever with him.
Serm. And should not that be owned by us in all, which is the Consideration upon which all is given?

VIII Prop. The righteousness of Christ is differently applied, and operative, as the Gospel distinguisheth the promised benefits with respect to the various conditions of such, who are the persons described in the promises. For explication of this, note,

1. The Gospel-promises distinguish the benefits that come by Christ, and describe the objects of each. The Promises are various; and those are all Gospel-promises that are made to fallen man for Christ's sake. To be a Promise to fallen man, and not Gospel; to be for Christ's sake, and not a Gospel-promise, are in the nature of the thing, impossible. The variety of the Promises is obvious, and the Persons to whom they are made are not alike described. Some are made to one grace, some to another grace; some on one condition, some on another. Justification is promised to believers; Pardon to the penitent; Returns of Prayer to him that prays fervently, and in faith; Glory to the persevering; abundant Glory, or reaping liberally, to him that sows liberally, that is, who is abundant in fruitfulness; he that hungers after righteousness, shall be filled; and the like. Each of the Promises are made in Christ's right; they
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are but an Inventory of Christ's claim; nay, Serm. they were made with respect to his Merits.

If God could make a Promise of saving benefits to Sinners without an eye to Christ's Satisfaction, as the consideration of making that Promise; I doubt, it will go too far to prove, that he may perform that Promise without an eye to his Satisfaction. The same Objection will not lie against a mere Decree or Purpose, to give such benefits in and by Christ; for this Purpose gives no man a right to the benefit, but the Promise doth give a right: And to suppose a Sinner's right without respect to Christ's righteousness, seems to weaken the necessity of Isa. xiii. 6. his Satisfaction and Merits, who is given to be a Covenant; that is, for his sake the Covenant is made, and by him it is confirmed and executed. But however various the Promises are, they grant in his right; they are Christ's legacies, they are bequeathed by his Testament; and therefore argue, that the respective blessings contained therein, are his proper goods, given out by the Promises as his donative instrument, and upon terms which the Father and he thought fittest to prescribe, as rendering the state of the receivers such, as they judged most subservient to infinitely wise and holy purposes.

2. It is Christ's righteousness, that exerts itself, and operates, in conferring the benefits included in these various Promises.
Serm. This empties itself in all those channels, and influenceth by each of those means.

The blessing conferred is a display of his Merits, as the procuring cause, whatever power the thing is effected by, or way it is effected in. Christ's righteousness is applied in pardon, in adoption, in the perseverance of penitent believers. This is applied in the answer of every Prayer; this is as truly in all additional degrees of grace in some Saints, as in any measure in every Saint; yea, in the augmented degrees of glory, as in a state of glory. Hence it is past doubt, that unless we say, some spiritual and heavenly benefits are given, not by or for Christ's righteousness; or that his righteousness may be equally applied, and yet not produce equal effects; then we must conclude, the righteousness of Christ is not in the same degree applied unto all, to whom it yet may be applied to saving purposes. It is applied to no true believer, but that it secures to him a deliverance from hell, an acceptance of his person and duties, perseverance in faith, and the kingdom of heaven at last: But are all as greatly beloved as Daniel, as mighty with God as Moses, or Jacob? Had he that was Ruler of five cities, as great Glory, as he that was made Ruler of ten cities? And surely the very preeminence in these respects, is owing to the righteousness of Christ applied. Rev. i. 5, 6.
Exh. Be careful and industrious to be the described objects of the several benefits you desire, according as the Promises describe the persons, and to whom they are made; yet expect each benefit by Christ's Righteousness, when you are the described objects of those benefits according to the Gospel-ordination. In vain do you expect the benefit promised, if you are not the persons to whom the Promise grants it; for the Promise doth as truly exclude the wrong person from its blessing, as it assures it to the right person. But by what doth the Promise describe you to be the person it speaks of? It is not by your name, but by your character; even your being such a one, as Christ declares by the Promise, he will give the benefit to. Would you be filled? be then one that hungers after righteousness. Would you be pardoned for Christ's sake? see that you be penitent believers; for it is to such only Christ's righteousness is promised to be applied for pardon. Would you reap plentifully? then sow plentifully; for if you be of them that sow sparingly, God doth not say it to you, that you shall reap plentifully. The like I may say of every other Promise that is conditional; for therein God moves us to duty by benefits; he induces us to what we are more backward to, by what we more esteem and desire. Election knows our names, the Promises appoint our qualifications:

And
Serm. And do not think thou canst plead Christ’s righteousness to obtain the good promised, if thou art not such a one as the Promise describes; for in making these Promises, Christ hath fixed the way how the effects of his righteousness shall be dispensed; and by these he requires us to guide our expectations, or they do not answer the end of his publication of them.

But when thou art, by the Grace and Spirit of Christ, the characterized man to whom the Promise belongs, expect the blessing as the effect of Christ’s righteousness, and not of thine own. The Promise had not been made to thee, but for that: It is in his right the blessing is conferred, wherever any partake thereof; which adds sweetness as well as certainty thereto. The Spirit frames the Vessel, but Christ affords the Oil. By the operation of the Holy Ghost thou art rendered the designed object of the Promise; but look to Christ, as the Procurer of the good which the Promise is to convey: But more of this hereafter.

IX Prop. In and by the Righteousness of Christ; they that sincerely believe, are, upon God’s pardoning of them, as free from condemnation, as if they had never sinned; and are as fully accepted and entitled to eternal Glory, as if they had kept the whole Law. For there is no Condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, who walk not
not after the flesh, but after the spirit. These are in that state, wherein the Curse is restrained from arresting them: Yea, they are heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ.

The Gospel-Covenant is their Charter of right, which is secured by the death of Christ, the oath of God, and sacramental Seals. The death of Christ is to be considered, not only as what purchased the Covenant-blessings, (of which I have spoken before,) but also as what ratifies the Covenant to our faith: By death it is irrevocable as a Testament; and it must needs be sure, or the Lord of Glory had never died to secure the ends of it. His death is too great a thing, to admit a doubt of the certainty of that Charter, by which the effects of that death are granted. And Christians therefore being thus free, and thus accepted and entitled, it proclaims them righteous.

Exh. Be comforted notwithstanding your faults and weaknesses, whilst your Hearts are upright in God's Covenant. What is not a just challenge to the Sincerity of thy faith, ought not to make thee conclude thyself accursed, or quit thy hopes of glory: Failings may cause mournings that we are so imperfect, when they ought not to perplex us as if we were in a lost condition. The same mouth that delivered the curse against Sinners in the Law, hath published forgiveness, and applied redemption.
II. If your faults be objected, Christ hath answered them: If the weakness of graces be objected, Christ hath made up that: If the greatness of Gospel-benefits be objected, it is Christ hath purchased them; and they are bestowed, not for thy graces, but for Christ's obedience, though it be to such as even thou art, if a sincere penitent, that they are given: For the Gospel-rule doth only appoint the persons who receive the benefits, but not ordain us to make the satisfaction for the Sin to be pardoned, or to purchase the Glory to be received. Wilt thou not let Christ appoint his own Legatees to his own bequeathments? and rejoice in the gifts, whilst thou art the person to whom he declares they belong? If he had promised heaven to a mere Sinner as such, thou oughtest as a Sinner to expect it with joy: But he hath promised it to all believing Saints, however imperfect; and must not thou with comfort look for it, and not quit thy hopes, till thou cease to be a believing Saint? Yea, he hath ministrèd further to thy joy, That he will influence thy Soul by his warnings against apostacy, by sacraments, and by constant supplies; so that thou shalt persevere.

X Prop. Christians become thus righteous upon believing, by the righteousness of Christ imputed to them in their Justification;
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Imputation; and by the continuance of this **Sermon**. Imputation they remain righteous. Upon our first believing, we are justified; and there is a constant **Imputation** of Christ's righteousness to believers for their continued Justification. Did men cease to be believers, God would cease to impute the righteousness of Christ to them. Did God cease to impute Christ's righteousness, men would cease to be justified; and did we cease to be justified, we should be subject to condemnation. But blessed be God, he will cause the true believer to persevere in faith, and so he shall remain in a justified state. God will preserve the habit of Faith; he will enable him to frequent acts of faith, and still prevent damning Infidelity: He will keep thee from a prevailing distrust and rejection of Christ as a Saviour, and keep thee from reigning disobedience to him as thy Lord.

I shall explain this great truth of **Justification by the imputed righteousness of Christ**, which may be conceived of according to the following heads.

1. **There is a making us righteous**, as it is giving a believer a right to pardon, absolution from the curse, adoption and acceptance, which is by imputing the righteousness of Christ to the believer. We must be made righteous, before a just God can pronounce us so, or deal with us as such; there must be a right to Pardon, ere God will
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Serm.  will pardon: This right to Pardon is given, by God's imputing to us the righteousness of Christ; and the effect of that imputing act seems to be the first consideration in the Change made in our state as justified.

For the better apprehending of this, you may remember I have before informed you, that Christ's righteousness may be considered; (1.) As the full performance of the conditions of the Covenant of Redemption, which included a full conformity to the Law of works; yea, and more. And, (2.) As an adjudged right to the promised reward, for his performance of those conditions. Now both these are imputed to the believer in this first consideration, of giving a believer a right to Pardon, &c.

(1.) The righteousness of Christ, as it was the performance of the conditions of our Salvation, is mediately imputed to the believer. God adjudgeth, that what Christ did and suffered for the actual remission of Sinners, was really done and suffered for us; it really belongs to us, and we are the designed objects of that actual remission, to procure which for us that obedience was rendered. God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have everlasting Life. Here we see, that God gave his Son to do and suffer what he did, that believers thereby might not perish, but eternally
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eternally live. Now being by grace believers, that we may have a right not to perish, but live, we have what the Son so given did and suffered, reckoned and accounted to us: God looks on what Christ did, as done for us; and esteems us believers, to be them whom his Son did that for: And therefore by his gracious ordination, we are the very Persons that have a right to the Pardon of those Sins, for which we were liable to perish, and excluded from life. I say, Christ's very performance of the conditions is imputed mediatly, in this manner: If one give me my Liberty, which he voluntarily purchased for me at a dear rate, he mediatly gives me what he paid for my ransom, though immediately I receive my liberty, and a right thereto; whereas the redeeming Price was paid to my detainer, in whose hands I was captive. So it was to God that Christ made Satisfaction, and yielded the meriting Price: yet it is applied and reckoned so to the believer, that he receives the same blessings thereby, as if he himself had rendered it; because it was for his Title to those benefits that it was rendered by Christ. Yea, by this Imputation it becomes his Security for all saving benefits, and is as pleadable with God by him, with respect to what is purchased for believers thereby, as if he had endured and performed the things Christ did: Since God adjudgeth, he is the person, in whose stead Christ died
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Serm. died and obeyed, that even he might be entitled to life, and might not die; Christ having died for us, that we should live by him. We have hereby the benefits of his Death, and have his Death to secure those benefits, yea, and as the foundation of our right to those benefits. Hence we are said Eph.v.11. to have redemption and forgiveness through his Blood; by whom we have now received the atonement; [καθαρισμόν, the reconciliation:] And herein the Blood which did reconcile, is applied, it being shed and accepted to be a propitiation through faith therein. The virtue of this Blood still remains, though the act of shedding is long since past; and that very act of shedding is still so referred to, in the communication of the benefits to such for whom it was shed, that it is still called a Blood of sprinkling; not as now sprinkled on us as material Blood, but as it speaks those better things, for us in Christ's intercession, and to us in the promises, and as we come to it, by believing therein as our Security in all we receive; it being shed for us, that we might have a right to Pardon thereby, as the procuring cause. It was given to God as a Satisfaction; 'tis given to us as Christ's Blood triumphing in our peace. Though God doth not adjudge, that believers made Satisfaction by it as their Blood, yet he accounteth it that, which is actually satisfactory for them, being designed and accepted to be so; and therefore they are therein.
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therein adjudged to be entitled to Pardon. Serm. II.

In the same manner I might speak of Adoption, &c. but one instance sufficeth. By this you see, that Christ's righteousness, as it is his active and passive obedience, the performance of the legal conditions of life and pardon, is applied in the manner it is truly capable of being applied: Here the virtue and merit of it is displayed and operative; the designed end of it is obtained; God expressly acknowledgeth and rewardeth it, in what he bestows; it's owned and relied on by the believer, as the price of peace, and merit of all good; it's made the Soul's security and plea, as to all its hopes and enjoyments. Rom. v. 18. And then,

(2.) The righteousness of Christ, as it is his adjudged right to his Seed's pardon, absolution from the Law-curfe, acceptance and adoption, is immediately imputed to believers, as his regenerate seed, and members of his mystical body. This right is esteemed, yea, made theirs; they have not merely the benefits given them, but they are invested in Christ's right to those benefits. Christ's righteousness is Jus adjudicatum ad præmium; he acquired a right to the reward, and it was adjudged that he had that right; upon his perfect obedience he was justified. Now part of the Reward was, That all the Elect should become his actual seed, and be made believers: And also, That all his
his actual seed, even believers, should be forgiven, absolved, adopted, &c. Christ therefore hath as great a right to this, as to be exalted; yea, it's part of his Glory. This right he carried into Heaven with him; this right he pleads in his Intercession, not as what is to be tried and argued anew, but as what is already adjudged; yet it's still to be executed, and the blessings he hath that right to, are to be dispensed. Believers therefore are not only pardoned, yea, they not only have a right to Pardon, by the promise of pardon to believers, but they have Christ's right to that Pardon, even his adjudged right that believers shall be pardoned. This righteousness is communicable more immediately, than the very acts are whereby that right was acquired; it's transferred to them, but without an alienation from Christ. This is included in that Gift of righteousness, and is that δικαιοκρίτης θεου, of which the Apostle speaks. In short, his Obedience must be supposed to lose its efficacy, and his Title be reversed, if his living members fail of Pardon; one article in his Covenant, as his reward, being this, that by his knowledge shall my righteous Servant justify many, for he shall bear their Iniquities.

It may be you will better apprehend the whole by this familiar Instance. A person purchaseth a Thousand Pounds a year for a valuable Price, and hath by Covenants
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venants a legal sure title thereto; he that purchased gives me by a deed of gift, Twenty Shillings a year of that estate, to hold in dependance on him and his title; mediately he gives me the purchase money of this gift; immediately he gives me this part of the estate, and his title for my security, without which I should possess precariously. It's a title by purchase, as to him that gave it me; it comes to me by gift, for I paid him nothing for it: Nor can I be said to pay the Seller, though I have by gift the title for my security, which he that gave it me acquired by his payment; yet still in dependance on him, who paid all, who hath the main of the estate, and is possessed of the original Covenants as in himself. This answers our case; excepting that God is as truly said to give us all, as Christ himself can be said to give us all; God having given his own Son to redeem us, and purchase all for us. I need not apply this Parallel more than to tell you, that as Christ acquired our Pardon and Acceptance, so we have his very right thereto to secure us. The whole is exemplified in that of the Apostle, Christ was made Sin for us, who knew no Sin, that we might be made the Righteousness of God in him. Christ was made Sin, not esteemed the committer of the fact, or as fill by it; but he stood liable and obliged to the punishment of it, and became the sacrifice for
for it, which is often in Scripture called Sin. This obligation to bear the punishment is reatus pænae; or if you call it reatus culpi quaternion, it's much the same, though not so safe: Yet in this Christ is not charged, as if he committed the Sin. So we are made the Righteousness of God in him, that is, We have given us that right of Christ to what was promised him for believers; and which was contrived and appointed by God to be the way of our salvation: The debitum pænae for our Sins became his, the debitum præmii for his Obedience becomes ours. But we no more paid the purchase of that right or title, than Christ did commit the Sins, the punishment whereof he obliged himself to undergo: He was made Sin, that is, obliged to die a sacrifice for Sin; to which answers, that we are made righteous in him, that is, invested in his Right, for obtaining the blessings promised to him for us in the Covenant of Redemption, and promised to us for his sake in the Gospel-Covenant, when we believe.

Herein I have stated the first thing included in Justification, and upon this the rest depend. Hereby we are made righteous in Christ's righteousness: Though we be not personally innocent, yet Christ's righteousness, which fully answered the Law, is judicially applied, so as to give us a sure right to be dealt with as to eternity, as if we had been
been innocent and perfect; which is what we principally need, and as much as we are capable of, considering we are Sinners, and that we did not provide the ransom, nor substitute him that became so. And now,

2. God hereupon actually forgives, adopts, and gives the earnest of glory to believers, thus invested in the righteousness of Christ, and on the account of that righteousness. This is executive justification in part; and indeed all benefits peculiar to the members of Christ, are conferred in a way of execution hereof; unless as we may consider such Benefits, as follow Pardon and Adoption, to refer to Justification, as including an additional Right resulting from God's pardoning and adopting acts. The reason why I add this, is, that Pardon gives a right to impunity, and Adoption gives a right to the privileges of children; and so with respect to Forgiveness and Adoption, a believer may be called righteous, and frequently in Scripture is called so, though inclusively of Christ's righteousness, because it is for that we are so forgiven and adopted. Forgiveness is of so great importance in Justification, that upon the account hereof we are said to be blessed: Yea, it's put frequently for the whole of Justification; (Rom. iv. 6, 7, 8.) so it is used in the Lord's Prayer; (Luk. xi. 4.) yea, so it is put in our Creed.
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Serm. 3. God judicially sentences believers, thus

II. made partakers of Christ's righteousness, and thereupon pardoned and adopted, to be them who have a right to impunity, favour, and glory; and accepts them as such, notwithstanding all challenges and accusations. Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's Elect? It is God that justifieth: Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us. This doth not only obviate the accusation of Persecutors, against such as are chosen to suffer; but it answers all Challenges against every believer, gathered out of the world by the Spirit, pursuant to God's eternal Election: For against the unconverted Elect, God himself hath much to charge; and he lays it to their charge by his Law-condemning Sentence. But as to the converted, here's a general defiance, and a large enumeration of what tends to their defence. God justifies them, and this for the sake of Christ's Death; and that, the Death of him who is risen, and being risen is enthroned, and being enthroned intends their Security by his Intercession. It's true, if they be charged to have been sinners, they must own it as a true Charge: But what then, must they die for their Sin? No; God declares they are pardoned, and this upon a Righteousness more than adequate to
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to the Law of works; and they have no lower a safety from their guilt, than Christ's Title, who died, that believing Sinners might not die, but live. Indeed, if the Charge be, That these are not believers, then God acquits them another way, of which hereafter. This is sentential justification, which is virtual now, and will be solemnized at the great Day. Further,

4. It is the Gospel, whereby God justifies us as his Instrument; God in his Word having declared, that he is the justifier of him that believes, and that we are justified by faith, and commanding us to believe, with a Promise, that we shall be justified if we believe. He doth, by this very Declaration of his Will, justify the believer. This Promise effects what it includes, as soon as the Object is answerable to the tenor of the promise. By this he imputes Christ's righteousness to the Convert, and so makes him righteous; declares him righteous, and treats him as righteous, in, for, and by Christ's righteousness; and this, as soon as he believes. There needs no more to express it now, than this Word of his Mouth; unless, as we may add, the Sacramental Seals, and also such influences and acts of Power, whereby such benefits are conferred, as are executive of the justifying Sentence; and so far are a Divine Declaration of our State as justified. And thus,

5. The Object of God's justifying Act,
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Serm. is the living, humbled, converted believers, who by Faith cometh to, accepteth of, and trusteth in Christ as an entire Saviour. The Promise of this mercy is given to them that believe; yea, is confined to such; and unbelievers are declared to have God’s wrath abiding on them: Nor can it be otherwise, when this Gospel is that Word of the Lord whereby we are justified. ’Tis necessary then, that we believe; but it is not Faith, unless it be a coming to, accepting of, and trusting in a Christ; nor is it a Christ, if he be not a whole Saviour. But when will we believe, if we be not convinced and humbled? Or how can we believe, if we be not quickned by the Spirit? Yea, what sort of Faith is it, if we are not purposed in our heart to turn from all Sins, Self, and Idols to Christ, and to God by him? Which turning is the word, by which the Spirit oft expresseth Faith itself. Ezek. xviii. 21, 30. Acts xxvi. 18. 1 Pet. ii. 25.

By what has been said, you may answer the main Enquiries, that occur to your mind concerning Justification: Qu. Who justifies us? Anf. God as our Ruler. Qu. What doth God do for us, or on us, when he justifies? Anf. (1.) He imputes Christ’s righteousness to us, whereby we have his Right to our pardon, absolution, &c. (2.) He actually forgives, absolves, and adopts us in Christ’s Right, and for the sake of his obedience. And by this forgiveness, absolution
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Imputed Righteousness, he further gives us a Right to impunity, the in-dwelling Spirit, perseverance, and eternal glory. And, (3.) He pronounces us free from all accusation and challenges, that would import a present liableness to eternal Death, or a bar to eternal Glory; we having Christ's righteousness, and thereby our pardon, our abolution from the curse, and our adoption, for our Plea and Defence. Qu. What is our State by being thus justified? Anf. We are accepted with God, free from eternal Condemnation, and entitled to Life, as if we had not sinned, but kept the whole Law to this time: Yea, we have some greater benefits than we forfeited, as union with Christ, the in-dwelling Spirit, and perseverance, whereby we are secured from forfeiting eternal Life for the future. Qu. By what Instrument, or sign of his Will, doth God justify us? Anf. By the Gospel-promise. Qu. Whom doth God justify? Anf. The true Believer, (whether he know himself to be so, or no,) and no others: Yea, God in justifying a man, doth as far declare him to be a believer, as he declares him to be justified. Qu. When doth God justify a Sinner? Anf. As soon as he is a Believer, and not before; such being the Object on whom the justifying act doth terminate, according to the Promise.

1 Exh. See that your Faith be true, and then may you rejoice in a justified State.
Serm. State. A false Faith will leave you condemned, as certainly as if you had no Faith: And a false Faith too many have been satisfied with. Simon believed, but yet had neither part nor lot in this matter; because his Heart was not right with God, and he was in the gall of bitterness, and in the bond of iniquity. Be then solicitous, that your Faith be right; see that it be unfeigned and true; true for its principle, even from regeneration; true for its nature, a fiducial consent, or such a trust in Christ, and in God by him, as to receive a whole Christ; true for its concomitants, that no saving Grace be wanting; true for its operativeness and effects, that it works by Love, purifies the heart, and makes you persevere in sincere obedience, and holy fruits. All this is necessary to the Faith the Gospel calls saving; since God will judge your Faith, and you, by it.

2 Exh. Be not satisfied merely with believing, or talking, that there is a full righteousness in Christ; but submit to God's way of imputing it; else you will be no better nor safer by it. Thousands are damned as unrighteous, tho' Christ hath a full righteousness. It is not from a defect in Christ's righteousness; no, nor because God fails to impute it to such, whom he hath promised it to: Whence then? It is because they do not savingly believe, and turn to Christ. The Gospel is God's Will,
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Will, as to the way of the application of Christ's righteousness; and if that be not obeyed, we are lost. (2 Thess. i. 8. Gal. iii. 1. Heb. v. 9.) Unbelief, is disobedience to the Gospel, and will destroy: ἀπεθετεῖ, which is disobedience, is oft render'd unbelief; (Rom. xi. 30, 32. Heb. iv. 11.) and ἀπεθετικος, unbelieving; (Acts xiv. 2. and xvii. 5.) and ἀπεθεθε, not to believe. Heb. iii. 18. The work of the Ministry is to call and persuade sinners to comply with the Gospel; with an assurance, that such as refuse not, shall be justified by Christ; and they who persist to refuse, shall perish, notwithstanding the grace of God, and the righteousness of Christ. Mat. xxiii. 37. Acts xiii. 38, 46.

Having thus insisted on this Proposition, I am led thereby to this Question:

Quest. Are Believers as righteous as Christ in equality? Or, Are they equally righteous as Christ?

Answer. Believers are not equally righteous as Christ. Sincere Christians are in some respect as truly righteous as Christ; but yet that is not to be equally righteous as Christ. Hence many chuse to say, we are as righteous as Christ æquè, but not æqualiter. Yea, though one assert an Identity in the righteousness, yet that will not argue an Equality. It's one thing, to have the same righteousness; it's another thing,
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Serm. to have it in the same measure. The Light II. in the air is the same as in the Sun; but yet it is in a greater degree in the Sun than in the air. But you will say,

Obj. We are equally righteous as Christ, with respect to his Suretiship righteousness.

Anfw. I shall, First, Give you my thoughts concerning Christ's Suretiship. And then, Secondly, Prove that we cannot on this account, nor any other, be truly said to be as righteous as Christ in equality.

As to the First Point, Concerning Christ's Suretiship; I would premife, That this term Suretiship righteousness, is no Scripture expression, no more, nor so much as the word Condition. I say, not so much; for if you consider Luke xiv. 26, 27, 32, 33. you'll find Condition used exactly in the sense objected against by some: Ver. 32, 33. Or else, while the other is yet a great way off, he sendeth an embassage, and desireth conditions of peace: So likewise, whosoever be of you, that forsaketh not all that be hath, he cannot be my Disciple: And ver. 26, 27. If any man come to me, and hate not his Father and Mother, &c. yea and his own Life also, he cannot be my Disciple: And whosoever doth not bear his Cross, and come after me, cannot be my Disciple. Our blessed Lord doth in these verses propose what is necessary to Christian Discipleship, without which we cannot be saved. He pitches on such
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Such things as were hardest to the flesh, as what his very Followers must be judged by; to inforce and improve which, he delivers two Parables. By the first Parable he adviseth men to consider well the terms or conditions of Christianity, before they engage in the profession of it, lest they be ashamed; ver. 28, 29, 30. By the second he confirms the first, and adds, how necessary it is to consent to these conditions, as hard as they be; for we are in a state of Enmity, and foolishly persist therein, since we are unable to defend ourselves against God, when his vengeance approacheth; and therefore 'tis our wisdom in the time of his long-suffering, to submit to the conditions of peace. This is further applied in the next words: So likewise, whosoever he be of you, &c. How is this redditive properly used, or the Parables applied, if taking up our Cross, following Christ, hating Father and Mother, and persevering, are not conditions of our true Discipleship, and consequently of salvation by Christ? unless we may be at peace, and be saved, without being Christ's Disciples.

But what need I digress, when the Assembly, and all valuable Divines, use the word in our sense? Yea, the Gospel so oft speaks conditionally: If thou confess, &c. I re-

Rom. x. 9: turn to what I affirmed, viz. That Sureship righteousness is no Scripture expression. Surety I know is once used, and but once as
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Serm. to Christ; the word righteousness is oft used; but Suretship righteousness is a new word, of human original, and I am sure, not consonant to Scripture-sense, as it's used to infer an equality of righteousness between Christ and us.

Having premised this, I will now shew you, [1.] What I grant concerning Christ's Suretship; and, [2.] What I deny, according to plain Scripture.

[1.] The things that I grant are these:

1. Christ is the Surety of the Gospel-Covenant, for all his actual Seed; yea, for the Elect, as far as it includes the promise of the first Grace. He is engaged, on the part of his people, that they shall grow in grace, shall persevere, and keep covenant with God, and not turn away finally or totally from him: He doth not bind himself to grow in grace for us, or to persevere in performing the conditions of this Covenant for us; but that we shall do it. Yea, he is Surety, to see the ends of the Covenant pursued, as to God's part, that he will forgive us, be our God, &c. Not that God's Truth or Ability need a Surety: But the weakness of our Faith is answered by such a support; for which end God sweareth, and appointeth Covenant-Seals: So doth he condescend to our infirmity!

2. Christ hath undertaken in the Covenant of Redemption, that he would make Satisfaction to Justice for us, and obey the whole
whole Will of God; that he would actually bring into the Gospel-covenant all the Elect, by causing them to believe; and that he would bring each of the Elect to eternal Glory in a way of Faith and Holiness; of which before. But you must not hence infer, that Christ engaged to repent for us, or to believe in himself for us; which to do, would suppose him a Sinner, and to need a Mediator. He was a real Sponsor, engaging to do all that belonged to him.

3. Christ accordingly died in our nature, and that not only for our good, but in our stead; nostro loco. We were liable to die, but he stepped in and died, that we might not die; who otherwise must have died, but now live by his dying for us. He was a proper αὐτοκτόνος, he gave his Life for ours; yea, and this to vindicate the glory of God in exempting us from death. He also obeyed for us; not indeed to exempt us from obeying, (for by it we are brought to obey, instead of rebelling,) nor only to be a holy offering and example; but that the want of our perfect obedience might not exclude us from acceptance and heaven; and that by his obedience and sufferings, he might acquire for all his members a Title to happiness, in his right, and not to be merited by any work or obedience of their own. That the Lord Jesus did suffer properly in our stead, is plain from what the Scripture
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Serm. Scripture says, that he came to give his life for many; and again, that he gave himself a ransom for, or in the room of all. He was typified in the sacrifices, whose lives were given up instead of theirs, for whom they were offered; and he is oft called a Sacrifice. Neither is it to be doubted, but he actively obeyed in our stead, in the sense above given; yea, and hath excluded also the necessity and place of our obedience for the Impetration of any saving benefits. Thus far the Word of God directs us to call Christ, either Surety, Sponsor, Representative, &c. But,

[2.] The thing that I deny is, That Christ by his obedience made atonement or merited for us, as a proper pecuniary Surety in the Law of works. The thing is far otherwise; for Christ suffered and obeyed as a Principal and sole undertaker, and not as a Surety, that supposed us Principals in that undertaking. He bound himself to God, to give his life, by dying in our stead, to save ours; but he never was bound in one Bond with us, that he should do so. I shall give you a few Reasons of many.

1 R. God never proposed it to fallen Sinners, to make atonement for their Sins, and by Merit to recover the eternal Life, which they had forfeited. Where is the Law or Covenant, whereby God proposed this
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this to Sinners, as their Duty, and a way for their recovery? By the Law of works it was impossible, and a contradiction:

And the Gospel condemns all thought of it, as contrary to the whole scope of it. The compact between the Father and Son was not a Law or Covenant proposed to Sinners, for their performance of the conditions thereof. Now a Money-Surety is bound to no more, than the Principal is bound to do. If I am not obliged to pay a hundred pounds, neither is my Surety bound to pay a hundred pounds. But you will say,

Obj. By the Law, we were bound to obey the Law perfectly, or to die for it. Anf. Yes: To obey was your Duty, and to die was the Penalty if you disobey'd. But, (1.) You were not bound to die, though you obeyed perfectly: But Christ was bound to obey, and to suffer though he obey'd. (2.) Nor were you bound, when you did sin, and suffer the Penalty, to obey afresh in a way of meriting forfeited blessings: But Christ suffered, and yet obey'd to merit forfeited blessings, and more. (3.) Nor were you bound to suffer as your Duty, and that in a way of Propitiation, to reconcile the offended God by it as an act of obedience: Yet Christ engaged in this manner: (4.) Nor were you bound by the Law, that the Son of God should assume your flesh, and therein obey and
Serm. and suffer: Yet thereupon depends the Satisfaction and Merit of the obedience yielded; thence is the Value, of the acts done and sufferings endured. It were not a Payment without that; for dying and obeying too, would not serve to save Sinners, if it were not the Son of God in our nature did both: This goes into the Price and Payment. Could men have done it, it had been no Payment, supposing but one Sin before. So that in this very respect, Christ was bound to redeem you, by paying a Million in the value of his Person; and the same Actions and Passion as done and suffered by you, would not have been one Penny in value. And is he properly but your pecuniary Surety, when he is bound for a Million, and you not for a Penny, as in Redemption-work? Yea further, (5.) You are supposed fallen, and the Covenant of Works broken, ere Christ undertakes to pay any thing. And can the Bond be the same, when the Parties are changed, and the Conditions so changed on both parts, as to the Creditor and Debtors too; the former granting other things, the latter paying greater things; the first in the rewards, the latter in the duties? Is it the same Bond, and you Principals, when transacted without your privity, your consent not given, the terms not exacted from you, and (unless to reproach you,) not possible to be proposed to you? God knew himself
himself and you too well, to propose to you, "If you will make your souls an offering for sin, and perfectly keep my Law, I will then receive you again into favour:" Yet this would change the Bond. Or if you would be thought Principals in the Covenant of Redemption, it must thus be proposed to you; "If you will procure and send the Son of God, to take your flesh and die, and to obey the Law for you, then I will be reconciled to you:" Had he been thus in your disposal, and he had done it at your disposal, you might claim at the rate as some do. But though God gave his Son, and his Son gave himself to redeem you, yet you never gave him; no, nor were engaged to give him, as the Condition of your recovery.

These, and many other Considerations, should lead us to conclude, that Redemption-work was proposed only to Christ in the Covenant of Redemption, and that he was Principal and sole undertaker, as well as the sole Performer, and of the People there was none with him. He alone undertook to satisfy Justice, that we might be redeemed; he alone engaged for the whole Impetration work, and to find the Merit of our happiness. And though part of his Obedience was that, which we were obliged to do, (yet not for Redemption at all;) nevertheless his Obligation to do it was not
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II. Serm. as our Money-Surety; but by a voluntary Sponfion he entred into a Bond, that depended not upon our consent or performance, and by which we have no claim, but at his and the Father's pleasure. It was us he was to buy, but it was he alone flood obliged to pay: He engaged to die for us, but that is not engaging for us as Principals, that he would die; a thing, which we never were obliged to. He did not engage, we should not sin; nor if we sinned, that we should make satisfaction: But he engaged, that he would satisfy God, that we might not die for our Sins; even one Christ for all of us, and once to die instead of our eternal Death.

2 R. Were Christ a proper pecuniary Surety in his death and obedience, there would be no room for God's forgiving us any Sin, or giving us any Mercy as of free gift, unless he forgave us more than Christ satisfied for, or bestowed what he did not merit. This is evident: For if my Surety be bound with me to a Creditor for a thousand pounds; if my Surety pay, as my Surety, this thousand pounds, the Creditor forgives me nothing, but I pay him all. So as to Merit: If I buy a Jewel for an hundred pounds, and give Bond for it, with a Surety bound with me for that Sum; if my Surety shall pay that hundred pounds, can the Seller be said to give me that Jewel? No; I in a Law-sense paid him,
Of Christ's Suretship.

him, because my Surety did it. Where- as the Gospel lays the Stress of our felicity upon Forgiveness: Rom. iv. 7. Acts xiii. 38. And though Justice do not suffer, as having received glory by Christ, yet that is not to exclude Forgiveness, but to make way for Forgiveness in a consistency with his perfections. And further, God no more sells us any blessing, notwithstanding Christ's Merits, than Christ sells them to us: Whereas he must sell all benefits, and forgive no faults, if he be considered as a Creditor, and Christ as our Money-Surety. But you will say,

Obj. God may be said to forgive us, being he admitted Christ to be a pecuniary Surety, tho' we pay by him. Anf. That goes a very little way towards Forgiveness; yea, and to refuse it in Money-matters, is hardly admissible by the rules of equity. It sounds low, to hear a Creditor say, "You were bound to me for a thousand pounds, which I was paid by one that I allowed to be your Surety; and because I would take it from you by him, I forgave it you, though I got from you legally by your Surety every Farthing of your Debt."

This is not forgiving; and the admitting such a Change, whilst the very debt in kind is paid, is not an abatement. Yet still,

Obj. God procured Christ to be our Surety, and therefore he forgave us. Anf. In discharging a Debt, this will not amount
II.

If one owes me ten pounds, for which I cast him into prison; on finding him insolvent, do I forgive him, if I get one that willeth him well to pay it for him? I befriended him indeed, but am paid all my self, even by him in his Surety, without any forgiving. I know nothing more suspicious to be an Error, than what tends to overturn the doctrine of the Forgiveness of Sins, which is the great support of a poor Sinner; and with this the notion of strict Money-Suretiship, whereby we paid all to God, is chargeable: Whereas if you consider God as Ruler, and Christ as Mediator, making satisfaction for criminals by enduring punishment in their stead, we avoid all the difficulties which that of Money-debts perplex the work of Redemption with. The Socinians main strength lies in Objections, from Sin being as a Money-debt, and Christ's Death being the payment of a debt, even the Idem. This is perceived, and therefore denied by our best Authors against the Socinians, as Lubbertus, Esseniuss, Turretin, Owen, Stillingfleet, &c.

3. Were Christ a proper pecuniary Surety in the same Law of works with them, then every Believer would be entitled to the same Reward as Christ is entitled to; yea, and as much, or more than Christ. This is evident: For if I covenant with another,
another, that in consideration of my paying a thousand pounds, I shall enjoy such an estate of fifty pounds a year; if I have a Surety engaged with me for the payment of that money, and by my Surety I pay the thousand pounds; upon this I have the legal right to that estate, rather than my Surety; and at most my Surety can have a right to no more, than that fifty pounds a year in common with me by those covenants: Or if there be other covenants between me and him, wherein I engage to repay him that or more, in those covenants he is not my Surety, but a distinct party. Hence it follows, that we are entitled to be exalted over all, and have a name above every name, to see our Seed, to be regarded as saviours, or at least to be satisfiers to God for ourselves, and our own Redeemers in a Law-sense. And if it be said,

Obj. Christ paid all personally, and not we, and therefore he hath peculiar Rewards and Honour. Anf. The Principal and Surety is one legal Person, and therefore, if the Law reckon that we satisfied in Christ, the Reward promised on that satisfaction is common to us with Christ. The Law gives the honour as it receives the tribute, and distributes the recompence as it estimates the obedience: And if one Person in Law, made up of us and Christ, alike obeyed in a Law-sense; then one Person in Law, made up of him and us, must be alike rewarded;
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Serm. warranted; and as we are reckoned to do all, so we are adjudged to have a Right to all that is due upon that doing. I shall say more of this presently.

II. If Christ be a strict pecuniary Surety, I think it will be impossible to confute many very erroneous Opinions, which naturally are deduced therefrom. What can be said against our being justified actually before we believe? For if we satisfied the Law in Christ, how can our Justification be suspended till we believe, unless there be some other Law? The Law acquits us, as soon as the condition is performed by us. And if you say,

Obj. We do not apply Christ to ourselves before Faith. Anf. (1.) God, by the Law, applies him to us, if we have satisfied it; and he hath applied him already, in making him our Money-Surety; for the Law will execute itself, whether we apply or no. (2.) When the conditions are performed by us, it's against the Law to deny us the Reward; or at least to continue us under its Curse a moment; yea, or to enjoin any terms on us for possessing the Reward, besides its own conditions, which are fulfilled by us: For after this, the laying of guilt on our persons at any time is unjust. Or should it be said,

Obj. We are not Christ's Seed, till we believe. Anf. All will not own that: But if we ever satisfy in Christ, it must be when he satisfied;
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fied; it is not to be done now, when the Act of performing the atonement, and paying the debt, is over. Can we, by becoming his Seed now, be esteemed to pay what he paid so many years since, if we did not pay it then? Or can he be our Money-Surety, by whom we pay now when he hath done paying, and not then when he was paying? But,

Obj. He being given by God to be our Surety, and not appointed by us to die, God may suspend giving us the benefits of his death, until we believe. Anf. If God made him a strict Money-Surety with us in the Law of Innocence, he either did change the Law, or precluded himself from a Right of suspending the benefits, (at least the restoration of his Image, and Freedom from the reign of Sin, the curse and wrath of God,) till we believe: For the Law is changed, if it say, "Thou shalt be free from the dominion of Sin, and the guilt thereof, but not till thou believe in Christ, though thou hast already legally performed all the legal conditions:" But if it be not changed, it immediately entitles to the Reward, and must be violated, if at least any Punishment lie upon the perfect performer of the conditions; for it's a punishing us after the debt is legally paid by us. Now though there is hardly a Truth more plain in the word of God, than that the Wrath of God abides still upon all unbelievers, notwithstanding Christ's
Of Christ's Suretisip:

II. Christ's Death; yet you see, how this notion of Money-Suretisip shakes it. I might give other Instances; as, that we ought not to confess our Sins, nor pray for forgiveness; that God afflicts only from Sin, but not for Sin at all; that God will judge and justify us only by the Law of works, and we are saved by that Law; that if God charge us with Sin, we may charge him with unrighteousness; that David was as acceptable to God, whilst he murdered Uriah, as when he obeyed God most; that God requires nothing from us, to escape his wrath and curse for Sin; and that we must not propose any benefit to ourselves by any Duty, or acting of Grace, nor are we a jot the better by them. These, and the like, spring from this very Opinion, "That we satisfied the Law fully, and perfectly obeyed it in Christ, as a pecuniary Surety with us in that Law;" to say nothing of the advantage the Socinians have thereby. These may caution us in our conceptions, especially when the considering of Christ as a pecuniary Surety of the Law of works, paying debts to a Creditor, is not necessary to any one Gospel-end; neither the glory of Christ, the government of God, the salvation of the Elect, the spiritual comfort of Believers, or the promoting of Holiness: All which are more clearly subserved by this word, a Surety of the new Covenant, joined with other
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other words frequently used by the Holy Ghost, as Mediator, Redeemer, Saviour, Ransomer, and the whole economy of Redemption plainly stated thereby.

5 R. Christ's being a strict Money-Surety, would be a very great loss to us. If he be our Surety in the Covenant of works, then we can have no claim to any benefit but what the Covenant of works promiseth; whereby we shall lose Union with Christ, the in-dwelling Spirit, and whatever degree of Glory is to be expected by Christ, above what Adam was to enjoy in case he had not fallen; of which I have spoken before. The reason is, If I have a Surety in a Bond, wherein I have certain immunities upon paying a sum of money, if my Surety pay that money, I can thereby have a right to no more immunities than that Bond contains.

6 R. Christ, where he is called a Surety, was the Surety of a better Testament; and therefore not of the Law of works, which enjoined obedience, and inflicted death on sinners. The word Testament is sometimes rendered Testament, sometimes Covenant; and well it might be rendered a legal Disposition: But call it which you will, this Testament or Covenant of which Christ is Surety here, cannot be the Covenant of works. It was not the Covenant that obliged us to die for Sin, or perfectly to obey in a way of merit, of which he is said
Serm. said to be the Surety here. Is the Law of II. works that better Covenant or Testament? Or must Christ be a Surety for us in the Covenant of works, because he is the Surety of a better Covenant, which is not the Covenant of works?

If you doubt whether this better Covenant be not the Covenant of works, consider the whole Context. This better Covenant is opposed to the Jewish Covenant, as the Priesthood of Christ is opposed to the Levitical Priesthood; which Priesthood of Christ the Apostle proves to be higher and better than the Levitical, by many arguments: As in particular, Christ was a Priest after the Order of Melchisedec, who was greater than Abraham or Levi: He succeeded the Levitical Priesthood, as it was unable to attain the great ends of Priesthood: His Priesthood is unchangeable, because he ever lives, and those Priests were mortal: Christ was made Priest with an Oath, they without an Oath: And to add no more, Christ was made Surety of a better Testament; which is again expressed by saying, He is the Mediator of a better Covenant, or Testament; and then it follows, If the first Covenant had been faultless, there had been no place for a second. Now it is manifest, the better Covenant, or Testament, must be the same in both these places; and the word in the original is the same in both. And you have here a full account, what this better Covenant is: It's the new Covenant,

Heb. viii. 6, 7.
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nant, wherein forgiveness of sin, among other blessings, is promised: At most, it’s the Covenant of Grace as in the last edition; of which Covenant, but on different accounts, Christ is called the Mediator, the Surety, the Testator. And the betterness of this edition of the Covenant, is founded on the betterness of Christ’s Priesthood; who purchased it with all its benefits by his Blood, confirmed it by his Death, and by his Intercession secures the great ends of it. So that, By how much he had a better Priesthood, By so much he was made a Surety of a better Testament: Or, as the Apostle afterwards expresseth it, He hath obtained a more excellent Ministry, by how much also be is the Mediator of a better Covenant, which was established upon better Promises. And was this now the Covenant of works? Surely no: For the Law of works pronounced the curse, this the blessing: The Law of works bindeth guilt; this affurses us, that God will be merciful to our unrighteousness, and our sins and iniquities he’ll remember no more: The Law of works is a killing Letter; but by this Covenant, of which Christ is Surety, God writes his Law in our hearts, and is to us a God, and we to him a People. Yea, Perseverance also is secured; for the Lord Jesus being Surety of this blessed and better Covenant, will see it kept by all the parties; he undertakes to have its ends accomplished, and to secure its being fulfilled. Be-

Serm. II. 

Heb. viii. 8, & seq.
Of Christ's Suretiship.

Serm. livers then shall persevere; and New Testament Saints shall generally have freer access to God, shall fear and know God more, and be holier, than Old Testament Saints. Yea, all the Elect shall be brought into this Covenant, and be saved by it.

As Mediator of this Covenant, Christ died for the redemption of transgressions, even of those under the first Testament, viz. before his Incarnation; which were pardoned on the prospect of it: And by his Death he purchased, that they which are called might receive the Promise of eternal inheritance. As Testator, he bequeaths, and disposeth by and according to this Gospel-Testament, what he acquired by his obedience, even to a bloody death; and by that death this Testamentary disposition is irrevocable. As Surety, he undertakes, that his Testament (which is also God's Covenant with us,) shall be fulfilled, even on our parts, as well as on the part of God to us. And this the Apostle directly applies to Christ's ever living and interceding, as what fitted him for it, and whereby he executes this Suretiship: Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost, that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them. Many Testaments are unfulfilled, because the Testator, being dead, cannot see to the execution of them, and so the Legatees are wronged: But Christ ever lives, and attends to the fulfilling his Testament,
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ment, which is the same with God's Covenant; with respect to which as God's Covenant, he still intercedes, as well as ever lives: Accordingly you'll find, that this Apostle lodges the height of the security of Christians, against and from condemnation, upon this Intercession of Christ; Who is he that condemneth? it is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God; who also maketh Intercession for us. He ascribes our Safety to his living and interceding, rather and more than to his mere dying; for though by his death he acquired and bequeathed absolution, &c. for his Seed; yet it's by his living again, and interceding, he secures, and sees his Seed possessed of that absolution, and all other blessings. And if we consider, that this Covenant mentioneth here, rather benefits promised to his Seed, than conditions of any benefits as required either of him or his Seed; he seems to be pointed at here more directly as a Surety to see God's Promises made good to his Seed, than to secure that the Engagements they are under by the New Covenant shall be made good by his Seed; though it's a great truth, He is a Surety on our part, that we shall keep Covenant, or we should soon undo our selves.

I think then, it is past contradiction, That the Covenant Christ is Surety of in this place, (which is the only place where
Of Christ's Suretisbip.

Serm. he is called a Surety,) is the Gospel-Covenant: And if so, he can, even as a Money-Surety, hereby be bound with us to no more, than what we are engaged to do and suffer by this Gospel-Covenant. It is true, by the Covenant of Redemption, he was engaged to suffer death in the human nature for Satisfaction, and this in our place; and also to obey the whole Law; and both, for the Salvation of his Seed: But in that Covenant he was Principal; for God never obliged us to Redemption-work, either by ourselves, or by any other; and therefore Christ herein is what the Civilians call Expromissor: He is obliged alone, though he acts for another. But how strange is it, that from Christ's being a Surety of the New Covenant or Testament, men should conclude, that Christ is a Money-Surety of the Covenant of works; and as such, paid all our Old Covenant debts, as debts; and that altogether in Kind, and so as we are accounted to pay that debt, and to merit Life by that very Covenant? yea, and should go so far, as to damn all that will not say as they say; though to say so, makes either Christ's obedience, or his sufferings, needless, all Forgiveness impossible, all Gospel-terms of application of Christ's Merits unjust; a suspension of a Right to those benefits for any time, injurious; a Right in men to equal rewards with Christ, inviolable; all remains...
remains of Displeasure on the unconverted Elect, and the Reign of Sin in them, matter of just complaint against God; and a Claim to any greater blessings than the Law of works promised, impossible.

I might further argue this Point by other considerations: As, that it’s inconsistent with Christ’s being a Mediator, he being a Party; and also with Christ’s being a proper Redeemer of Sinners, any more than of himself: Yea, it excludes the true Gospel Imputation of Christ’s righteousness in our Justification upon believing; as there’s no Righteousness of Christ that we have given us; since it was legally in us as much as in him, we having legally performed the conditions as much as he; and so we need not look out of our selves for Righteousness, for though our Surety did the acts from whence that Righteousness resulted, yet the Law-Right was in us as well as in him; with many other.

All I aim at by insisting on this Point, is to guide your thoughts to true apprehensions of the Doctrine of Satisfaction, and to secure you against the vulgar mistakes and dangerous notions that are gathered from the abusive straining of the word Surety. Whereas, if you consider God as Rector, Sinners as Criminals, and Sin as a Crime, making Sinners liable to the curse according to the Law; which Law must be honoured in the satisfaction of Justice, and
Believers not Equally

SERM. and vindication of the Divine Government:

II. And the Lord Jesus, on the Law-giver's proposing it, freely undertaking, and promising in the Covenant of Redemption, to submit to the obligation of bearing the punishment due to, and in the stead of those Sinners; this punishment being to be endured in the human nature, and being of equal weight, yea, and in many things, of the same kind, with what they were to endure: And the Law-giver promising to Christ, for his enduring this punishment and perfectly obeying his will, that a great and certain number should certainly believe in him; and that all believing in him, should in his righteousness be pardoned, adopted, sanctified, and eternally saved, in a way of faith and persevering holiness, to his glory; and that Sinners should have an offer of these benefits on the terms of the Gospel-Covenant, and the benefits be assuredly dispensed in that Gospel-way, &c. I say, In this manner every thing is consistent; and with these limitations, the terms Sponsor, Mediator, Surety, and Redeemer, are proper and consistent. I proceed now to the

Second Point, To prove that we are not equally righteous as Christ; and here I shall have occasion to shew, we are not so as to his Suretyship righteousness.

[I.] We are not equally holy as Christ; as this is a conformity to the Divine Image
Righteous with Christ

and Will, and is called righteousness. Have we an habitual Holiness, in a measure comparable to his? Or can we pretend to that Purity of heart and life, or that exalted Obedience to the Will of God which he rendered? Our hearts must condemn such a thought; nay, Angels dare not be rivals with him therein; much less can we, vile Creatures, whose defects are so manifest, and whose defilements are so many. He is proposed as our Example; but in what is it we can imitate him in equality?

[2.] It is not true, that we performed the conditions of redemption and life equally with Christ. I suppose, they mean this by Suretisship righteousness, who chuse that word. They think, that because a Principal may be said in Law to pay to the Creditor the very same Money as the Surety pays, and is considered in Law to have paid it equally with the Surety; therefore all Sinners for whom Christ died and obeyed, did then equally die and obey as Christ himself: Or as others would have it, that when they believe, God doth account, that they died and obeyed equally with Christ, and they have fully answered in a Law-sense the Law of works; so that they are justified by that very Law, being truly and legally innocent by the Satisfaction they have made, and the Obedience they have yielded as one legal person with
Believers not equally Serm. with Christ: And so they are righteous as
II. Christ, not barely in Similitude, but in
Equality.

But though I grant, that the Righteousness of Christ, for which we are jus-
tified, be a righteousness adequate to the Law, yea, supra-legal, as well as in sub-
stance truly legal; yet I deny that to be a Suretiship righteousness, in a sense that can
infer us equally righteous as Christ. For,

I R. I have fully proved, that Christ
was not a Money-Surety with Sinners or
Believers in the Law of works, though he
died in their stead, and his Death secured
their release and happiness; because the
Law-giver in the Covenant of Redemption
admitted and promised this; and the Gosp-
el doth proclaim this, and assure Christians,
that they shall be treated as believers;
yea, and as if themselves had obeyed and
satisfied, viz. as to all the blessings pro-
mised to believers. But all this doth not
infer, that we paid the price of heaven,
or that we legally endured the Wrath of
God; there's no Suretiship that amounts
to this, and therefore no Suretiship right-
eousness that connotes it. Christ was not
our Money-Surety in the Law of works, in
performing the Law of Redemption, and
therefore we cannot be said to do and suffer
what Christ did, equally with him; nor
consequently, to be as righteous as he in
Equality. But should it be urged,

Obj.
Obj. Christ was made under the Law, to redeem them that were under the Law; that we might receive the Adoption of Sons.

Ans. (1.) I might shew, that the context confines this to the following sense; viz. Christ was made under the Jewish Law, (delivered Four hundred years after the Promise,) which could not give Life, nor the Spirit; under which Law the Jewish believers were shut up, and it was their Schoolmaster, and they as Servants in bondage under the elements of the world, that is, the Ceremonies; and so were far from the designed liberty of adopted Sons. But Christ was made under this Law, to redeem and rescue those Jewish believers from this bondage, and to bring the Gentiles as well as they, and at one instant with them, to the Gospel-freedom and liberty; which is called the adoption of Sons; even a Liberty from the Jewish yoke and bondage, which many were still fond of. (Consult Gal. iii. and iv.) In this sense, it is not the Law of Innocency, as a proper Covenant of works, that is meant by the Law under which Christ was made. The Law of innocency or works, had not in it these ceremonial Ordinances, and the like. Yet,

(2.) I grant, that Christ in taking our nature, became a Servant, and was thus subject to the Law of Innocency, to its precepts, and its punishments, as a Medi-
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Serm. Mediator, according to the terms adjusted

II. in the Covenant of Redemption. But,

(3.) How follows it, that because he obliged himself in the Covenant of Redemption, that he would in our nature be subject to the Law for our redemption; that therefore he was such a Surety in what he did, as that we legally did what he did; and that, in the estimate and sentence of that Law, as a Law of works? It is so far from concluding this, that it concludes the contrary. We did it not, because he did it; he did it to redeem us, we were to do it to prevent the need of redemption; and had we done it, there had been no room for his doing it: And obeying alone would have served our turn before Sin, and neither our obeying nor suffering could serve the turn after Sin. Further,

(4.) Christ did not then become a Surety or an undertaker to die for us, by being made under the Law; but he was made under the Law, because he had undertaken to die for us. His very being made under the Law of works, was but the performance of a previous engagement to the Law-giver; this being one Article in the Covenant of Redemption, That he should take our nature, and be a Servant under the

Heb. x. 5.

Law, and make his Soul an offering for Sin. Can any infer then, that because Christ was made under the Law, in performance of his prior engagement to redeem lost Sinners;
Righteous with Christ.

These Sinners were never obliged; that therefore these Sinners did truly do and suffer, whatever Christ did and suffered to redeem and save them? It is true, that but for Sinners, and the Law, and Divine Justice, Christ needed not to enter into any obligation, that he would be under the Law, and die for Sinners, and obey to make the Law honourable. But what is this to make us Principals in that Bond, whereby he became obliged to come under the Law, and die for us? The Law is honoured, and Justice satisfied, but not by us, though for us; since he alone stood obliged by his Bond, to honour the Law, and to satisfy Justice. It was not from any obligation the Law of works had upon him, that he became obliged to be a Subject; or if he became a Subject, that he must die whilst he was an innocent person: Nor was it the Law of works, that gave him a right to his Reward, if he should obey and die; this Law never promised, his Death should be a Ransom for all, and he be glorious as a Redeemer. The Law of works hath nothing of this; Christ had to do with a higher Law, before he submitted to this; a Law wherein he was Principal, transacting without us, though for our recovery. I'll give you an instance to illustrate this: There is a Law made, that he that commits High-treason shall die; a Thousand persons com-
Believers not Equally

Serm. mit High-treason in various degrees, and
II. are condemned; but the Law-giver, or
absolute supreme Ruler, makes a Law;
that if such a great Monarch will become
his Subject, and die to expiate this Treason;
those condemned Traitors shall be for-
given, and released in such a time and way;
as is agreed between the Law-giver and this
Monarch: This Monarch becomes a Sub-
ject, and dies to expiate the Treason, and
deliver the Traitors. Now here the Law-
giver is satisfied, the end of the Law is
answered; the Monarch dies in the stead
and place of the Traitors; and they in a
fit time and way are released. But yet
they cannot be said to die, nor to pay a
Ransom for their Lives; much less can it
be said, that they paid as much as the Mo-
narch. But again,

2 R. We did not equally with Christ,
perform the legal conditions of redemption:
Otherwise, we equally vindicated the ho-
nour of Divine Justice, as Christ did; we
purchased the Spirit’s Operation, and Faith,
equally with Christ; we redeemed our-
selves, and bought the Church with Christ’s
blood, equally as Christ did; all which
are notoriously false. The ground of the
Consequences is this, He that equally per-
forms that by which a thing is effected or
procured, doth equally effect or procure
that thing: Therefore if we performed
that equally with Christ, by which the
honour
honour of Divine Justice is vindicated, we did equally honour Divine Justice: If we paid the Price of our Redemption, and that whereby Faith and the Church is bought, in equality with Christ, we did redeem our selves, and purchase Faith and the Church, equally with Christ, the performed conditions being the Ransom and Price.

3 R. If we performed the legal conditions equally with Christ, we then are entitled equally with Christ, to all the Rewards proposed to Christ upon those conditions. The ground of the Consequence is this, Whatever is proposed and promised upon any conditions, is equally due to all who equally perform those conditions: Therefore if Christ is to have a name above every name, and all Judgment and Authority committed to him, for obeying the Law and dying; then if we have equally with Christ so obeyed and died, we are to have a name above every name, &c.

4 R. If we performed the legal conditions equally with Christ, then we have an equal share in whatever contributed to make Christ's Sufferings and Obedience satisfactory and meritorious; and so the Influence of the Divine Nature, into the value of all the performed conditions, was equally ours, as it was Christ's. The reason of the Consequence is this, Whatever is essential to the performed conditions, must be equally ascribed to all that equally per-
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performed those conditions; and none of
you will doubt, That it was not sufficient
to redeem Sinners, that the mere acts were
done, and the sufferings endured; but that
they were to be done and suffered by him,
that was habitually holy to perfection; yea,
by him, that was the Son of God in our na-
ture: The value resulted from the Dignity
of his Person; and had he not been the Son of God, he could not make Satisfaction
for Sin by his obedience: It then unavoid-
ably follows, That if we equally obeyed
and satisfied with Christ, then we are ac-
counted legally to have the Dignity of the
Divine Nature in what we performed, and
that in equality with Christ; a thing the
Law never obliged innocent man to, and
a thing too great to be assumed by sinful
wretches.

What need I more Arguments to prove,
that we did not equally with Christ perform
the legal conditions? Though we have the
same Right to a freedom from condemna-
tion and to eternal glory as if we had, yet
we are excluded from that carnal Pride, in
saying we did it legally ourselves, and are
engaged against Idleness and Security in
our obedience to the terms of the applica-
tion of what Christ hath performed. If
we dare not pretend, that we satisfied
Justice, vindicated the honour of God's
Government, purchased the Spirit of grace
and Faith, and redeemed ourselves, yea, and
and the whole Church, in equality with Christ; if we abhor pretending to the same Glory and Authority, which belongs to Christ as Redeemer, in equality with him; if we tremble at pretending to have an equal Share with Christ, in the dignity and value of his obedience, from the glory of his Divine Person as the Son of God; we must renounce this conceit, that we equally performed the conditions, the reward whereof is our Redemption and Salvation; and therefore should renounce, that we are equally righteous as Christ. The performance of these conditions being the legal Righteousness of Christ, and that for which we are justified and saved, it is not to be equally ascribed to us and Christ; and for any Pretence to it from its being a Sureship-righteousness, you have seen there is no Sureship of that kind, as will infer that we performed whatever Christ performed, or suffered what Christ suffered for our Redemption, much less equally with him.

Though I might stop here, for it is the Righteousness of Christ, as it was the performance of the legal conditions, which is intended by Sureship-righteousness, in respect of which we are said to be equally righteous with Christ; yet I will proceed further, and observe,

[3.] It is not true, that we are equally righteous as Christ, as he is righteous with respect to his Right to the reward, upon
Believers not Equally

II. His performing the conditions thereof. If any thing would afford a shadow for the assertion, this is likeliest to do it; though alas, the thing intended is of a higher nature, even the performance of the condition it self; but yet, even in this lower sense it is ungrounded. By the Reward, I mean, what was promised to Christ for himself or others, in consideration of what he was to do and suffer. I shall briefly give you some considerable differences between Christ's Right to the Reward, and our Right, even though it is in Christ's Right we obtain all saving blessings.

1. Christ's Right was by his own Purchase, but we have a Right by Gift, and do receive every benefit as the effect of his Purchase. He bought a Pardon for penitent believers by his own blood: He graciously gives believers this Pardon secured by his title. Is there nothing peculiarly honourable to Christ, distinct from us? Sure, he hath the Glory of the Purchase, and of his Beneficence; whilst we have reason for humble Gratitude, as needing this, and receiving it as a Gift, though he makes it safe to us. Rev. i. 5, 6.

2. Christ is righteous, as the Subject in whom Righteousness inheres and formally is; but Believers have it by Imputation, and hold all in dependance on it as in Christ. The Purchase is peculiar to him, and the Right resulting therefrom, never alienable
Righteous with Christ.

alienable from his Person; though it be so transferred, as to be the plea and security of believers, for what is promised to them: Though it be upon them, it is still in Christ. Surely then, here is somewhat of a distinct Ground, as to the degree, reason, and manner of denomination: Subjectively righteous, and imputatively righteous; Originally and independently righteous, and dependently righteous, have not a Sound of equality. The Moon that borrows its light from the Sun, and depends on the Sun for light, is not equally light as the Sun, tho' it have the same light. Believers use, and apply themselves daily to this righteousness, as it is in Christ, that they may be dealt with according to it.

3. Christ had nothing forgiven him, and needs no Forgiveness; but Believers are forgiven much, and oft need Forgiveness, and are taught by Christ daily to pray for it; yea, much of their happiness and hope lies in God's forgiving them. Is there a full Equality between him that is happy by Pardon, yea, is often pardoned actually after he is justified and made righteous; and him that never needed a Pardon for himself, yea, in whose Right that Pardon is granted when so often needed? Alas! Believers have their Right to blessedness maintained by God's frequently forgiving their sinful forfeitures: Without this Forgiveness they would soon be liable to misery, and to be dealt
Believers not Equally

Serm. dealt with as unrighteous: And are such equally righteous as Christ?

4. It were intolerably arrogant, for Believers to plead with God, so as they might justly do, if they were equally righteous as Christ. Dare they say, "Lord, we need no Pardon from thee, thou forgivest us nothing; I legally paid the utmost Far-thing, by perfectly obeying and suffering too. I will, that this and that be done for me: Thou art unjust to me, as well as to my Surety, and not only unfaithful, if I am denied." Would this sound conscientiously, any more than decently? Have Believers a Right pleadable on this head of Justice? And yet Christ is so righteous, that he can plead so of Right. Can they be equally righteous, whose Claim is so different?

5. We are not dealt with as if we were equally righteous with Christ; and yet God is not unjust nor unfaithful therein. Believers have much Sin in their hearts, frequent Offences they commit; they want much of God’s Image, their Graces are very weak and imperfect; the Spirit of God is oft grieved by them, and for it abates his Influences; God is provoked frequently, and therefore hides his face, and rebukes them in displeasure; yea, leaves them under temptations; to say nothing of other penal Corrections, as Poverty, cursed Relations, Death and the Fears of it: Yet in
all God is righteous, even when these are inflicted for Sin; nay, a great part of them is Sin in them, though the with-holding of more Grace is righteous in God, and is oft repeated as penal; yea, indeed, all remains of Sin in our hearts, are the penal effects of our first Apostacy, not yet removed by Divine Grace. Can any man consider this, and say, Believers in this case are equally righteous as Christ? Hath he no more a right to his present exalted State, than we have to our present freedom from the effects of our Apostacy? Or are we equally righteous, when all these things are justly left upon us? Had we a right to be at present free from all Sin and Trouble, to be immediately made fully conformable to Christ, sure we should arrive thereto even now? And if we have not a right to a present freedom from these Evils, and enjoyment of the opposite Good, we cannot be now righteous equally with Christ. A present right to freedom from Sin hereafter, is even in that an Inequality to Christ’s right, who is entitled to a present freedom from all that is humbling or afflictive, and never was subject to Sin itself.

6. Christ hath a right to much more Good, than we shall ever enjoy, or have a right to. Believers have not now, no nor ever shall have, a right to a Reward equal to the Redeemer’s Crown: He will receive a homage as Redeemer; his human nature
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possesth a Glory beyond all created Beings. Now can they be equally righteous with Christ in matter of right, who have a right to no more than what is abundantly short of his? It is unaccountable, to denominate one righteous from the greatness or largeness of Right, and to conclude them equally righteous who have so unequal a Right, as to the greatness of the things they are entitled to, of which this Head speaks; and when there is such a difference in the nature of their right, as applied to them, of which before. Christ in his right hath given us many blessings, which begin the Felicity he intends to compleat hereafter, according to our various capacities to receive: But he hath not transferred to us his right to the Salvation of Millions, to Dominion over Angels, to give out the Fruits of his own Righteousness as he pleafeth; and many such Prerogatives, that never belong to Believers.

I MIGHT add, We are not so solemnly adjudged righteous as Christ is, and that makes an Inequality: And our righteous State is sustained, by a constant Intercession of Christ in his own right. But I think enough is said, to conclude this Point: For if we are not equally holy as Christ, nor have equally performed the legal Conditions with Christ, nor have an equal right to the Rewards promised on those conditions as Christ, nor are equally adjudged righteous
Righteous with Christ.

righteous by God's solemn Sentence as Christ _Serm._ was; Where is the least Shadow of doubting, that Believers are _not as righteous as_ Christ in equality? no, not as to _Suretyship-righteousness_, or in any other proper sense, Some however will say,

Obj. _If my Surety paid my Debt, I am as free from my Creditor's Arrest, as if I never owed him any thing: I can tell him, I legally paid him all, and he cannot charge me, &c._ And therefore I am as righteous as Christ.

_Ans._ The Impropriety of calling God a Creditor, and Sin a Debt, otherwise than metaphorically, I have already spoken to: The Socinians have such an Advantage by it, that all men who understand the true way of opposing them, quit these terms. But,

(1.) _Such_ as make this Objection, and urge it to prove that Believers are as _righteous_ as Christ, must confine our Righteousness, as a right only to _impunity_, and not extend it to _positive good_ as eternal Glory is. And is it not strange, to affirm that Christ by his death _only paid_ a _debt_, but merited nothing; and yet to argue, we are as righteous as Christ, merely because our debt is paid, which is by his death? What, is not Christ's _active obedience_ a part of his Righteousness? If it be, then notwithstanding our Impunity by the payment of our debt, Christ is more righteous than us,
II. And,

(2.) It is so far from true, that the Believer paid God all his debt, that it is true he paid God not one Penny of his debt, neither by himself, nor by Christ as a Money-Surety. Christ made Satisfaction to God the injured Law-giver, as a Principal undertaker to save us in his way; but the Believer never made any Satisfaction to God for the least Sin, as I have fully proved: And therefore it's gross arguing, that I am as righteous as Christ, because I paid all my debt; when I paid nothing, but was forgiven all. Again,

(3.) The Believer is contracting new debts every day, and were it not for a renewed washing or pardon by Christ's blood still applied, he would be subject to new Arrests. (Jer. xxxvi. 3. Psalm li. 9. Matt. vi. 12.) Is it well argued then, I am as righteous as Christ, when I would daily run myself into Prison; but that I have a Pardon oft repeated in the virtue of his Righteousness? Further,

(4.) Though Pardon in Christ's right will keep a Believer out of hell, yet those are unacquainted with the Word and the dealings of God with Believers, that think they feel none of the bitter fruits of Sin, and have no experience of any Arrests of displeasure for Sin. (Rev. iii. 19. Amos iii. 2.) Eternal condemnation is the forest, but not the
the only, effect of Sin. Is it a part of our Serm.
Freedom, that our Lusts are so strong; that
the Image of God is so little restored; that
God is still so much dishonoured and of-
fended by us? &c. Will this reasoning per-
suade you? "Because I shall be kept by
"Christ's Righteousness out of hell, there-
"fore I am as righteous as Christ; though
"I am still subject to many penal effects of
"Sin, and know not how much greater
"I may yet be subject to." And again,
(5.) Do TH the Plea formed in this Ob-
jection, fit the mouth of any true Believer?
"Lord, I do not now need thy forgiving me
"any thing; nor ever was indebted to thee
"for abating me ought; I bore the Punish-
"ment legally before I offended, and paid
"the Debt before I contracted it: Be but
"just towards me, and I fear no advantage
"thou canst have against me: Let me be
"and do what I will or can, I am out of
"thy reach: I have, in the eye of thy
"Law, suffered what can be inflicted;
"nay, I am as righteous as Christ himself,
"and that in equality; therefore thou
"mayest as well, and as much, be offend-
ed with him as with me; yea, may'ft
"as justly deny him the Reward of his
"Obedience, as deny me any part of that
"Reward; for I performed the Condi-
tions in the eye of the Law as much as
"he, and have a right equal to his; I am
"equally righteous with him." Are these
Believers not Equally, &c.

SERM. the Apprehensions of an humble broken Heart? These things are as unreasonable, as if Millions of persons were liable to die for Robbery, and the King and his only Son should agree, that the Son should die in the room of these Millions of Criminals; that they, owning humbly his kindness, might be released and honoured, and the Son have the glory of being their Redeemer, and have homage done him as such. Would it not appear strange, if one of these after his escape by the Prince's death, should say to the King, "I owe you nothing for "my Life, I paid you in your Son's dying "for me?" And should say to the Son, "I have done and suffered as much, in the "eye of the Law, to save my Life, as you "did, and deserve it as much as you; and "have as much Honour due to me for "dying in you, as you have for dying for "us Millions; the King and the Law look "on me, and all should judge me, as just "a man as yourself." I doubt such a Man might forfeit his claim to Freedom, for want of humble thankfulness, and for denying the King's Son the glory of being his Redeemer.

Exh. With Sobriety of mind keep an humble Sense of your distance from Christ, under the highest Privileges he advanceth you to. Adore his Grace, that through his blood you are righteous as pardoned believers, but dread comparing with him; He will,
Op Justification by Faith.

will, and it's fit he should, in all things have the Prebeminence; and sure to be more righteous than us in all respects, is one of those things: What can be a tenderer part of his Prerogative?

XI Prop. Neither Faith, nor any Work of believers, are any Righteousness, that have any share or place with Christ's righteousness in Justification, as this is before described. Our Graces do neither make atonement, nor merit pardon of the least Sin, or the conferring of the lowest benefit. No Acts of ours are a jot of our Righteousness, or right to pardon or glory in a way of Justice: Justice could not allow them that place, they being imperfect, and the actions of Sinners: God hath no eye to our Works, as any procuring cause of his imputing Christ's righteousness, or of his pardoning, absolving, or accepting us.

Reader, Because my enlargement on this Head is long, that it may be better comprehended, I shall divide it into several Heads.

I. I have already told you that Justification is that Act of God, whereby he imputes Christ's Righteousness to a believer, and thereupon pardons, absolves from condemnation, accepts and adopts him; whereby he hath a right to glory, and is adjudged, one free from condemnation, as if he had not sinned, and an Heir of Glory, as
Of Justification by Faith.

Serm. If he had obeyed the whole Law. This is to make us righteous, as in Justification.

II. In Justification thus considered, the Righteousness of Christ is that, which is regarded by God, and influential into all; as the only Merit, and procuring cause. His Obedience active and passive, is the only legal Consideration, on which God pardons, absolves, adopts, or gives a right to Glory; yea, it is Christ's very Right, wherein God doth pardon, absolve, &c.

3. Justification, as including these benefits, stands entire, as to its causes, antecedently to a believer's interest therein. It's a blessing purchased by Christ; it's offered to Sinners, and included in the Promise. A justifying Righteousness, wherein or whereby a Sinner is to be pardoned and entitled to Glory, is not to be wrought out by men; it's already fulfilled by Christ; and these Effects of it are lodged in the Gospel, as Christ's deed of gift, with his title, to be applied to all that are made partakers thereof.

4. To be justified actually, is to be made actual partakers of a Gospel-right to these Immunities and Privileges in Christ's righteousness, as it is imputed to us by God, in the applicatory Sentence of the Gospel-Promise. We have for Christ's obedience a right to Pardon, &c. given us; and thereupon are pardoned, and to be dealt with and accepted as such.

5. God
5. God in and by the Gospel hath described and determined, who shall be thus actually justified, and this by descriptive Qualifications: They are Sinners condemnable by the Law, (hence called ungodly,) but not unbelieving impenitent Sinners; for God justifies none, but whom by the Gospel he promiseth to justify. Now if the Gospel promised Justification to all Sinners as such, or to all impenitent unbelieving Sinners, then all Sinners, all impenitent unbelieving Sinners, would be justified as soon as they are such; and would cease to be justified, when they cease to be unbelieving impenitent Sinners. But God by his Word hath positively declared, that such as these he will not justify whilst they are such, but leaves them under condemnation, and the Wrath of God abideth on them. God's purpose of a better State for any, doth not prevent their being at present in this worse State: It is his justifying act, that changeth their condition, from a liableness to condemnation, to a Right to Impunity from destructive evils; as it was his condemning act, which altered their State from a Right to Impunity, to an obnoxiousness to ruin: This condemning act was by the Law, that absolving act is by the Gospel. And therefore, 6. Whatever God by his Gospel makes necessary in a person whom he promises to justify, all that, and nothing but that,
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II. That, is absolutely necessary in the person who shall be justified. I do not speak of what is necessary in a person after he is justified, but what is necessary in him on whom God's justifying act doth terminate. We may thus judge then, what is made necessary in the person to be justified: Whoever God promiseth to justify, as described by any personal character, such as a believer, &c. must have this character, to be justified: Whatever God promiseth Pardon to, as Repentance, is necessary to obtaining Pardon: And whatever is contrary to that, (for which he declareth that he will, notwithstanding Gospel-Grace, continue the Sentence of condemnation on Sinners, and deny them mercy,) must be removed, or it excludes from Justification: So that when he says, If the wicked turn not, he shall die; conversion is thereby made necessary. We may know therefore by these Rules, what kind of person he must be, whom God by his Gospel doth justify: God will not deny it to any, to whom the Gospel promiseth it; nor can he by the Gospel grant it to him, whom he declares he will deny it to; yea, on whom he still more does bind condemnation.

Ezek. iii. 19.

7. Faith in Christ hath a peculiar aptness, and is more especially honoured in the first application of God's justifying act upon a Christian; though nothing can be wanting,
wanting, which God hath made necessary, 

in him whom he will justify. This ac-

knowledged Christ and his Righteousness; 

and by it we return to him, as the way to 

the Father, and own his authority, which 

is the reward of his Mediation. This is 

our conjugal Consent, and the band of 

Union on our part, with Christ as our 

Husband, Head, and entire Saviour. It 

includes all that regard, which is appro-

priated to Christ as Redeemer; and there-

fore we are said to be justified by Faith; 

and not by any other Grace, as I remem-

ber. But yet Forgiveness, is promised to 

other things, especially to Repentance; and 

we are called to repent, with a Promise of 

blotting out our Sins, and to turn to God, that 

we may be forgiven.

When I have considered, that we are 

still said to be justified by Faith, and yet 

Repentance is so absolutely required to the 
Pardon of Sin; I have been apt to think, 

that the Spirit of God seems to instruct us, 

That Justification in the first part of it, viz.
the imputing Christ's righteousness, and 
investing us in his right to Pardon and other 
blessings, is especially applied to Faith; and 
yet our enjoying actual Pardon, upon our 
Inveftiture in Christ's right, is promised to 
Repentance: As if God would ascribe the 
first application of Christ's righteousness to 
that Grace, which more especially acknow-
ledgeth the Redeemer, whose Righteous-

M
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II. Yet, that Sin which is Treason against God, should not be forgiven, even for Christ's sake, without repentance, wherein God is more especially acknowledged as our God and rightful Law-giver; whence the Sum of our Ministry is made, Repentance towards God, and Faith towards the Lord Jesus. If there be any weight in this, (which I only offer to consideration,) then Faith is more especially made the Condition of the first part of Justification, viz. the application of Christ's righteousness; and yet Repentance also is made the express Condition of the second part of Justification, viz. actual Pardon, (that great Privilege possessed by us,) with a right to what this Pardon entitleth to. Hereby the dignity of the Law-giver, and the honour of the Redeemer, are distinctly provided for in the Justification of a Sinner; yea, the Gospel-order is preserved, for by Christ we come and return unto God, whom we had by Sin forsaken. Yet remember, that Repentance is still a concomitant of Faith, whatever Priority, as an express Condition, I assign to it; for no utterly impenitent person can put forth an act of saving or justifying Faith.

8. Our blessed Lord exerts a governing Authority in a way of Grace, or Grace in a way of governing Authority, in the appointing and requiring what he makes necessary in the person to be justified. He commands men to believe, with a Promise that

1 Joh. iii. 23.

Acts xx. 21.
that they shall be justified if they do believe, which is the Scope of the Gospel: He plainly threatens all that will not believe, that they shall not be justified if they continue in unbelief: He hath appointed Ministers to use the blessedness of a justified state, as a motive to men’s believing, or coming to Christ. Thus it is also, as to Repentance in order to Pardon, &c.

Here then is the Authority of a Law-giver, yet the Grace of a Redeemer: Here’s a Law in the obliging power of the Command, and the certain connexion between the duty and the promised benefit; and yet here is Grace, mere Grace, in the adjustment of the Sanction, as to the matter it contains, and the merit it refers to. This, as to us, is governing Grace, and not governing Justice: For it is not Justice, that adjusts the benefit, with respect to the duty, as meritorious thereof; here’s nothing as of debt to us for believing, yet a certainty of being justified upon believing; here’s no Pardon as a debt for repenting, yet a Pardon sure upon repenting. Divine Justice was honoured in Christ’s fulfilling the Law of works, where God displayed his governing Justice; yea, it is honoured with respect to Christ, in God’s giving all benefits in Christ’s right, and as Christ’s proper Reward: Yet as to us, it is of Grace, that a Believer should be thus sure to be justified. But though Grace be thus advanced in the matter given,
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Serm. yet here's Authority expressed in the manner of giving, and Divine Government maintained according to the present state of redeemed Sinners. Some obedience shall be yielded, though perfect obedience is become impossible; there shall be the reins of a Sanction on our necks, though the Sanction of the Law of works hath and must condemn us, if Christ relieves not from it: Fear and Hope in us shall not be useless to us, though we were by the Fall, in a case, as to ourselves, utterly desperate; yet as to Election, and Christ's Undertaking, eventually safe: There shall be a Law of Faith to judge and save us by, though we daily transgress the Law of works, and by every transgression are liable to the curse.

I might, had I time, easily prove what I have asserted, and give you the great usefulness of this Point, that the Gospel, by which the blessings of Christ are dispensed, is a Law, or a display of Grace in a way of Authority and Government: But I will only glance at the following things.

(1.) Hereby the Gospel is said to be obeyed and disobeyed. Rom. x. 16. 2 Thess. i. 8. 2 Cor. ix. 13. (2.) Men become culpable as Rejecters of its benefits. Acts xiii. 41, 46. (3.) All Gospel-benefits become fit and strong motives to Gospel-duty. Acts ii. 38. (4.) The Benefits are suspended infallibly, till the Conditions be performed.
formed. *Luke* xiii. 3. (5.) They that obey the Gospel, may be sure of the promised benefits, and know how to try their Interest and conclude it. *Heb.* v. 9. (6.) The Gospel-blessings may be truly offered to all, and all charged to accept of them, by complying with the Conditions. *Acts* xiii. 38. (7.) The Conditions hereby are described, stated, urged, and not left uncertain. *1 Cor.* xiii. 2. (8.) A Rule of Judgment is hereby fixed, whereby God is justified in saving some, and damning others, who yet had the very same offers, invitations, and calls. *Rom.* ii. 16. (9.) They that have disobeyed the Gospel, are justly liable to sorer Punishments and Vengeance, than would have fallen on them for their first Apostacy, or for transgressing of the Law. *Matt.* xi. 24. *Heb.* x. 29. (10.) Here is an apt means to excite to diligence, watchfulness, faith, repentance, and holiness; and to prevent sloth, despair, presumption, and disobedience.

I appeal to the Consciences of men, Whether fallen men are more like to be governed by telling them, "You are under no Law but the Law of works, which requires all Graces and Duties alike, and all to be done perfectly without Sin, or you must eternally perish; though, it is true, if God please to justify you by Christ's righteousness, then you have legally fulfilled this Law, and **you**
Serm. "you are justified by it, and shall go to heaven. But God requires no Duty or Care on your part, in order to be justified by Christ's righteousness; nor doth he command you to act any Grace, with a promise of any benefit upon that act; nor threaten you with any damage, whatever Sin you commit: So that you have Faith as a Sign, but not as a Condition of your Pardon; nor ought you to obey any Command, as a means of good to you, but only in gratitude, that Christ hath done all for you." Or is it not more like to influence men, if they are told, "God hath set down this authoritative Rule, to give Sinners the beneficial fruits of Christ's death, and commands you to obey it; That though you are lost, yet if you believe and repent, you shall be pardoned; if not, the wrath of God will abide on you: Turn to God, and you shall live; if not, you shall die: Fight the good fight, and if you overcome, you shall be crowned, and in due season you shall reap if you faint not; but if you draw back, God will have no pleasure in you: Be fruitful, for if you be barren you are nigh unto cursing, and your end is to be burned: Use the talents you have, for if you improve them, God will reward you with greater blessedness; but if you hide them in a napkin, you shall for your unpro-
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fitableness be cast into the lake that burns with fire and brimstone: Subdue your lusts, for if Sin reign in you, you shall die; but if you mortify the deeds of the body, you shall live; &c. O then attend the means of Grace, look unto Christ, be earnest with God, watch and strive as for your Lives.” I appeal, I say, to the Consciences of men, Whether is more like to influence men to a compli-ance with the design of Redemption, and to obedience to God, the first of these, or the last? And I am sure, this last is the way God chuseth, for it’s his own words; though we are not by this way excluded from adding arguments that may also excite to Gratitude. But are not these words of Authority, the dictates of a Ruler, and yet not the Law of works, which pro-miseth nothing of Good to the imperfect, and bindeth Death for the least Sin?

9. **The Gospel enjoineth nothing on men for the impetration or purchasing of Justi-fication, or any other benefit;** but that they may receive Justification, and every bene-fit, as the effect of Christ’s Merits. Christ hath bought all by his obedience, and by the Gospel prescribeth the way how he in his own right will give what he hath acquired. As the Gospel is his Testament, he describeth his Legatees; as it’s God’s Covenant, our consent to it is necessary to receive its blessings.

M 4        10. THE
The Place and Use of

Serm. 10. The use of Faith in order to Justification is, that it renders the Sinners the ordained objects of God's justifying act and gift, according to his own Gospel-rule. Justification brings the Righteousness by which we are pardoned; but God promises to justify him that hath Faith, and faith he will not justify him that hath not Faith. Doth not Faith distinguish him that hath Faith, from another that hath not Faith? And doth not God declare, he will deal very differently with him that hath Faith, and him that hath no Faith? he'll justify the one, and still condemn the other. And it's the same, as to any other Condition of any other promised benefit: The Condition is not that for which the benefit is given, but it renders a man the Person, to whom God hath promised to give that benefit in Christ's right.

11. All endeavours after Faith, are endeavours after Justification; and all neglects of Faith are neglects of Justification. This is plain; for if the object of God's justifying act be the Believer, then whatever tends to make him a Believer, tends to bring him into a justified State; and whatever tends to hinder him to believe, tends to keep him him out of a justified State. It's the same as to all other Promises made to any Grace or Duty: Though all the Promises are made and performed in Christ's right; yet when he describes the person by any
any Grace or Duty who shall receive the Serm.
good promised, we pursue that good pro-
mised, by following after that Grace or
Duty to which the Promise refers. Therein
we look to Christ's righteousness with a
just hope, when we look to him in his Pro-
mise, and follow that which he hath af-
fured the fruits of his Righteousness upon.

12. God now doth, and will hereafter
more solemnly judge men's Faith, and men
by their Faith, as far as he hath made that
Faith necessary to any blessing. For,

(1.) God says in his Gospel, I will, in
and for Christ's righteousness, forgive him
that believes, and no other; yea, all unbe-
lievers shall be still condemned, because they
believe not: Christ's righteousness shall not
be applied to them for Pardon. And,

(2.) If the Gospel hath described what
this Faith in truth is, and hath warned us
of all false Faith as vain and insufficient to
our pardon; if these two things be true,
Can you imagine, [1.] That God doth
make no Judgment of that Faith, whether
it be true or false? Are all sorts of Faith
alike in his account; a dead Faith, and a
living; a feigned Faith, and an unfeigned
Faith? Doth he give and execute the Par-
don, without any regard to their being such
believers as his Gospel appoints? Surely
he that says, Be watchful, and strengthen
the things that are ready to die, for I have
not found thy Works perfect before God;
doth
Serm. doth distinguish between the Faith the II. Promise is made to, and the Faith which the Promise is not made to; nay, which he threatens as hypocritical. Or can you think, [2.] That God makes no Judgment concerning a man's Interest, or no Interest in the promised Pardon, with any regard to his having true Faith, or his not having it? The Question is not, What righteousness that Pardon is founded on? for that is Christ's, and the Pardon connotes it: But the Question is, Is this or that man the person to whom God hath promised to give that Pardon? Doth it by that Promise belong to this believer, or that unbeliever? I ask then, Will not God judge this man by having true Faith, to be the very man the Pardon by that Promise belongs to, and that the Pardon doth not belong to the other man for want of true Faith; nay, that because he hath not Faith, he is subject to the threatenings denounced against unbelievers? God's present dealings with souls according to his Gospel is a kind of virtual Sentence, but at the great day he will solemnly judge according to the Gospel. The Work of that day will be, to sentence men's Faith to be true or false, upon full evidence of its truth or falsity, and to convince the world that God hath pardoned all believers, and none but believers; and to condemn publickly all unbelievers, and solemnize before all, the happy State of those
those pardoned believers. The Case is the same, as to every other Grace or Duty to which God hath promised any benefit in the Gospel. As far as God makes any Duty a necessary Condition of any benefit by the Gospel, he will judge us according to that Duty; and if we totally want it, that benefit will be withheld: He that did not repent, shall be denied the blotting out of Sins at that day. Acts iii. 19.

13. Hence, men can be said to be justified by Faith as a sort of work, no otherwise than thus: That Christ adjudgeth a man to be a believer who is so, and his Faith a true Faith; and that he is to be dealt with as a true believer according to the Gospel-promise.

Justification in this sense, is quite another thing, than Justification by Christ’s righteousness, or by Faith as it connotes that Object. This is not pardoning, absolving, and accepting a guilty undone Sinner, which must be upon a righteousness adequate to the Law, and satisfying to Justice: No, no: It is but a determination of a particular cause, viz. He is a true believer, and not an unbelieving hypocrite: And yet it is of great importance to our main cause, being that God hath said, Christ’s righteousness shall be imputed to none but the true Believer: And if we must be judged whether we are Believers or no, we must be sentenced to be believers or unbelievers; and
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Ser. M. and if we be sentenced to be Believers, we are so far justified by Faith as a sort of work: And if our Faith be tried by our words, or other works, our Faith is justified by those words and works, and we are justified as to this cause in trial by those words and works; that is, We are adjudged not to be unbelievers; nor to be merely such believers whose Faith was not evidenced by such words and works. Mat. xii. 37. James ii. 17, 21, 25. The matter is the same, as to any thing the Gospel indispensably requireth, and concerning which we must be judged.

14. In the like manner, Faith can be called our subordinate righteousness, no otherwise than as it is the performed Condition which the Gospel requireth in the person, to whom God promiseth to impute the righteousness of Christ for Justification, or for actual forgiveness and absolution.

It is not the legal righteousness; for the Law would condemn any man, notwithstanding his Faith, if he had not Christ's righteousness imputed to him. It is not the righteousness that is imputed for Justification, as that in the right whereof Pardon and Acceptance is promised, or stands. It is not the Merit that God regards, either in making or applying the Promise. It is not a righteousness by Acceptilation, (which the Socinians call it,) that is, it is not reckoned instead of a legal or perfect righteousness,
Faith in Justification.

Faith in justification, which were to exclude Christ's Satisfaction, and set it instead of his righteousness. It is not a righteousness that makes up Christ's righteousness, or at all serves to the same end. It's not a righteousness by or for which God justifies us, that is, God doth not pardon or accept us for this.

But Christ having a full Righteousness, it is this that he promiseth to impute for Justification to all that will believe sincerely; requiring and commanding Sinners to believe in him, with this Promise, That if they will believe, they shall be justified by his Righteousness; and if they believe not, they shall not be justified by his Righteousness, but die in their Sins, notwithstanding the full Righteousness that is in him, and the offers made to them. I say, As far as this Promise gives the Believer a right to the promised benefit, his Faith is that upon which he receives that right; and so far the Gospel makes him righteous by his Faith; that is, He is the man whom the Gospel assures that benefit to; which it gives the unbeliever no right to, but directly excludes him. So that this Faith is no righteousness, that is any part of Justification, which is the Benefit promised, and subsists entirely in its own causes: But what righteousness it is, depends wholly on the authority, tenor, and truth of the Gospel, as the instrument whereby God applies Christ's
Christ's righteousness to us for our Justification. If the Gospel doth not promise to justify one that hath true Faith, though it be imperfect, then indeed Faith is no Condition, nor at all a Conformity to the Gospel, as defining the Condition; and if the Gospel doth not by its Promise or Sanction, give any Right to the benefit promised upon performing the Condition, then indeed Faith must not be called a subordinate righteousness. But if the Gospel assures to every true Believer Justification by Christ's righteousness, then true Faith is the performed Condition; and thereupon the Gospel gives him an infallible title: Yea, this Gospel is his title by God's gracious Will, to his partaking of Justification by Christ's righteousness; yea, to the Imputation of Christ's righteousness for Justification: But still it is Christ's righteousness that justifies, and only that; though it be thus assuredly applied to him that believes.

15. Faith itself, much less any other Grace or Work, is not the righteousness, or any part of the righteousness, wherein a Believer is accepted, pardoned, or glorified, or wherein he stands before the Justice of God; nor is it pleadable against the Law of works, or the charge of sin.

It is Christ's righteousness alone, that pleads for Believers in all these respects; this answers the Law, and for this we are released from the Curse. By this Righteousness
Faith in Justification.

our Pardon and Heaven were purchased, and for it they are given: That there is a Pardon, that there is a Glory for fallen man, is owing to Christ; and that Believers have these given to them, is also in Christ’s right, though his Gospal assures them to Believers. Yea, it is for Christ’s righteousness that the Spirit works Faith in any person. Faith puts in no claim of Merit, nor can it stand before governing Justice, nor admit a trial before God as Creator, as what entitles any to his Rewards. But to the Praise of divine Grace and Wisdom, our blessed Redeemer will own true Faith, as that which he hath ordained to be a Means of investing us in his blessed Righteousness, and what renders a Sinner certain of the fruits of his Merits. The Believer hath a Right by the Gospel to plead all Christ’s obedience as the Security of his Pardon and Glory; and he hath the Gospel to plead as what gives him, upon his believing, a Right to use that Plea. What Christ hath done answers all the benefits; Christ’s Gospel applies what Christ hath so done, and gives the benefits for it. Faith is the Condition of the person, to whom the Gospel applies Christ’s righteousness, and gives the benefits: But it is not that, for which any thing is given, or by which it is purchased: It determineth the Legatees in Christ’s Testamentary Absolution and Gifts, which he bequeaths
Serm. bequeaths to Believers, and confines to them therein.

Exh. 1. Be watchful, that you set no Grace, Duty, or Work of yours into the place of Christ's righteousness. Do not think any thing you do, answers the Law of works, or is any way proportioned to governing Justice. Dread a thought, that any thing is due to thy best Duty, as of debt. Whatever seem to be good works, are wholly vain, highly provoking to God, affronting to Christ, and Snares to yourselves, if you think they are a Christ, or instead of a Christ to you: And this you are guilty of, if you think you hereby atone for your Sins, or merit Glory at the hand of governing Justice. Will you rob Christ of his Glory, who satisfied for all your Sins, and purchased all blessings alone; and who freely gives you but the fruits of his own Purchase, whatever Terms he insists on for the dispensing of his Gifts, in a way most honourable to himself, and profitable to you?

Exh. 2. Yet do not thrust your Graces or Duties out of the place, where Christ by the Gospel-promises hath set them. He knew what was consistent with his Honour, and that it would not be injurious thereto, to insist upon Terms of the application of his Righteousness, and the communication of the Fruits thereof in a way of governing Grace; though as Sovereign
vereign Proprietor, he gave the power to perform those Terms. He thinks not himself debased, by giving out his Acquests, as a Priest upon his throne, or erecting a Gospel Kingdom as a Redeemer of lost man; which the Gospel Dispensation is generally called, as if on purpose to secure the Gospel Law. Mat. iv. 23. 1 Cor. xv. 24. Search carefully, whether the Spirit of God hath wrought in you the Conditions of the benefits of the Gospel-Covenant.

These are necessary to your actual obtaining of any benefit promised to them respectively; and you expect those benefits without God's Promise, yea, against God's Word, if you neglect to act the Grace the Promise is made to. On the other hand, you distrust God's Promise, in not assuredly expecting the Benefit for Christ's sake, when you have the Graces to which the Promise is made. The Gospel doth not deceive us, when it encourageth to Duty by benefits; as when it faith, Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have Right to the tree of life: If thou confess with thy mouth, and believe in thine heart, thou shalt be saved: Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life. Will Christ fail to do what his mouth hath uttered, though he display his Grace in giving us that assurance upon such Duties? Christ's righteousness will be applied in making good every Gospel-Promise: 

N  How
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S E R M. How unsavoury then is it for any one to say, that all your obedience avails no more to justify you, than your worst Sins? It is true, no Duty is our Righteousness for which we are justified; but it is as true, that the obedience and great duty of Faith signifies more to our Justification, than that worst Sin of unbelief: For Christ’s righteousness will never be applied to us for our Justification, unless we believe; and if we believe, we shall certainly be justified by Christ’s righteousness. Oh Sirs! Woe to us at the last Day if we are found to have nothing but the vilest Sins, and no Graces or Duties; for then will God judge us by the Gospel, whether we are believers or unbelievers, obedient or disobedient to the Gospel, godly or wicked, precious or vile. (See Rom. Gal. vi. 7. ii. 6, to 13.) And, Be not deceived; God is not mocked, but whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. We may have boldness in the day of Judgment, because as he is, 1 Joh. iv. 17. 1 Joh. iii. 7. so are we in this world. Little children, let no man deceive you: He that doth righteousness is righteous. Whatever Christ, by his Gospel, promiseth upon any Duty, we follow after that, in being earnest with God in Christ for ability to do that Duty; and if by Grace we are enabled thereto, we may rejoice in God’s Truth, and be sure that in the Righteousness of Christ, he will perform that Promise to us; whereas if we neglect the Duty, we wickedly presume to
Faith in Justification

II. to expect that Blessing, and abuse and pro-Serm. phane the Name of Christ and his Righteousness, in thinking we may have that Blessing by his Righteousness, though we impenitently persist in our neglects. The Reason is this, Christ in his Gospel-promises hath declared, how the effects of his Righteousness shall be dispensed to men, and designeth thereby to govern our hopes and fears now, and to judge us at the last Day. I should now inlist,

SECONDLY, On the other sense, wherein we are made righteous by Christ's obedience; which is, by the Merits and Spirit of Christ to be made obedient to the Gospel, at least in those things which Christ hath graciously appointed to be the Conditions of our actual enjoyment of saving benefits, as the effects of his sole righteousness. But I have already declared what may inform you somewhat thereof; nor have I room to pursue it: Only let me hint,

1. That Faith, Repentance, Holiness, &c. are a real righteousness. They are oft called so by the Holy Ghost, and men are denominated righteous thereby: Nay, these are called righteousness, and men said to be righteous with respect to these, abundantly oftner, than on the account of the imputed Righteousness of N 2 Christ:
How made righteous


2. All our inherent righteousness is owing to Christ's obedience; and to effect it, was one of the principal designs of Redemption. The Impunity of Sinners is a lower design, than the restoration of the Divine Image to depraved man. Tit. ii. 14. Eph. iv. 20,---24. He purchased our Graces, and mainly attends to the mortifying of Sin, and perfecting the Holiness of his Members; and will at last present them to the Father, fit for his delight. Eph. v. 27.

3. The Oeconomy of Redemption is such, that the Holy Ghost is to have a great hand in saving Sinners; especially in applying Christ's righteousness to men, and communicating the effects thereof. Hence it is said, that we are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God. The Father gives the Redeemer, the Redeemer pays the price of Redemption, the Holy Spirit applies the price. The Father gives his Son to obey for righteousness, the Son by obeying acquireth the righteousness, the Spirit quickens and works Faith in the Sinner, whereby he becomes the person justified by his righteousness, according to the Gospel-rule of its application; which Rule was jointly enacted by Father, Son, and Spirit. It is as dangerous to exclude the Holy Ghost from an Effi-
Efficiency in framing Sinners for the participating of blessings in Christ's right, as it is to exclude Christ from the sole Impr.

Many little think, what a dishonour and offence they are to the Holy Ghost, in denying an authoritative Connection between Duties and Benefits, and allowing him no hand in making them the Objects to whom Gospel-benefits are appropriated by its Sanction. The Language of such to the Spirit is, "We are, without any operation of thine on us, the persons entitled to all Benefits: Christ hath not only a Right to all these Blessings, but we also are fully and constantly invested in that Right, without any dependence on thee, or obligation to thee: Though we own, thou workest some of those things, after we have a full Right to them, and because we have that full Right; yet we are at no time indebted to thee, for any ways rendring us the persons to whom that Right is applied or belongs; the vilest wretch in Hell oweth thee as much Thanks on that account." I would tremble to hold a Principle, whereof this is the native Language; when I see, that though the Promises are made in Christ's Right, and the Benefits contained in them are his Purchase; yet, as they require Conditions in such as shall be partakers of Christ's Right to those Bene-

by Christ's Obedience.
How righteous by Christ.

Serm. nefits, to the Glory of the Son, and of the Father who gave his Son; to there is a wise contrivance for the Honour of the Holy Ghost also, as it is he who enableth men to perform those Conditions, for a Gospel-Interest in those Benefits.

A R E.
A

REPLY

to

Mr. Mather's Postscript.

IN this Reply I shall consider, *First*, The Errors Mr. Mather charges me with: *Secondly*, What he offers in Defence of his own: And then shall add, *Thirdly*, Some Exceptions to some other passages in his Book.


SECTION I.

*First*, *I shall consider the Errors Mr. Mather charges me with.*

These Errors he loads with no lighter Epithets than *damning* and *blasphemous*; Terms agreeable to his long-known temper and charity. He introduces his charge with an *Ecce*, This is he, *he is the man*. Would he infer, that I am the *only man*? No, the body of Divines, except *Antinomians*, a

N 4
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Sect. firm as I do; and in his Preface it is his Charge confuted. I am the man that eminently defend these? Alas, I can shew him Volumes of the dead; and many are yet alive, whose defence of my Positions is so nervous, as renders mine truly inconsiderable, and his opposition thereto contemptible. Sure then, it is either to leave a mark, that his factious design may more succeed; or to point me out as the person designing by him in his Sermons, (pag. 22, 64.) in words indeed too blunt for a man of his own sagacity to need another comment. Yet after all his labour to make the man sure, he hath affixed the Charge so falsely, that an ingenuous Reader will sooner charge him for a base Trick in his insinuations, than me as the Patron of the opinions he would ascribe to me.

Postscript, I Charge. He is one that makes Union to Christ, our having this Righteousness upon us, and our being justified by it, to be given us in way of Reward of something done by us.

Repl. [1.] My words (which he refers to here and pag. 46.) are these: "Gospel-benefits are no Reward of debt, and yet they are given in a way of Reward: The benefits are given, not for our Faith, yet upon believing; not upon it as a meriting consideration, yet upon it as that the presence whereof is made necessary by the Gospel,"
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"Gospel, this having required Faith, and sect. "
"confuted the benefit to him that believes. "
"If a man says, I'll give you a thousand "
pounds if you will come to my house "
"and fetch it; is it not a free Gift, though "
"the poor man must come if he will have "
it? and the Giver is yet bound by his "
"promise to give it if he come; and not "
"bound to give it if he refuse to come."


These are my very words which he pretends to mention, and no where in my Books can he find the least shadow for more. You see, (1.) I mention only Gospel-benefits, and not Union with Christ or Justification. (2.) It is Faith only I mention, and not something done by us, by which he would insinuate, that other good Works are meant. (3.) I say, it's upon believing, and not for Faith; upon it, not as a meriting Consideration; but upon it, as that the presence whereof is made necessary by the Gospel. Doth not this sound lower, than his Reward of something done by us? Upon it as a thing present, and of it as a thing meriting, are very different. (4.) The occasion of my using these words was this; to prove, that God by the Gospel enjoins Faith as a condition of our having those good things, which yet he freely gives; and that Christ shews his governing Authority in his displays of Grace, and excites to Duties by motives from benefits freely given;
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Sect. given; and that Gospel-conditions have no

I. Merit of condignity or congruity. And,

(5.) I laid the umbrage of the way of Reward, wholly on the Gospel-promise, and not upon the least Dignity of the act done; God, who is our Ruler, commands Faith, and promiseth, as a motive to Faith, the benefits purchased by Christ as good things. Here's the whole of this damning Error, as far as he could justly call it mine. And by this time you'll discern as little Danger to me by my opinion, as to him by his false and malicious attempt to expose my Ministry and Person, not to say Truth itself; yea, and the generality of Ministers and Christians, who will not stoop to him as a Dictator. But,

[2.] I shall descend into the merit of the Cause truly stated, which is resolved into two Questions.

1 Quest. When may a Benefit be said to be given in a way of Reward, when yet it is not in a way of debt or merit, or a Reward for the thing done?

Ans. A thing is thus given in a way of Reward, when a Benefit is given in a way of Encouragement of something required, yea, or desired to be done, however small or unvaluable the thing done is, or however great the benefit is. If you say to your Child, "If you'll make a Bow and thank me, I'll give you such an Estate:" When you give him such an Estate upon his
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so bowing and thanking, you do give it Sect. him in a way of Reward: It's a Gift, be- cause that Bow and thanks deserve not that Estate; yet it's given in a way of Reward, since you promised it in a way of Encouragement to his Bow and thanks. Indeed all Gospel-conditions are but a mere receiving of the benefits.

2 Quest. Whether God doth give Gospel-benefits in a way of Encouragement to our performing of any Gospel-duties?

Ans. Can any one read the Bible, and not cease to doubt, that the Scope of it were vain in its proposals and promises, if the thing be otherwise? For,

1. Are not the Promises of the Gospel motives to duty? When it is said, Repent Acts iii. and be converted, that your Sins may be blotted out; and, Come unto me, and I will give you rest; Is the blotting out Sins no encouragement to Repentance? and is Rest no exciting motive to a weary Soul's coming to Christ?

2. Is it a Dishonour to Christ, to perform his Promise, in the way, and to the full ends, that he makes that Promise? Doth he use the benefit as a motive, but not dispense it a way shewing his Approbation of the duty whereto the motive was influential? Especially, when his actual performance of his Promise to some, is an encouragement to all others, as it's a ratification of his word. So it is urged, That ye be not slothful.
Mr. M's false Charge confuted.

Sect. Slothful, but followers of them, who through
Faith and Patience inherit the Promises. He
would have us to this day be diligent, be-
lieving, and patient: And what is his mo-
tive? Even this; that others were so, and
upon being so do now in Heaven inherit the
promised good; through Faith and Patience
they inherit.

3. Doth not God frequently express
his regard to the duty performed, as what
he encourageth and shews his Approbation
of, in applying the benefit he promised here-
Ezek.xviii upon. When the wicked man turneth away
from his wickedness, &c. because he consider-
eth and turneth away from all his trans-
gressions that he hath committed, he shall sure-
ly live, he shall not die. Again, Come ye
blessed, &c. For I was an hungred, and ye
gave me meat; &c. And, Well done, good
and faithful Servant; thou hast been faith-
ful over a few things, I will make thee Ruler
over many things.

4. How oft are Gospel-benefits called
a Reward in Scripture? Whosoever ye do,
do it heartily, as to the Lord; knowing that
of the Lord ye shall receive the reward of
the inheritance; for (or because, γὰς;) you
serve the Lord Christ. And, Let no man be-
guile you of your reward; as falling from the
Truth would be the way to lose it. Again,
If any man's work abide, he shall receive
a reward: And every man shall re-
cieve his own reward, according to his own
labour.
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labour. Nay, we are down right Infidels, and next to Atheists who deny God is, if we do not believe that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him.

5. The humblest Saints, that abhorred Merit most, have been encouraged to their duty by the promised benefit, and expected to receive it in this way of Reward that I contend for. Let us not be weary in well-doing; for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not. Yea, If I do this thing willingly, I have a reward: And this I do for the Gospel’s sake, that I may be partaker thereof with you: So run, that ye may obtain: We strive to obtain an incorruptible Crown; I therefore so run, not as uncertainly, &c.

6. How oft are Christians called worthy of the benefits, (in a Gospel-sense,) and that with respect to their Graces and Perseverance? They which were hidden, were not worthy, because they rejected Christ. And when Christ sent forth his Disciples, he tells them, If the house be worthy, let your peace come upon it; that is, on those who would accept their message: In which respect the refusers of Christ are called unworthy of everlasting life, though Forgiveness had been tendered to them. So also, Thou hast a few Names, which have not defiled their garments; and they shall walk with me in white, for they are worthy: He that overcometh, the same shall be clothed in white raiment, and I will not blot out his name.
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Sect. name out of the book of life, but I will con-
I. fess his name before my Father, and before
his Angels. A perievering freedom from
Pollution in doctrine and practice, is the
very thing that the Promise refers to, in
the persons thus encouraged; for the fifth
verse prevents Mr. Mathers perverting of
the fourth. For though Christ's righteou-
ness is supposed to this, and all other Pro-
mises, and the reward is in his Right; yet
it is to those that overcome, and not to others.
And tho' it is on Christ's account, they that
are faithful are esteemed worthy; yet
it is the faithful, and not the unfaithful,
that in him are so esteemed worthy.

7. I have oft thought what these men
think of Christ, that he alone can give
nothing to his Followers in a way of re-
ward, nor propone any thing to his En-
mies, as an encouraging inducement to be-
come his Disciples. It seems he cannot
outbid Satan, the World, and the Flesh,
left he make his Followers Merit-mongers.

8. As strange is it, how they that credit
these confused men, can ever come to
any grounded hopes or Assurance of an
interest in any Gospel-benefit. Can they
hope without a Promise? That is vain.
But what is the Promise to them, without
an Interest? No more, than to such as ne-
ver shall enjoy it, which are very many.
Then how is it theirs? whereby have they
an interest rather than others, since God
offers
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offers the promised benefits to those others sect.
as well as them? If they say, "I am a be-
liever, and those others are not so; I a-
believer shall have these benefits for
Christ's sake, but those others shall not,
because they are still unbelievers; and
so Christ's righteousness shall not be ap-
plied to them, for an interest in these be-
nefits according to these Promises."
Alas, hereby they fall into the Error which
Mr. Mather calls damnable; they expect the
benefit in a way of Reward, upon being
believers rather than unbelievers.

9. The Ministry is by these wild no-
tions reduced to a dead unapt thing. Take
away that Encouragement to conversion
and godly perseverance, resulting from the
Benefit promised thereto, and the Dangers
they escape thereby; and who will mind
their telling their Story, as they call it?

10. Nay, they confound all men in their
serious Endeavours. They call men to be-
lieve in Christ; and tell them, (as Mr. Ma-
ther,) in case they do so, his Righteousness
will be upon them: That seems an En-
couragement; so far well. Ay, but take
heed; for if you expect, that upon your
believing, God will apply Christ's right-
eousness to you, that is damnable, and not
consistent with Faith. So, you must pray,
mourn, and reform: But you must not re-
joice in it, or look for any thing upon it,
faith Mr. Mather, that is destructive. What
shall
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Sect. shall we think then of poor Paul? who says, Our rejoicing is this, the testimony of our Conscience, that in simplicity and godly sincerity, we have had our conversation in the world: And Paul brings many under Mr. Mather's damning Sentence, in his saying, it is our rejoicing. Yet I would chuse to be in their case, above any men's who talk of Faith and Christ, if they neglect this. What shall people do in this Wood? It is impossible to serious men, it is injurious to Christ and his Promises, not to look for that promised good, upon doing what he moves us to by his Promises. But yet Mr. Mather and his Party assure, you are damned if you do it. The Spirit faith, In keeping God's commandments there is great reward: Mr. Mather tells you, there is none. The Spirit faith, Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life: Mr. Mather faith, you are gone if you expect it. Christ faith, Watch and pray always, that ye may be accounted worthy to escape all those things that shall come to pass, and to stand before the Son of Man: Mr. Mather tells you, he thinks it inconsistent with Faith to do so.

11. They effectually strike at Christ's Government, in one of the principal Means he hath pitched on to administer it by in our present state. For with them it is damnable to be excited to Duty, by hope of any good upon obedience, or by fear of missing that
that good if we obey not: And so in truth Sect.
Promises and Threats are nullities, as to I.
Mr. Mather resolves all the Reasons of obedience, into the
Motives of what God hath done for us.
Pag. 70. And indeed, they are motives; but they are not the only motives, nor the chief motives, that God makes use of; nor even what are fittest to impress mankind; yea, or Christians, whilst they be so imperfect and encompassed with Snares: We see, they restrain not from wrath, malice, faction, &c. in too many. How dare men say, It is damning to submit to such Arguments, which God so often useth, from future Rewards and Punishments; because he sometimes moves us, from past Privileges, or present Decencies? Yea, though you should add the authority of the Precepts, whilst you divest them of all Promises and Threatnings, to invigorate men's compliances therewith; we say, Frustra est praecipere, quod impune potest neglegi. Christ faith, If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them. And, He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, bath one that judgeth him; the Word that I have spoken, that shall judge him. And again, Be not deceived; God is not mocked; what a man soweth, that shall he reap: For he that soweth to the Flesh, shall of the Flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit, shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting. I
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Sect. might transcribe the greatest part of the Bible to prove this.

12. They dreadfully contradict themselves in all the profitable Sermons they preach. Mr. Mather faith; It is a damnable Error in me, to say, that God gives any Benefit in a way of Reward or Encouragement upon believing; though it be not as a Debt, or as if Faith merited ought; yea, and it is in and for Christ's righteousness that it is given. Yet hear what he says himself, pag. 68. Ob get Faith, see that you believe; for in this way it will come to pass, that the Righteousness of Christ shall be upon you. If a man should ask him, Doth God command me to believe? He will say, Yes. Qu. But doth God by you persuade me to believe, by this argument; That Christ's righteousness shall be upon me? Ans. Yes sure; or it is a mere delusion. Qu. Well, but shall I have it upon my believing? Ans. Yes, it is in this way. Qu. But will it be upon me if I believe not? Ans. No, I have told you, pag. 66. Your Souls shall go down into Hell. If then it be asked, "Do you intend, that I may tell my own backward heart, If thou wilt believe, thou shalt have an Interest in this blessed Righteousness; and to urge the worth of this, and the necessity of believing, upon my Soul?" I suppose, Mr. Mather must here suspend. But if I ask, "May I expect assuredly, when
"I am through Grace enabled to believe, that upon this God will put the Righteousness of Christ upon me, and make good the word wherein he caused me to hope, viz. That if I did believe, the Righteousness of Christ should be upon me?" Here Mr. Mather by his Principle must cry out, O No, this is to follow a Soul-destroying Error, if there be any in the world. Pag. 46. Should it be said, "But, Sir, I will not plead my Faith as any Merit, but only plead the Promise God is pleased to make to my Faith, and rely on that word now that I have Faith." Mr. Mather will tell me, Yet that is damnable, for then it comes in a way of Reward. And should I ask again, "If that be damnable, pray why, did you use this Motive in the name of Christ to persuade me to believe? How could it be a motive to Faith, if I was not to expect it upon believing? Or if I was to expect it before I believed, in case that I would believe, Why may not I expect it, now that I do believe?" I know not what Answer Mr. Mather will make, unless, (1.) It is something done by man: Or, (2.) God will be still at liberty to perform, or not perform, the Benefit, though he did promise it: Or, (3.) He will not perform it in the way he promised it; that is, He promised it as an Encouragement to you if you would believe, but he will
Mr. M's False Charge confuted.

Sect. will not accomplish it as an Encourage-

ment now that you do believe, nor seem

so much to approve of your Faith. The

first were silly; because it was, a man was

persuaded to do this, even to believe: For

I hope, it is a human act, though by the

Spirit's power. The second is, to imprech

the truth of God's word. The third is, a

weak Foppery; as if it were a dishonour to

God to give the Benefit, in the way he chose

to use it, as a motive to the Duty; espe-

cially when (as Mr. Mather owneth,) it is

by the Gospel-word that God puts this right-

eousness on us; which is the very same

Word whereby he urgeth this Benefit, as a

motive to man's believing. If I again ask,

"Why Mr. Mather would by this Motive,

"thus persuade Sinners to believe?" He

would, I hope, say, This is the way God

hath ordained to convert them to the

Faith. "But why dare he preach thus,

"when it implies what he calls a damming

"Error, or else it is a mere mockery?"

I'll answer for him, He had a mind to

venture a contradiction, rather than be

wholly useless to those people, whom he

designed to frighten from the Ministry of

others as damnable, that he and his Party

might be more considerable.

Reader, would'st thou know whence

comes this Confusion? I'll tell thee, It is,

because they consider not, (1.) That though

the Gospel be not a Law, wherein govern-
Mr. M's false Charge confuted.

ing Justice displays itself in the adjustment of benefits to the duty; yet therein there is a governing Authority in a way of Grace, suitable to the State of men, in the dispensing of the fruits of Christ's death. (2.) That a Reward of Grace is quite another thing, than a Reward of Debt. (3.) That all Gospel-benefits are given in Christ's right, and are the effects of his Righteousness applied to all that partake of them. (4.) That all Gospel-Precepts and Promises do authoritatively appoint and describe the persons, that are partakers of benefits, for the sake of Christ's righteousness, but not their own; and do not put men on purchasing these benefits. (5.) Yet these do fully distinguish them that shall partake of the benefits, from others that shall not partake of them. The Gospel doth hereby fix a certain Rule of Judgment, and doth infallibly direct men's hopes, fears, and expectations: Also it governs men's endeavours after Graces and Duties, as the certain Means, on our part, of coming at the respective Benefits, graciously promised in and by Christ, to or upon those Graces or Duties. But these things I have before largely insisted on. This damning Error comes to no more at last than this, The Gospel-Covenant is conditional, not as to the first Grace, but as to the subsequent Benefits; and so, that God requires us to believe and repent, that we may escape the Wrath.
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Sect. I. Wrath of God; and that there are Promises made to Graces: All which the Assembly of Divines do in plain words affert. How many therefore are under Mr. Mother’s condemnation? Nay, it is well, if he himself was innocent, when he prefaced Mr. Flavel’s book, called, The Blow at the Root; for there all that I affert in this Point is affirmed. Again, he says of me,

II Charge. He is the man, that makes the State of Believers to be undecided, and in suspense during this life. This is my Second damning Error.

Repl. [1.] He is very unfair in wording this: For who would not infer, either, (1.) That I affirm, that all true Believers are not in a state of Salvation. Or, (2.) That an Elect Person, who is brought to believe savingly, may apostatize, and eternally perish. Or, (3.) That a Believer, during this life, may not be assured of his eternal happiness. But he knows in his conscience, that I do often, in the plainest words, affert the contrary to each of these. Take a few Inftances out of my Book: Gospel-Truth stated, pag. 114, 115. I affirm, ["that we are justified the same moment as we truly believe in Christ, and the blessing is not suspended for any time longer: And an Elect person once justified, shall by Christ’s care, be kept in a justified state," I affirm, pag. 82. "that
that Assurance is attainable in this life, as Sect.
the effect of Faith." I affirm, pag. 137. I.
that the essential blessings of the Gospel,
become the inheritance of a believer, as
soon as he is turned to Christ: And that
a penitent believer shall be saved, if he
die before he hath time for further obe-
dience.” Again, pag. 151. “Do not
say, the Elect believer will not fall away:
I think the same; but yet, Is it the less
ture, that even he shall perish, if he
fall away? Nay, doth not God by these
threats, contribute to keep him from
Apostacy?” See Defence, pag. 318.
[2.] I will give thee the ground upon
which he wordeth this Charge. I said,
pag. 61, 62. “The reason why I use the
word Condition, is, because it best suits
with man’s relation to God, in his pre-
sent dealings with us, as Subjects in
trial for eternity.” And pag. 148. “How
unsuitable is it to the present state of
mankind, that Christ should govern us
without promises and threatenings? He
is a King, and we are his Subjects:
And we are, 1. Subjects in a state of tri-
al for another world; and, 2. We have
great remains of Sin within us, and
temptations without us.” These are the
places, that give him the greatest umbrage:
Now where is it said here, that a Believer’s
case is undecided?

[3.] Let us briefly examine, where the
very
Mr. M's false Charge confuted.

Sect. very true Difference between him and me consists; for certainly there is one, though he thinks it the best defence of his own opinion, to misrepresent mine, or else he had gained little by calling it damming. The Difference is not, 1. Whether all true Believers are in a state of salvation. 2. Whether they shall persevere. 3. Whether it be by the influences of Christ, through the Spirit, that they do persevere. Nor, 4. Whether the Influences of the Spirit and Perseverance, and the Certainty of their Salvation thereupon, be the effects of Christ's righteousness, and purchased by his obedience. All these I affirm. But the real Difference is, (1.) Whether God require Believers to persevere in Faith and Holiness, as the means of their continuing in a state of salvation? (2.) Whether it be a blamably legal Fear, to be solicitously cautious in resisting temptations, and striving in Christ's strength to persevere, lest we eternally perish? And, (3.) Whether if a man have once believed, yet, if he should fall under the reigning dominion of Sin and Corruption, he ought to suspect that he is not in a state of salvation? These three I affirm, and Mr. Mather denies; or I can make nothing of his words, which thou must join together. Pag. 50, "If thou hast indeed believed with the Faith of the operation of God, and thy conscience know it, thou mayest then conclude..."
Mr. M's false Charge confuted.

"elude assuredly, That whatever thy Sins Sect.
"have been, or whatever thy defects and I. "corruptions now be, yet this righteou-
"ness of God is upon thee, thou hast it, "and dost stand in it." But let it be ob-
served, The Faith is an act past; the Con-
clusion is at present, whatever a man's cor-
r uptions now be; the only evidence of the past
Faith is the knowledge of Conscience, which
is not infallible. And by the way I can
prove, That by his opinion, as that first
act is before Regeneration, so no other, or
after-act of Faith, is necessary to continue
our justified state. Again, pag. 63. he
exposeth such, "as hold that we stand in
"it [this Righteousness] by our own Faith."
And pag. 64. "their continuance in obe-
dience, and the not failing of their Faith,
"is one of the Privileges of their state, and
"the effect or fruit of their having this
"Righteousness of Christ upon them, and
"not the means or cause thereof." You
see, the not failing of Faith, is not so much
as the means of our continuing to have this
Righteousness on us; for of its first being on
us, he makes Faith a cause, pag. 51, 52.
I need not shew, how oft he calls all
Fears about this perseverance in our state
legal.

I have not time to argue these, there-
fore shall only touch on each.

(1.) God doth require Believers to per-
severe in Faith and Holiness, as a means
of their continuance in a state of salvation.

Thus it is said, Because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by Faith; be not high-minded, but fear:—Towards thee, goodness, if thou continue in his goodness; otherwise thou shalt be cut off. And so again, By Faith ye stand. And how conditionally is it proposed by the Apostle? You hath be reconciled, to present you holy and unblameable in his sight; if ye continue in the Faith, and be not moved away from the hope of the Gospel: Where our unreprovableness and reconciliation in the body of Christ's flesh through death, as to continuance, is stated on this, If ye continue in the Faith. And elsewhere it is said, Now the just shall live by Faith; but if any man draw back, my Soul shall have no pleasure in him: But we are not of them that draw back to perdition; but of them that believe, to the saving of the soul. So that it is by Faith we live; and this believing is to salvation, as drawing back is to perdition. How many are the promises of salvation to Perseverance, and Threatnings of death against Apostacy; and these uttered to Believers? Yea, and are urged as a great means of their perseverance, which divine wisdom hath appointed. Obj. Christ's righteousness upon us keeps our Faith. Ans. And yet, keeping our Faith through God's power keeps that righteousness upon us to salvation. And know, that Christ's righteousness
eouneness is applied, in correspondence with
the Gospel-rule: It is not upon the Apo-
state to give him a right to salvation, but
upon the persevering Believer: It is on the
Believer for his present right, but it is in
Christ for to be still applied to the perse-
vering Believer for his continued right.
Obj. The Believer will not fall away. Anf.
It is not naturally impossible, but it's by
Grace that he shall not fall away. But
then, God's helps and means must be used
by him, of which these Cautions are not the
least; and the connexion between Apo-
stacy, and the loss of salvation, is never the
less true, and so Mr. Mathers Principle ne-
ever the less false; for if ever be draw back,
my Soul shall have no pleasure in him. And
truly you may as well infer, that Faith is
not necessary to our Justification at first, as
that Perseverance is not necessary to our
continuing so. For as it was sure of the
Elect, even before they believed, that they
should be justified; so it is sure of the Be-
liever, before he persevered, that he shall
be saved: But yet, if Faith be necessary to
the first, so Perseverance by as express a
testimony is necessary to the last.

(2.) It is not blameably legal Fear, for
Believers to be solicitously cautious in re-
sisting temptations, and striving in Christ's
strength to persevere, and this left they ete-
nally perish. Hold fast that which thou
haft, that no man take thy crown, means
Rev. iii. 11.
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Sect. means to beget Care in holding fast. And

I. the Apostle gives it as a Caution, in which he

-comprehends himself; *Let us fear, lest a* Promife being left us, any of us should seem to come short of it: Any appearing chal-

lence from within themselves was matter of

Fear, for on Christ's part there's no suspi-

cion. Again, it's a divine Charge, *Work*

out your own salvation with fear and trem-

bling; not only begin it so, but so work it out. Nay, in no span of time on this side

the grave is the best Saint exempted: *Pass*

the time of your sojourning here in fear;

and the reason is, *If you call upon the Fa-

ther, who, without respect of persons, judgeth according to every man's work.* These men

now tell us, *There is no judicial Proceeds of Believers, no Judgment by a Gospel-

rule: It will not be asked you, what Sin you have committed or forsaken, what Duty you have omitted, or Good you have done; but, are you in Christ? As if these were of no use to determine whether we are in Christ truly or no, and as if a Privi-

lege were the proper matter of a judicial Trial. Mr. Mather may know, who these are. Oh Christians! Is our Race as yet run, our Fight already fought, or our Dan-

gers past? Are we still in vic, or in ter-

mino?*

(3.) A man that hath once believed,

if he should fall under the reigning power of Sin and Corruption, ought to suspect that
that he is not in a state of salvation. If ye live after the flesh, ye shall die; but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live; was a truth directed to all the Saints at Rome. And let me tell you, the dominion of Sin is a more sure evidence, that men are now out of a state of salvation than the knowledge of their Consciences, that they formerly believed, is of their ever being in a state of salvation: For this may be a mistaken knowledge, but the other is the divine Word. These conceits are obviated by what the Lord declares, When I say to the righteous, Ezek. xxxiii. 13.

he shall surely live; if he trust to his own righteousness, and commit iniquity, all his righteousness shall not be remembred, but for his iniquity that he hath committed he shall die for it; that is, If because he began to do well, and because he hath done so for a time, he ventures to give up himself to a course of Sin, he shall certainly perish for it. This is the plain Sense of the place, notwithstanding Mr. Mather's forced Perversion of it against our expecting any benefit upon performing any duty. The Apostle Paul thought not himself above this Rule, when he says, I keep under my body, lest when I have preached to others, I should be a cast-away. What a damning Sentence would Mr. Mather pass on Turretin, Perkins, Mr. Anthony Burgess, and most of our old Divines, who jointly
Mr. M's false Charge confuted.

Sect. jointly affert, That if David had died before he had repented of the Murther of Uriah, he had been damned? Nay, that comfortable text of the Apostle brands his Rom. viii. position, There is now no condemnation to them that are in Christ, who walk not after the Flesh, but after the Spirit; whence it's evident, That if they now walk after the Flesh they shall be condemned, at least from its being inconsistent with their present being in Christ, whatever they think of their former believing. I will not retort damning on Mr. Mather's opinion; yet to such Souls who credit his notion, That whatever thy corruptions now be, if thy Conscience know that thou haft believed formerly, thy Salvation is safe; I must in pity say, thou mayest eternally perish by it. For thou canst not judge now it was a true saving act, but according to the sentence of Conscience; and thy Conscience may be mistaken: Yea, if thy corruptions now have dominion over thee, and continue so, Eph. v. 6. God warns thee, Let no man deceive you with vain words; for because of these things the wrath of God cometh upon the children of disobedience. But Mr. Mathew adds,

Pag. 72. III Charge. And whether he do not in truth disown the Imputation of our Sins unto Christ, and of his Righteousness unto us, it is like, if he live, the world will see more fully; for he hath given such pregnant indications thereof,
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thereof, as do amount to at least just cause of

Jealousy.

Repl. [1.] Is it come so low as a Jea-

loufly now? when he was one that under

his hand affirmed thus of me, "He teach-

eth, that the righteousness of Christ is

imputed only as to effects, with a pur-

chase of a conditional grant, viz. this

Proposition, He that believeth shall be

saved:" And they cite for it, though in

contrary words, Gospel-Truth, pag. 43, where

my words are these. I affirm, "That Christ

by his righteousness merited for all the

Elect, that they should in his time and

way be certainly partakers of its saving

effects; and did not only purchase a con-

ditional grant of those effects, viz. this

Proposition, He that believeth shall be

saved." To which I add in the next words,

"That besides these effects being made ours,

the very righteousness of Christ is imputed

to true believers, as what was always

undertaken and designed for their salva-

tion, and is now effectual to their actual

pardon and acceptance to life; yea, is

pleadable by them as their security, and

is as useful to their happiness, as if they

themselves had done and suffered what

Christ did." Reader, were these men
duly tender or honest, when they pervert
words so plain, and ascribe to me what is
as directly contrary to my words, as yea and
no? They say, that I affirmed what I de-
Mr. M's false Charge confuted.

Sect. ny, and that I denied the very thing I affirmed: But the Turn could not be served without these methods.

[2.] The ground of Jealousy I'll give, and judge you how just it is. (1.) I did affirm, "that Christ did bear the punishment of our Sins;" yea, "that he bare the guilt of our Sins, which is that respect of Sin to the threatening of the Law, whereby there is an obligation to bear the Punishment." But I denied, "that Sin itself, as to its filth and fault, was transfacted on Christ; and that Christ was made and accounted by the Father the very transgressor, the adulterer, and blasphemer." Gospel-Truth, pag. 10, 11. Here's my Crime, for Mr. Mather hath oft preached up the latter. (2.) I affirm as thou seest, of the Imputation of Christ's righteousness: But my Fault is, that I deny, that God accounts that we legally died and obeyed, or that we made Satisfaction to God; though I grant, that Christ died for us, yea, in our place and stead.

[3.] I have, through the goodness of God, lived to declare in this Book enough to confute his prophecy, and his opinion too; though I think he should pray for a more calm and charitable spirit, before he pretend to predictions concerning his brethren. And now,

[4.] Will he repent of his rigid censorious Slander? For I'll here declare, that I assent
affirm to his own words, pag. 18. “By Sect.
" imputed I mean, that it [Christ’s righ-
" teousness] is looked on by God as belong-
" ing to us, in order to our being judicially
" dealt with according to the merit thereof.”
This I have oft affirmed, but it’s far short
of what he elsewhere strains it to. Farther
he charges me with saying,

IV Charge. The Son of God was united Pag. 75;
to an Embrio, which (he says) is a piece of
ignorant Blasphemy.

Repl. My words were, (as above, pag.
32.) “Oh for God-Man to be at any time
“ unactive as an Embrio, or child in the
“ womb! for him to be born of a woman,
“ &c.” I said not, that the Son of God
was united to an Embrio; unactive as an
Embrio is another thing: And I will bring
him twice Ten, to oppose his two Witne-
fes. But had I said it, where is the Blas-
phemy? when the divine nature, I hope,
was united to Christ’s dead Body in the
grave, as all grant. And very many say,
that the divine nature was united to the
Flesh before it was organized or animated;
of whom is Turretin, who says, Etsi anima
infundi non potuit in corpus, nisi jam orga-
nizatum, &c. non sequitur λογος non potuif-
se carnem statim sibi unire, cum opus ejus
non possit aut præsente aut absentæ animā co-
arēfari. So Pearson also, and multitudes,
are Blasphemers with this bold man. But
Mr. M's false Charge confuted.

Sect. I. supposing, (that though the Virgin conceived by the power of the Holy Ghost, and went her usual time, and that Christ was like other children, and the Fæetus had matter and nourishment ministred thereto by the Virgin, who conceived by the power of the Spirit; yet) that the Divine Person was not united to the Flesh before it was animated: Are not many Physicians so ignorant, as to judge the Soul is united to the body unorganized? and if so, either the human nature of Christ had a separate subsistence from the Divine Person, which is false, or the Divine Person assumed it when the body was unorganized. But it is a theme not fit for me to pursue, who must confess my Ignorance therein in comparison of Mr. Mather, who can tell us, how the human nature of Christ leans on the God-head in the Son, and hath the eternal power of the Deity clasping about it, and holding it in that union. May not this spherical, yet very dull Author, call what he pleases in this point a piece of ignorant blasphemy? whatever greater Divines, or skilful Physicians, say to the contrary.

Because I would wash off all his Dirt at once, I will give you one Charge out of his Book, which he forgets in his Postscript, though it hath been their best Tool; viz.

Pag. 22. V Charge. That I lick up Bellarmin that
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that Popifh self-justiciary's vomit, in my ex-
position of Phil. iii. 8, 9.

Repl. This is as true as the rest; for when I expounded that text, I plainly af-
affirmed, (1.) That we are justified by Christ's imputed righteousness only. (2.) That all holiness compared with winning Christ, is to be esteemed as dung. (3.) That the best thing in us is vile, compared with Christ's righteousness. And indeed, if that text speaks only of Justification, and the Apostle designs to oppose his own right-
eousness to Christ's, then his own and ours are as unfit as dung to be found in. But,
(4.) I then judged, (and still do,) that the Apostle there designed to proclaim the preferableness of Christianity to Judaism, and what was Pharisaical, yea, or self-in-
vented. And therefore, as he enumerates all the dignities of Judaism, so he ascribes to Christ the whole Glory of his entire redeemed State; shewing, that not only his Justification, but his Sanctification too, came from and by Christ; both which were of a diviner nature, as well as ap-
pointment, than what he arrived to while he was a stranger to Christ: He expected therefore, and pressed after a perfection therein, while he despised all things, all privileges and attainments, which stood in competition with Christ; yea, and was glad he had lost them all for union with him; a perseverance in whom, with higher com-
Mr. M's Defence answered.

Sect. munications from him, was the very main I. Aim of his life and endeavours. I am sure, this Sense best agrees with the context, and is far enough from Bellarmin's sense; neither want I reason sufficient to prove it, had I room: Yea, my exposition of that Text is so far from militating against Justification by Christ's righteousness, that it proves it strongly.

S E C T. II.

Secondly, I shall now consider Mr. Mather's Defence of his own Errors.

He confines his Defence to two Points; saying, I kept silence as to more. When others read this Book, they will find a greater number, though it seems he could not perceive them when he read my Notes: And though he hath left out of his printed Sermons many obnoxious passages, yet he will meet with his Sureship-righteousness; the Debtor being as clear as the Surety; pag. 24. with his limiting so far Christ's merit to his active obedience; pag. 15. with his position, that all the Graces of the Spirit are effects of our being justified, and not at all the means thereof; pag. 32. that all our obedience avails no more to our justification, than our worst Sins; pag. 71.
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that, though he ascribes a causality to Faith, the Crown of Glory is due to us in Justice; pag. 12. yea, even a remunera-
tive Justice is exerted to us; pag. 15. &c.

But let us take what he thinks most concerns him: And of these

I. The first Point is, That Christ's Incarnation was no part of his Humiliation. Where, [1.] He grants the Point which ought to be the real Question. And, [2.] He sets up for his Chimera with a false State of the Question and its terms.

[1.] He grants the Point which ought to be the real Question. He tells us, pag. 73. "If you take Incarnation largely, as comprising Christ's taking our nature and the common sinless frailties of it, together with his being in the form of a Servant, and made under the Law, I know not why it should be denied to be a part of his Humiliation."

Repl. Well, Christ's taking our nature is granted by him to be part of this large Sense: And who can fairly exclude the rest out of the subject of this Question, Was Christ's Incarnation part of his Humiliation? Did not Christ assume our nature, with these frailties, and in the form of a Servant? Is our Question concerning an Ens rationis? that is, Supposing Christ had taken our nature, without taking the form of a Servant, which was next to impossi-

P 3
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If, or without its finless frailties, which were then natural to it; and not under the Law, which was the next End of taking it. What would it have been then? that is, If it had been what it never was, nor never would have been, (whatever some Popish Schoolmen talk,) is that to be the Subject of this Question? is this meant by Incarnation? Whereas, as it indeed was, or as Christ was incarnate, and the only way he was incarnate, Mr. Mather grants it was Humiliation, and so he fairly yields the cause.

But where will you hold him? In a few lines, he drops the form of a Servant, as not so proper a part of Christ's Humiliation, because Christ in his Exaltation hath still the form of a Servant. Well recalled, because so soon! But it is to get creditable company in his oversight, for he chargeth the Apostle with the same Slip; pag. 73. "Humiliation, &c. which the Apostle calls taking on him the form of a Servant, or rather being made under the Law; between which there may be conceived some difference, for Christ is still God's Servant, &c." It's well, the Apostle added this in another place. But what gains our Author by this Halt?

1. Either he engageth against him, Phil. ii. 7. where the form of a Servant is part of Christ's Exinanition; (and note, that the best Authors esteem Christ's taking the form
form of a Servant for his very Incarnation, and not any humbling Circumstance consequent of it:) Or else Mr. Mather answers himself, and his poor Argument too; and sure, that's convictive: For if Christ was humbled in taking on him the form of a Servant, though he keeps the form of a Servant in his exalted State; then Christ might be humbled in assuming our nature, though he keeps that nature in his exalted State.

2. Yea, I think one may follow him to Gal. iv. 4. For if there the Apostle more properly mentions Christ's Humiliation, and inftanceth Christ's being made under the Law; yet he fails not to join therewith Christ's being made of a woman, to share in the Humiliation with his being made under the Law. It would seem, Mr. Mather thinks, the Apostle had better served his purpose, if not written more accurately, had he set made under the Law in the room of taking the form of a Servant, in Phil. ii. 7. But it will be no otherwise, yet he fits not down with it: For after all his mending and winding in vain, to confine all Christ's Humiliation to his being made under the Law; he hesitates, and will be halving that too: And therefore tells us, "He is not now "under the Law, as he was in the days of "his flesh." Then, the whole of Christ's being under the Law is not a part of his Humiliation; it must be confined to an
Mr. M's Defence answered.

Sect. As he was in the days of his flesh. And what's all this Toil for? You'll presently see, it's to keep all Humiliation within the compass of the Curse; as he had said before, pag. 7. "All the while Christ was in a State of Humiliation, he was under the Curse:" A point, which that difficult text Gal. iii. 13. will never prove, as to the whole time.

Let us now review, what he hath brought his first State of the Question to, which promised so well primo intuitu. We have lost Christ's taking our nature, which was never intended; we have lost the form of a Servant, as what is still retained in Heaven; we have lost all that's included in being under the Law, except as it was in the days of his flesh. And now,

[2.] It is time to see, what use he'll make of all this, and how he supports his Chimera by a further false explaining of the terms of the Question: And this he doth, by confining Humiliation to what is far less than it truly is; and making Incarnation to be such an abstracted thing, as it never was, nor possibly could be.

1. Humiliation is "fulfilling the Law, either in the Precept, or in the Curse of it;" pag. 75. and before, pag. 7. he confined it to being under the Curse.

Repl. The Disjunctive may help, otherwise he hath given so hard a Definition of Humiliation, by making it convertible with
the Curse, that it would sound ill to ascribe it to the Eternal Word, unless on the account of our Flesh already assumed; yea, or so as our Author intends by the Curse. But the best of it is, this is *gratis dictum*; but where is the Proof, that's a thing he seldom mindeth; that *he faith it*, is enough to bring you under his damning Sentence, if you deny assent. But,

(1.) There is a very great part of Christ's Humiliation as the Son of God, which is no part of the humbling Curse as upon the Son of Man. His *Exinanition*, or laying aside of his Glory, is Humiliation in the account of the Holy Ghost; and this was true of the Son of God, as to his very assuming our flesh, abstracted from its humbling circumstances, as I have fully proved. Is it strong reasoning then, Because the Humiliation of Christ hath more parts than one; therefore that which is not that one part of it, is no part at all of it?

(2.) Christ did assume our nature in obedience to a Law, even that of Mediation; to which he had subjected himself as our Sponsor; this also I have proved. And sure, if obedience to the Law of works, as he grants, would render the Incarnation a part of Humiliation; why will not obedience to another Law, especially from him who owed no obedience but for our Redemption, and by his own consent?

(3.) Mr.
(3.) Mr. Mather will hazard his ill-jumbled hypothesis of Suretiship, unless he'll grant, that supposing the Son of God would be a Redeemer of man, the very Law of works required his Incarnation: If so, then Mr. Mather hath allowed, that it must be a part of Humiliation in his own proper Sense. Yea,

(4.) I know a notion of his that must fall; that supposing the compact between the Father and Son, antecedent to the Incarnation, the Son stood obliged to assume our nature with its frailties; and that, because it was our nature whom he was to redeem, and because it was in that State by our Sins, which he had obliged himself to expiate. Yea,

(5.) Upon his being thus obliged, millions of Sinners were pardoned and saved before his Incarnation; and therefore he stood charged with their concerns, so as to be obliged to satisfy for their Sins, and that in their nature; (for out of their nature would not serve.) Put these two last together, and we shall come, even with Mr. Mather's own good liking, to our Point, viz. That Humiliation doth properly predicate of the Incarnation strictly taken. Yet I suspect it will hardly go down: Why? Because Mr. Mather is so very fond of the avoAtct and filth of Sin being on Christ, that he cannot think Christ humbled sooner, or longer, than he can with some tolerable decency call.
call Christ the very murtherer, adulterer, blasphe-mer, &c. which he hath too fre-
quently preached; and in his Book, pag.
14. he a little washeth, by saying, He put
on the Sinners garments; and our Guilt,
our Sins, were upon him: (Crispian phra-
ses, which for some end or other he still
likes to consecrate.) With him the true
model is, Christ must be as unrighteous as
Sinners, that Sinners may be as righteous
as Christ; and our Saviour cannot be
humbled till he be a Sinner, nor Sinners
happy till they be Saviours. Here is the
arcanum, whatever be the pretence.

2. The next Term he dissecteth and
strictly garbleth, is Incarnation; pag. 73.
"It is strictly his dwelling in Flesh,
comprehending under it both the act of
assumption, and the relation or union
effected thereby between the human na-
ture so assumed, and the person of the
Son of God."

Repl. If one should ask him, How the
dwelling in flesh comprehends under it the
act of assumption, which is supposed to it as
much as entring into an house, is to a man's
abode in it? I know not what Answer he
will make, unless that the Son of God re-
peats the act of assumption as long as he
dwells therein, by that which he calls The
Divinity clasping the Humanity, pag. 63.
If one should again demand, Why he leaves
out all that is proper to real dwelling? since
there
Mr. M's Defence answered.

Sect. there might be assumption and relation, though it had ceased the next moment.

I judge he must answer, Pardon my improper speaking, in making that the principal thing, which nothing of what I speak faith anything to. But if he should answer, By dwelling in flesh I do intend, Christ's still remaining in our nature, and only suppose to it the act of assumption, and the relation effected thereby: I reply, That this is the grossest Fallacy; for Christ's continuing in our nature, is remaining Incarnate, and not formally Incarnation; which is the term in the Question. And the design of this Fallacy is, to change the Question for the sake of an argument that he greatly wants; since the Question thereby would be, Is the Son of God's continuing in our nature, a part of his Humiliation? And is any so foolish as to say, That this is the same Question, as, Was the Son of God's Incarnation a part of his Humiliation? where the term Incarnation is the very assuming our flesh into relation and union; and is so far from being comprehended in the Son of God's still dwelling in flesh, that it is supposed thereto, even as its cause; yea, and doth not so much as connote it, but as he assumed it to dwell in it for ever. Such Juggling it seems is necessary.

But the main Enquiry I now come to, viz. Whereby was the act of assumption? How did the Son of God take our flesh into union
union to his Divine Person? Was this in Sect.
and by his Conception? To this Mr. Mather
answers, pag. 74. "Christ's Incarnation "
"is one thing, his Conception another:
"By the one he became man, by the other
"the Son of man: The former implies only
"his participation of the nature; the
"other, together with the nature, the
"manner and way of his partaking there-
"of; though still in Christ they did con-
"cur and coexist."

Repl. It seems then, being man, and
being the Son of man, differ; and that so
far, as humbled and unhumbled: But did
not the Son of God become man by becoming
the Son of man? If so, then he was
humbled by becoming the Son of man, but
again unhumbled by becoming man. He
faith, they coexisted. What, as two sepa-
rate things? No; he tells you, it's as a
thing, and the way and manner of that
Thing therewith But to the loss of his
Fancy, he will find, that the thing hath
its being, by what he calls the way and manner of that Thing: For the Son of
God's Incarnation was by his conception, as
the means and cause of it; and therefore,
if he was humbled by his conception, he
was humbled by his Incarnation too; for
he became Incarnate by being conceived.
He tells us, They did concur, as well as co-
exist in Christ: But what meaneth he?
Did Christ's being man, as by Incarnation,
Sect. II.

concur to make him the Son of man by conception? as his being the Son of man by his conception, did concur to make him a man, or Incarnate; that is, he took flesh as a man, that he might be conceived, as much as he took flesh by being conceived. At last finding, upon a long rolling in his mind, that if to be conceived was to be humbled, the Son of God then must be humbled by becoming Incarnate; he leaves this profane Cant, and tries what he can make of granting, "There was an abasement in the manner of his Conception, but not in his being conceived." But as I think he can never part them, so I have elsewhere proved, That his being conceived is the greater debasement; and there was nothing in the manner of it debasing, but as supposing the thing itself was so. Alas, what is this or that human circumstance, compared with God's taking our flesh? And what are the circumstances? Mary, though no rich woman, was of David's line, a free woman, and a Virgin. Yet let us hear his reason, since he seldom offers any: "The human nature was really related to Mary, as to its Cause, for she conceived him; yet the was not a Cause, either of his Incarnation, or of his Humiliation." Doth he intend, that Mary was not the Cause of the Son of God's Will to be incarnate, and so humbled? That is not the point, and none
none doubt it. But I ask, Was not Mary Sect. the Cause of the human nature, as it was Christ's human nature? and did it not become his human nature, as he was conceived of her, by the efficiency of the Spirit? Well, therein, and so far, she was the Cause of his Incarnation: And if she was not the Cause of his Humiliation, pray whence was the abasement in the manner of his Conception, which Mr. Mather just now affirmed? I dare not pretend to seek out any, left in naming the word Embrio, he should call it a piece of ignorant blasphemy.

Mr. Mather, after all his superfine Distinctions, of Christ's assuming our nature being another thing than his Conception; the thing, and the manner of the thing, (though that manner was a Cause of it;) the Conception, and the being conceived; being self-conscious that he had offered no arguments fit to proselyte any, his admirers not being able to understand them; and such as could guess at what they did signify, being sure to despise, if not abhor them; he comes down to offer a Proposal from his own choice; pag. 75. "For my own part, " I would chuse to refer Christ's Conception to the things that made him allied in blood to us, and so fit to act as our Surety, rather than to his actual performing the work of Suretitship, as antecedently standing in that relation to us."

Repl. DESIGNETH he by this, to leave others
others to choose for themselves, without a damming Sentence? That is unlike the height and heat of the man. But what can we make of this Jargon, as connected with what past before? Was not Eve allied in blood to Adam, though she was not conceived a daughter of man or woman? And therefore Christ might have been allied without Conception. Again, was not Christ allied in blood to us by his Incarnation, which he faith is another thing than Christ's Conception? It seems by our Author's words, That his abstracted Incarnation was Christ's taking the human nature or flesh, but not specifically our human nature or flesh: Or was his assuming the human nature, as distinct from Conception, an assuming a human Soul not allied to our Souls; as he is allied to us in blood by Conception, and he doth here confine it thereto? Here we meet with another Distinction, sufficient to argue him still a designing man, but not a very distinct or discerning one: Here's a human nature, and yet not a human nature allied to us; a human flesh and blood, and not a flesh and blood allied to ours. By Christ's Incarnation he took a human nature, a flesh and blood, not allied to us: By Conception he became allied to us in flesh and blood, and in nature too; unless he hath it in his mind, that Christ hath not a human Soul allied to ours. Those words also are very uncertain,
uncertain, Antecedently standing in that relation to us. Doth he mean, that Christ was not related to men as their Surety, before his Incarnation? How then were all the Saints saved before his coming? Or is it, that the Son of God did not perform any Suretyship-act, in assuming our nature, or being conceived? If so, then he had not undertaken to assume our nature before he took it; though all that he did or suffered (had it been possible,) would not have availed us, unless so done and suffered in our very nature: And can you suppose, he engaged not that as a Surety or Sponsor, without which nothing had been payment? Or doth he intend, that Christ was not allied to us in blood before his Conception? It is true; and yet as true, That he was allied to us in blood by his very Incarnation, as well and as soon as by his Conception: Christ did not assume a human nature before nor otherwise, than as he was by his Conception allied to us in blood, and Soul too. At last we are gotten out of this Labyrinth, made up of nothing but ripe blown Thistles.

His Authorities, when examined, avail him little. I have but room to examine one, yet he is at the Front of them; pag. 74. Dr. Ames faith, "Humiliatio est, qua Medull. subditus est justitiae Dei, ad illa omnia lib. i. cap. perficienda, &c. The Humiliation [of Christ as Mediator] is that whereby he was
Sect. " was subject to the Justice of God, for
II. " finishing all those things which were re-
quired for man's Redemption: Phil. ii. 8." Here he confineth Humiliation to one part,
viz. a subjection to Justice, (not Author-
ity,) and this for finishing (not beginning) what was necessary to the Redemption of man; which by the Text he quotes, refers to his Death or passion on the Cross, of which before he was not capable as God. But that he confined all Christ's Humiliation to this, which excludes his Incarnation, is not evident; for the next words are, " Hu-
miliatio ista non fuit, &c. That Humi-
liation was not properly of the Divine " Nature or Person, considered in them-
tselves, but of the Mediator God-Man: " Therefore the assumption of the hu-
man nature, simply and in itself con-
sidered, (non est Humiliationis bujus pars) " is not a part of this Humiliation." That Humiliation, and of this Humiliation, do indicate, that he had an eye to somewhat else that might be called by this name Hu-
miliation; at least it doth not prove, that Christ's Incarnation was not a part of any Humiliation of the Son of God, because it was not a part of this Humiliation. Dr. Ames limits it to this part; Mr. Mather concludes against any other.

Our Author at last, having bungled so at Demonstration, falls to suspicion-work, which I confess his Talent renders him much
Mr. M's Defence answered.

much more expert in; as if thinking no Evil, were no part of Charity; or at least, want of Charity were no challenge to Faith. But what hath his jealous head brought forth, after so oft tumbling the word Conception? Even this, "his own doctrine of Imputation is lost, if Christ's Incarnation be a part of his Humiliation."

Well, it's a point I never thought of before; and it's a comfort to me, the Gospel-doctrine of Imputation will suffer nothing, but be availed thereby: I hope to find much more of Christ imputed to me as done for me, than what I was personally obliged to do by the Law, or was esteemed legally to perform; though I own, as well as Mr. Mather, that Christ died in my stead; yea, and so obeyed too, as you'll see in this Book. But with him, farewell all Christ's Obedience or Humiliation, if we did not legally do and endure all the very same: And if so, he must take his leave of the greatest part of the price of Redemption, viz. the value given to all Christ's obedience by the Divine Nature; for I hope, the Law never required that in man's obedience.

But since he lays such stress on his point of the Incarnation being no part of Humiliation, let us appeal to competent Judges. The Apostle speaking of Christ Jesus says, Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God; but emptied himself of his glory, taking on him the form of...
Mr. M's Defence answered.

Sect. of a Servant, being made in the likeness of men: And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto Death, even the death of the Cross. I have rendered *emptied himself of his glory, and left out the two copulatives which are not in the Original. The main matter is reducible to these two points. (1.) Is *emptying himself of his glory any Humiliation? I answer, It signifies more Humiliation, than *emptied himself of his glory, which is rendered *humbled, ver. 8. The word is as much, as *rendering all glory and honour vain or void; and is so used, 1 Cor. ix. 15. (2.) Is the Son of God's *Incarnation intended by the Apostle, when he faith, *he made his glorying void? It is certainly and eminently so. For, 1. The Nominative Case to this Verb is confined to the Second Person not incarnate, who being in the form of God, &c. He, even be so considered, before he was God-Man, emptied himself, or made his glorying void as to manifestation. And wherein could this properly be so, but in *becoming incarnate? for whatever debasement followed after his Incarnation, referred to him as the effect of thus emptying himself. And, 2. The whole seventh verse is confined to his *incarnation, as I have fully proved above. He emptied himself, being made in the likeness of men. And ver. 8. being found in fashion as a man, is that which lets in what followed his Incarnation, though but one emi-
Mr. M's Defence answered.

II. The second Point to be marked is, That Believers are as righteous as Christ in equality, as to Suretship-righteousness. For that's the Point. He faith little here for it; and I have said enough in this Book against it; therefore a few words will serve.
Mr. M's Defence answered.

Sect. His Authors rhetorical Sayings are more reconcileable to Truth than his Position.

Mr. Bradshaw affirms, "That Pardon " without the rigid Imputation of the " active obedience, serves to all saving pur-
" poses." But I'll dismiss this with these Remarks.

1. He builds his whole notion upon a Suretiship righteousness, and never proves Christ to be any such Surety as will at all infer, that we are as righteous as he on that account. I have carefully weighed what he hath written; and find what he faith for it, pag. 10. is, that he is called a Surety, Heb. vii. 22. I grant it; and he'll find, I have proved, that Christ is there called only a Surety of the Gospel-Covenant; and therefore can, as mentioned in that place, be engaged to no more thereby, than what that Covenant includeth. Though yet I grant, that other Scriptures prove, that Christ undertook to be the end of the Law for righteousness, and died in our place or stead, &c. of which I have insisted at large. And if this will not serve, he adds his All: He who is obliged to pay another's Debt, or any part of it, is properly, and in strictness, his Surety. To which I answer, But not always so as that the Principal can be said to pay that debt as much as he, nor be as just as he, nor be said to be immediately relieved upon his payment, &c. For if a Friend goes to a Creditor, and promiseth to
pay part of a Prodigal's debt; agreeing together, that upon sundry terms, and in a fit time, and by degrees, the Prodigal shall be acquitted and released; yea, and that his debt shall be remitted to him in a way of forgiveness by the very Creditor, and he still be bound to certain Services thereby; I hope, all the former daring assumptions are prevented, and yet the Surety engaged to pay part of the Prodigal's debt. Should not Mr. Mather, pag. 10. forbear saying, that holy Mr. Baxter "wrangles against" and rejects this counsel of God against "himself," and only cite the place where Mr. Baxter argues this point, and offer no better proof? But that's their way; he shall reason, and they'll do their work by mere reproaches, and cursed censures.

2. He faith, pag. 75. "That Christ's "Resurrection, Ascension, and Inter-"cession, are not imputed to Believers:" Yet all the proof he brings for an eternal legal Union between the Elect and Christ, and their being one Person in Law, is, pag. 59. "That they are said to be in him, in "his reviving, rising from the dead, and "fitting in heavenly places." So that what in one place is the instance and ground of legal Surety-Imputation, in the other is excluded from being imputed. I hope, those phrases will, by his followers, not again be pleaded for Suretyship-Imputation.

Q. 4 3. How
Mr. M's Defence answered.

Sec. 3. How dogmatically spoken is it, pag. 76. "That if it be the same Righteousness in which Christ and we stand, he and we are, so far as that righteousness makes "righteous, equally righteous?" But, Sir, he and we come not alike by it; and we depend on it, as in him, for all: He stands not in it so as to need forgiveness, which we do; yea, that forgiveness is oft repeated to us after we are made righteous: He is by it entitled to much more than we are, &c. of which elsewhere. And since he infers an equality from a sameness, let me ask: Are we as spiritual as Christ? And yet it is the same Spirit that is in Christ and in us. Are we as much beloved by God, as Christ our Mediator is? And yet Christ says, Thou hast loved them as thou hast loved me; —that the Love wherewith thou hast loved me may be in them: Here's As, and the same Love, yet it were Impudence to pretend to be loved equally. Yea, our Lord says, The Glory which thou gavest me, I have given them: Here's the same Glory, but must we be as glorious as Christ in equality? Alas! Do not we see, that the same Guilt of a Fact may lie upon many, and yet all not be guilty in the same degree? Judge then, what an air of Assurance doth this short-sighted man breathe forth in the next words, "I can hardly think "any man is so forsaken of common under- "standing, as to deny it:" Because he cannot
cannot give convincing light, he will threaten us into it by calling us mad; and had he thought this would have sent more open mouths after us, he would have given us this term instead of Semisocinians, men that hold damning blasphemous Errors, and what not. But any man, that intimately knew Mr. Baxter (whom he loads with these Titles as well as others,) and Mr. Mather, would not be long concluding, which had more understanding, truth, love to God and man, publick-spiritedness, godliness, integrity, and whatever makes a Gospel-spirit and the Image of Christ upon a man; to say nothing of humility, good nature, freedom from envy and malice, &c. Yea, God blessed him more to the real Conversion of Souls, than a hundred Mr. Mather's; notwithstanding his charging him, with rejecting the counsel of God against himself; pag. io. and holding pernicious Soul-destroying Errors; pag. 46. for it is him, whose words he puts there in a broken light.

4. He very oddly evades the Charge of the Assembly, who declare, "This Communion which the Saints have with Christ, Confess. chap. 26. a. 3. doth not make them in any wise partakers of the substance of his God-head, or to be equal with Christ in any respect; either of which to affirm, is impious and blasphemous:" This Place I cited, but would not repeat the words at Piner's.
Mr. M's Defence answered.

Sect. ner's-Hall. To this he tells us, pag. 76.

II. "This must be understood in a limited sense, &c. for taken absolutely, it will not hold: Believers are men equally with Christ, &c." I answer, True; for he hath almost told us, we are hail fellows with Christ: He was not humbled in being a man, nor is he dishonoured in our being as righteous as he; yea, we are told, pag. 7, "Christ's Incarnation may as justly be said to be a part of his Exaltation, as of his Humiliation." But though the Assembly intend not the being of a man in what they so severely brand, yet they mean nothing if they exclude what is so great a Perfection of Christ as his Righteousness is, when they fix Blasphemy on saying we are equal with Christ in any respect: They must think his Righteousness such a Prerogative, that they who will equal Christ in this, may next ask of him his Kingdom also; and Mr. Mather hath given us a handle for that, upon our very being as righteous as Christ. For, pag. 25, he at large shews, that Christ hath two Titles to Glory, a natural one, and an accumulated one, viz. an acquired Title as our Surety: And if you ask, what Glory that is, you'll find, pag. 56. "It is that special Revenue of Glory and Praise, which the Father, who begat his Son from eternity, and loving him with an infinite Love, designd him." Now then, if Christ's Title to all
all his acquired Glory be his Sureship-righteousness, and as to that we are as righteous as be in equality, what can hinder us, not only to have that very same Title to Heaven and Glory, as Christ hath as he is our Sponsor? but, I say, what can hinder Believers Claim and Title to the very same high Throne in Heaven, and to the very same degree of Glory, which Christ, as their Surety, hath a Title to? since Christ hath it for that very Righteousness, which they have as much of as he himself; and that God gives, or rather pays them all of remunerative Justice; and that they are one mystical Person with Christ: All which this modest Author affirms, pag. 15, 55. Reader judge, is this no other equality than in being men as well as Christ?

5. Though he talks so much of Sureship-righteousness, he gives an uncertain Sound of that Bond wherein Christ and believers come into that legal oneness. For,

(1.) One while "he was constituted a "Surety in that Covenant between God "and him;" pag. 10. and thereby "there "was a legal Union, and this Union was "from everlasting, and it was of supercre- "ation Grace, and perfected in the tranf- "action between God and Christ." Pag. 59, 60. Reader know, that I grant, there was a Covenant of Redemption before time, and that therein Christ undertook to redeem and save elect Sinners, &c. But yet I de-
Sect. ny, that by that Covenant Christ and the
II. Elect were eternally one legal Person, or that
he is their Surety in such a sense, as will render
them legally esteemed to do and suffer all that Christ did pursuant to that
Covenant; or that thereby they are as righteous as he. Thou wilt find my argu-
ments in this Book; at present it is enough to say, We were never Principals in that
Covenant, and therefore Christ could not be such a Surety. The thing insisted on in
that Covenant was Redemption-work, and the Salvation of Sinners, as fallen; but the
redeeming and saving of Sinners, or ourselves as Sinners, was never proposed to us
as our Duty; it was inconsistent and impossible to our State as fallen. And with
his leave, as it looks strange, the Elect should have two legal heads at once, viz.
Christ and Adam; so if Christ and men were eternally one legal Person, I doubt, it
may as well be proved, that Christ legally broke the Law in the Elect's breaking it,
as that the Elect kept the Law in Christ's keeping it. Well, thus far here's a Surety
without a Principal, and a work or debt which none was ever bound to, but him
that is called a Surety in such a sense that many must be said to do and pay as much
as he.

(2.) Another while "Christ's name"
"was put into the original Bond, in which
"we by the Law and Covenant of our
"Cre-
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"Creation were bound." Pag. 10. He told Sect. us before, he was constituted a Surety in another Bond, viz. the eternal Compact: And if so, then his name is put into this Bond, in performance of his antecedent Suretyship, and he is not made a Surety by putting his name in this Bond: Whence it follows, that what he doth pay of this Bond, can be said to be paid by us no otherwise, than according to the nature of his Suretyship in the former Bond, wherein we have seen he was principal and sole undertaker. I am glad by this that I need not argue with him, that if Christ was a proper pecuniary Surety with us in the Covenant of works, then it was either absolutely or disjunctively: If absolutely, that he would keep it, then we were not Parties at all engaged: If disjunctively, that either we or he would keep it, then it was never broken; for he hath kept it, and his obedience, without any suffering, sufficed to fulfil it, &c. But Mr. Mather granting, (and that truly,) that Christ was constituted Surety in the Covenant of Redemption, prevents my insisting on such things. Only still note, as I have elsewhere proved, that Christ's being made under the Law (which he means by putting his name in the Bond,) was the effect of Christ's Suretyship.

(3.) Yet inconsistently enough he says, pag. 14. "Christ was made our Surety, his Name was put not only into the Co-
Mr. M's Defence answered.

Sec. "Venant of works, but into it as a broken Covenant." Here all is ruffled again, and how shall we unriddle it? He was but now constituted a Surety in the eternal Bond, but here he is made a Surety in the broken Bond: He that distinguished between assuming our nature and being conceived, no doubt, will find some Difference between constituted a Surety, and made a Surety; for that he must do, or he contradicts himself. Well, I grant that Christ came in our nature to obey the Law we had broken, and bear the punishment we had deserved, and to answer the end of the Law which we had frustrated. But that will not make him such a Surety in this broken Bond, as shall make us legally accounted to do all, and suffer and answer all, and be as righteous as he that did it; though it be in his very Righteousness that we are saved, notwithstanding we have failed in all this. For I ask, when he put his name in this broken Bond? Sure, not before it was broken, for then he was Surety before. Again, when he did put his name, did he do it to the very same purpose as we were originally bound, viz. that we might live by our innocency and obedience as our righteousness? No, it was to redeem us from the effects of our own disobedience. Did he engage, that we should do and suffer what would be a Price of our redemption and salvation? No, he was to do it himself
himself in his own legal Person: I say legal, because the divine dignity of his Person gave the legal; yea, suprālegal Value in God's account to what he did and suffered; for one mere Man's doing and suffering what the mere Law enjoined, would not have satisfied for millions; and the broken Bond itself did not require a divine Person's obeying any more than the whole Bond did, though the Attainment of its ends did so. Again, if Christ's Suretyship was so limited within this broken Bond, then as he was bound to do and suffer no more than it required, so neither he nor we are entitled by that Obedience to any more than this broken Bond at first covenanted to give.

Yea further, Mr. Mather faith, pag. 57. "The Elect were constituted (at first) under another Head, and under another Covenant, which had nothing in it of Christ and his Righteousness, either to be brought in for them, or to be applied to them."

Repl. But if Christ's righteousness be no higher than that Covenant did require before it was broken, the righteousness of perfect Adam had been as great as Christ's: And if the unbroken Covenant was the same as the broken Bond, How should the unbroken Covenant neither have nor require any righteousness of Christ's, and yet the broken Bond measure and limit Christ's right-
righteousness, and sentence us legally righteous for it? But if, as Mr. Mather faith, the Covenant with Adam and the Elect was another Covenant from the broken Bond; then we are not under the Covenant requiring what at first it enjoined; and being federating Parties only in the first, and subjected to penalty by it only as it is broken, here’s no obedience-work for a Surety, nor place for a proper Surety in bearing the penalties. But I have elsewhere enlarged, and therefore conclude; That such confusion about the Suretiship should abate men’s regard to his censures against such, as will not own he himself knows not what, and proveth none sees how.

6. I find after all, that this equality of Righteousness between Christ and us, is not so much from legal union, or judicial imputation, but from a coalescence of believers into one mystical Person with Christ by a Vital Union. Thus we are told, pag. 55: "Between our believing and our being justified, there comes in our coalescing into one mystical Person with Christ by this Vital Union, and our having his righteousness upon us unto the justification of life; and so our being justified is not the next or immediate effect of our believing, &c." Here indeed, if I understand what one person is, he may well argue we are as righteous as Christ; for we are christified with Christ, not in name,
name, or on account of his undertaking, Sect. II. his mystical body; but as being one mystical Person, opposed to a legal Person: So that by pointing at any Believer, you may avoid the danger of that saying, If you believe not that I am he, you shall die in your sins. Mr. Mather may rise higher, than that we are as righteous as Christ, and say, we are as holy as Christ, as honorable as Christ, as wise as Christ; and so interpret his proof from 1 Cor. i. 30. Nay, are we not assumed into a personal union with the Eternal Word, as the human nature of Christ is? which I think is unavoidable, unless Christ hath more Persons than one; besides, his being a legal Person, which he opposeth this mystical Person to. And that he means something like this, hear what he says, pag. 60. "It is called a Vital Union, because in effecting it there is a vital touch, as I may say, between Christ and us, and a clasping each on other." Compare this with what he afterwards declares, pag. 63. "The human nature of Christ leans on the Godhead in the Son, and hath the eternal power of the Deity clasping about it, and holding it in that Union: After somewhat of a similitudinary way, though with great dissimilitude and disparity, do we by Faith lean and live upon Christ, the eternal power of the Godhead in Christ, (and not R " so
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Sect. "so much the strength of any created
II. "principle of Grace in us,) holding our
"hearts unto him, and causing them for
"ever to live upon him." Can you find
much difference, though he pretend a dis-
proportion? The awfulness of the Subject
restrains me from exposing this affected
Cant, which is the only Gospel with these
men, because it is Mystery, that is, unin-
telligible Nonsense fitted to a Rosocrucian,
or a Beheimist. It is not enough, that Christ
is the Author of all in us, and the Securer
of all promised good to us; and that he
condescended to confirm this, and to com-
fort our souls, by such gracious Instances of
a mystical union, as that between the Vine
and Branches, the Head and Members, the
Husband and Wife; yea, that the same
Spirit dwells in Christ and us; each of
which inform, and assure to us, the Bless-
ing designed to be signified thereby, but
not whatever our profane Fancies may wrest
a metaphor, or force an expression to. Must
men strain it to one Person, whereby Christ's
Prerogatives and our vile Defects are in
common to Christ and us? Is this to let
Christ in all things have the Prehevinence?
The Scriptures needed not so many meta-
phors, to represent to us the several Bene-
fits we have by Union with Christ: This
one would have served for all, yea, far
exceeded all: Only that one Person would
consist but with few of them, nay with
none;
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none; Head and Members do not make one Person, but one Body; yea, one Spirit in Christ and us, doth not make one Person; unless you'll make the Holy Ghost to be an animating Soul to the Body, and so to be the chief constituent part of the whole Person. What will a deluded vain Fancy expose men to at last?

S E C T. III.

THIRDLY, I shall add some Exceptions against some other passages in Mr. Mather's Book.

I have been already engaged to hint at some; yet among many obnoxious enough, let us consider some more of his Stamina.

I. He declares, pag. 56. "God hath ordained Christ to do all with God for the Elect, and that he shall be all from God to them: —All, I say, that in this ruined condition they need to bring them to that height of Happiness, &c." Pag. 58.

Repl. If he had meant only, that Christ was to do all with God in a way of satisfaction, impetration, merit, or intercession, it were true; but as he words it, it may be very erroneous; and it is to scrue in an Error, he doth thus express it. Hence, because
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Sect. because he finds Repentance and Faith are
III. so necessary to our salvation, he hath in his
Pulpit endeavoured to inform men, how
Christ repented, that he repented for us;
and though he doth not publish it in this
Sermon, as he did elsewhere, that Christ
believed for us; yet you'll see presently,
how much he endeavours to convince us
that he did so; for if he believed whilst
humbled, it was for us; and it is imputed
to us, as he oft in this Book affirms. Had
I Mr. Mather's liberty, what would I call
this Error? for though it is in Christ's
Strength and Grace that we repent, believe,
turn to God, and do good works; yet if
we do not these as our personal acts, Misery
will be our portion. If you (not I) believe
not, you shall die in your Sins: And, Except
you (not I) repent, you shall all perish; faith
Christ : And, I say unto you, Except your
righteousness (not mine) exceed the right-
eousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, you
shall in no case enter into the Kingdom of
Heaven. Had Mr. Mather been an Au-
ditor, surely he had not said, "Lord,
"thou understandest not the Gospel; it's
"thou art to do these things; this is the
"deep Counsel of God, however legally thou
"speakest:" He might as well say, It's
thou Christ shalt perish, as, thou Christ art
to repent.

II. He tells us, pag. 62. "Faith is a
"prime
"prime and principal part of our being."

And, pag. 63. "He is the first Pattern and original Copy of believing."

Repl. Is Christ's Faith the pattern of Faith in Christ? I remember somewhere Dr. Goodwin speaks of God's trusting Christ till he was Incarnate; and of Christ's trusting the Father since the time of his Sufferings: Yea, we may easily grant, that Christ believed God's promise; and, as a man, depended and relied on God's power and truth. But this is no other Faith than Adam in Innocency acted, or than the Law of works directed to. By this account we may think better of the State of Pagans, than most do; for without Gospel-revelation they may believe in God, trust him, and depend on him. But what is this to the account the Scripture gives of Faith in Christ? Did Christ come to himself as a Saviour? Did he receive himself as a crucified Redeemer? Did he eat his own flesh, and drink his own blood, for eternal Life? Did he plead his own Merits, and rely on his own Righteousness, for Pardon and restored Peace? Did he consent to be married to himself? Did he look to himself for healing? Or, to use Mr. Mathers account of Faith in this very page, Did he go out of himself unto himself for all? Yea, take part of his description of Faith in Christ, pag. 39. "The Subject
Sect. "of Faith is the heart of a convinced broken-hearted Sinner: The very nature of Faith, and the acting of the Soul in it, is such as doth imply and include a sight and sense of Sin and Misery, and a lively heart-influencing Conviction of utter helplessness in a man’s self, and unworthiness to be helped by God, &c.” Reader, Doth Christ’s Faith in the nature of it, imply a sense of utter helplessness and unworthiness in himself, or of his Sin and Misery? The reason he gives, for justling out such as Abraham, and setting up Christ for the original Copy of believing in himself, is this: “The human nature of Christ lives and subsists in the Second Person, leaning on the eternal Deity of the Son of God; it hath its subsistence in the bosom of the Godhead, &c. and hath the eternal power of the Deity clasping about it.” Pag. 63. The Apostle did not know this Faith, when he said that Charity was greater than Faith. Well, as sublime as this reason seems to be, I will venture to say, This is not that Faith in Christ which the Gospel requires of Sinners. And to this purpose, (1.) I will give you a reason of Mr. Mather’s, which be sure is none of the best; pag. 7. “Christ’s dwelling in our nature is no part of the punishment of Sin; for then the Divine nature only is punished, and not the Human at all, nor
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"nor the Person." It's a bad one for what he brings it, since that assuming the nature and dwelling in it differ; and I have answered it before, and it needs a great allowance to keep it from &c. But if the sufferings or acts of only one nature be not the sufferings or the acts of the Person of Christ; then the acting of Faith of the one nature on the other nature, is not acting of Faith upon the Person of Christ; and consequently not Gospel-Faith, which is to be acted on the Person of Christ: Here the human nature believes, but that is not with him, Christ that believes; it believes on the Divine nature, and that with him is not Christ who is believed on. What now is become of Christ's believing, even by his own reasoning?

(2.) The object of Faith in Christ, is God-Man Mediator, a crucified Christ, &c. but the Deity of the Son of God abstractedly considered, is not God-Man Mediator, &c. Truly if our Gospel-Faith is specified by this, I see not the need of Christ's Incarnation or Death, nor of regard thereto.

(3.) This leaning, and especially to the purposes assigned to this act of Christ's human nature, is not all that which is essential to the Faith in Christ which the Gospel requires. But why should I scribble the little Paper left? It's like the reasons he gave for Christ's repenting, viz. The repenting, proaches
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sect. III.

proaches of them that reproached thee, are fallen upon me; and he was a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief.

III. He plainly discovers his Mind to be, that Faith is an act of the Soul whilst spiritually dead and unregenerate. Pag. 61. he joins with such as say, "Faith is the means and way of our being made spiritually alive, rather than our acting Life, as being already brought into a state of Life; as the Body's clasp ing hold on the Soul by the animal Spirits, which are corporeal things, is rather the means of Life, than an act of Life, &c." And, pag. 62. "Suppose that the principle of Grace, begotten and created in us in Regeneration, do contain in it the habit of Faith, which I will not now call in question; yet, &c." Again, pag. 32. "All our new Obedience, and all the Graces of the Spirit comprized under that one word Love, are the effects and fruits of our being justified." And, pag. 60. "In Union (by Faith, which is the cause of this Union,) we are brought immediately into a state of Spiritual Life, first relative, then qualitative, &c."

Repl. Here, with the Arminians, he denieth the habit of Faith to be necessary to the actings of Faith. He is contrary to the Assembly of Divines, who tell us, that "God in effectual Vocation, takes away the heart..."
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"heart of stone, and gives a heart of Flesh," sect. III.

"renewing their Wills, and by his power determining them to that which is good, and effectually drawing them to Jesus Christ:"

"To which they add, that renewing their Wills, and by his power determining them to that which is good, and effectually drawing them to Jesus Christ:"

"Man is altogether passive therein, until thereby quickned by the holy Spirit, he is thereby enabled to answer this Call, and to embrace the Grace offered, and conveyed in it." And in their Catechism we are told, "Faith justifies a sinner in the sight of God, not because of those other Graces which do always accompany it, or of good Works that are the fruits of it, &c." Here we see, that there is a quickning regenerating work and change on the Heart and Will, in order to the act of Faith; that there is no Faith unaccompanied at any time by other Graces; and that by good works they intend not such Graces, &c.

Did not Mr. Mather tell us, pag. 60. that in effecting our Vital Union, there is a vital touch, as I may say, between Christ and us, and a clasping each other. Is there a vital touch before Life, or a clasping while we are dead? Doth the Mind see Christ, whilst it's blind; or the Will embrace him, whilst it's morally dead, impotent, unpersuaded, and averse? Do we consent to Christ, and covenant with him, whilst Satan, Sin and Enmity reign in our faculties; or open the door to Christ, whilst these keep the keys? God faith, The natural man receiveth.
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Sect. receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, neither can be know them, because they are spiritually discerned: But Mr. Mather faith, Yea, it's while they are natural, that they see Christ and close with him. Here's a knowledge of an ignorant mind; here's a coming and receiving without Life: Here's a Faith the Gospel-covenant never promiseth; for it's not included in God's writing his Laws in the heart. The whole stress of Salvation is laid by him on an Act of a dead unregenerate sinner; and men are justified, while the Soul is not turned from darkness to light, nor from the power of Satan unto God. It were worth asking him, whose Act this act of Faith is? It's not a human act, unless you can suppose the Mind and Will can act without any vital principle, yea, against it's own prevailing principle: Here then must be a force, and unactiveness too, in our very acting; and it's a strange clasping of what we hate and abhor. I doubt, here may come in again Christ's believing for us. However,

(1.) He must think, that our Faith after we are alive, is either a Faith specifically distinct from that which justified us; or it's still an Act not effected by a regenerate principle, but is somewhat either below life, or above man, even when he is spiritualized. He seems to bid at both: His Simile is for the first; the Spirits, which he
he faith are corporeal, clasp about the Soul sect. for Life; so it seems our Faith is a dead thing always, never made Life or living, any more than those Spirits are made soul; otherwise it looth its clasping meetness, as they would do in ceasing to be corporeal. Yet other times he makes it look like a Divinity clasping about us.

(2.) I do now see a little, why the man is so against God's giving us any saving benefit in any way of Reward, though not of debt: It's because Faith is the only thing ordained, (not required,) as a physical means on our part; and this is so low a thing, that a dead sinner may act; or so sublime, as not to be a human act.

(3.) Again, I see why he doth still confine our Justification to the end, to the first act of Faith; yea, and deny the immediate influence of Faith on our Justification: For if you should bring it among Duties, or to be under the notion of a Duty, all is spoiled: No, it must be a mere physical Band of union, not enjoined by God as our Ruler, but appointed as the corporeal Spirits for Ligaments. I dare not touch the Philosophy part of that, lest if I name Embrio, he should curse me anew.

(4.) I know now at last, why he thought me a Pelagian, (the selfish reason why he wrote it to London, I knew long since;) because I in a printed Sermon put the Act of Faith after spiritual Life. It seems,
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Sect. seems, I should have said with him, pag. 60.

III. "That in Union with Christ as one mystical Person, (which is by the efficient causality of Faith,) we are brought immediately into a state of Spiritual Life, first relative in our Justification and Adoption, and then and thereupon qualitative, &c." His proofs for Faith before Life, because Christ promiseth Life upon believing, are contemptible; as if further Spiritual Life, and Pardon, and eternal Glory, be not Life, as well as Hell is Death, and some sinners twice dead.

IV. The Faith he so much insists on, hath not all the essentials of a saving Faith. I know many worthy men distinguish between Faith quae justificat, and qua justificat; and no doubt, the Soul hath an especial respect to Christ as Priest, and to his Righteousness in order to Justification. But our discourse is of the Faith quae justificat. What that Faith is, he tells us, pag. 62. "Faith is a going out of ourselves "unto Christ for all." And pag. 40. "The heart's acting towards this object in "its believing, is most properly in a way "of trust, and dependance, and affiliation."

Repl. [1.] We have just seen, it wants a vital principle, as it is the Act of an unregenerate dead Soul. Now this brings it, in the Judgment of most Divines, to be no saving act at all, no saving Faith, because
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cause the act of a natural and dead Sinner. Sect.

[2.] I need not mention, that it is no obediential act. And note, That when our Divines deny, that Faith is not imputed as an act of believing, or as an evangelical act of obedience; they say, it's not as such imputed as our justifying righteousness, which I grant. But they positively affirm, that the Faith by which Christ's righteousness becomes imputed, is an act of evangelical obedience. Again, [3.] I will not insist how far the assent of this Faith is limited, as to its object, as well as its nature.

[4.] I grant, that by Gospel-faith we trust in, and depend on Christ as our only Saviour; and that by it we go out of ourselves to Christ for all atonement, merit, causality of acceptance of all we do, and Strength and Grace to enable us to all. Yet, [5.] See how much more the Assembly includes in saving Faith: "By this Faith, a Christi-

an believeth to be true whatever is revealed in the Word, for the Authority of God himself speaking therein; and act-eth differently upon that which each particular passage thereof containeth, yielding obedience to the Commands, trembling at the Threatnings, and embracing the Promises of God for this Life, and that which is to come: But the principal Acts of saving Faith are accepting, receiving, and resting upon Christ alone for Justification, Sanctifica-

a. 1.

ch. xiv.

a. 2.

Ibid.
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[7.] Here's no yielding up ourselves to our Redeemer's conduct, no dedication of ourselves to him as our owner, guide and ruler, nor consent or engagement, or purpose of heart, to do so: Whereas Gospel-Faith is such a trust of and on Christ, as includes a yielding up ourselves to him, to be saved by him in his own way; as he sets down the terms, viz. to deny ourselves, to take up our Cross, and be his Followers and Disciples. Isa. xliv. 5. Rom. vi. 13, 16. Luke xiv. 26, 27, 33. Jer. xxx. 21. [8.] Here's no purpose of heart to renounce the World, Flesh, and Devil, who are Christ's rivals and competitors; to whom we before, did yield up ourselves. 1 Pet. iii. 21. Job. v. 44. That must be surely a strange conjugal consent, wherein the Wife promiseth no duty or loyalty; only expects all to be done for her. But yet,

Obj. If we trust and lean on Christ, we shall do these.

Anf. (1.) It is as true, if we do these, we shall and do lean on Christ; and by that rule we may as well call these Faith, and leave out that. (2.) It is not a saving Trust in Christ, that doth exclude these, or is without them. This is plain; because the act of Gospel-Faith is oft expressed by these,
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these, as well as by Trust; and a Sentence Sect. of condemnation lies still upon a Soul that III. wants these, and is under the power of their contraries. We will not have this man Luke xix. to reign over us, was the language of un- 14, 27- belief; and for this they were subject to death. (3.) The Scriptures tell us of instances of a Trust and leaning, that proved destructive for want of these other things, and certainly will prove so to all others. Thus it is said, The Priests teach for hire, Mic.iii.15; and the Prophets divine for money; yet they will lean upon the Lord, and say, Is not the Lord among us? none evil can come upon us. Nor is it to be doubted but the foolish Vir- gins had a degree of Trust in Christ; yet were they lost for want of Oil, though they looked for so much from him. Yea, (4.) As he wordeth it, and joineth it in other places, it looks to be a mere contemplative act, which as a man that's unregenerate doth with him perform, so a carnal man may do it for indulging his Sloth and Carelessness; as if he were to say, "I will now and " then apply to this meditation, Christ shall " do all for me; I trust him to do so, and " therefore I am safe, tho' I do no more; " yea, I shall be damned if I strive to do " any thing else as a means of obtaining " saving benefits, though it be in Christ's " righteousness that I expect all," And yet we are expressly warned, Not every one Mat. vii. that crieth, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the 21. kingdom
V. He ascribes too much to Faith, as imperfect, dead, and unholy a thing as he makes it; even more than I dare for a world ascribe to that which is the true Gospel-condition. For he expressly tells us, pag. 51. "There is between our believing and this righteousness being upon us, a reference of Causality."

Repl. We must be Soul-destroyers, and be destroyed, for saying, God requires Faith, suspending Pardon till we believe, and by his Promise securing it to us when we believe; though we expressly deny all causal Influence; and confine the condition to the mere frame of the object; and do leave Justification in all its causes entire, as the Benefit to be given in Christ's right to him that is a believer. Yet our Accuser, Witness, and Judge, can innocently cry up a Causality; a real and proper Causality; a mediate Causality of Justification, an immediate Causality of Union with Christ, which is the greater benefit: Pag. 52. My short Legs can follow these small strides. It's a cause of Justification; but how? By more than that rule, Causa causæ est causa causati. Faith is a cause of Union, that Union is a cause of Christ's righteousness being upon us, and that righteousness being upon
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upon us is the cause of Justification; and Faith is an influential cause of Justification. If you go forward with what Justification is the cause of, and what that is also a cause of, Faith is a cause of even as much, and in the same sort as it is of Justification; and if you go backward to the next cause of Faith, and to the cause of that, even all that is the cause of Justification, as much, and in the same sort as Faith is. And what kind of cause is Faith in all? It's always with him a Physical cause, a natural touch and claspine. Yet pag. 52. he faith, It's by God's constitution or ordination: Hopeful words! but he soon throws it out of a moral Causality again, and brings it to the corporeal Spirits clasping about the Soul. Here's a Covenant-consent, without an act considered as any way moral; a strange thing to any man of sense, who must know, that Acts are considered only as moral acts in every Covenant.

VI. He accounts all performance of any Duty with an expectation of any saving benefits as morally connected therewith, to be in a legal manner and Spirit, from legal or old Covenant principles, and unto old Covenant ends, &c. pag. 28. Compare pag. 71.

Repl. I have fully proved, that though nothing done by us is the righteousness wherein we stand before a just God, nor is the merit of any Good, or any atonement for
Sect. for Sin, or instead of a legal righteousness:

III. Yet there is in the Gospel a display of Authority, though in a way of Grace, and a restores way fixed for giving out the effects of Christ's obedience in his righteousness, as benefits encouraging to duty: And in that way we must expect them to the glory of God's Truth and Promises, and we wickedly presume in expecting them otherwise; and hereby Obedience to Christ and the Righteousness of Christ are not opposed, nor old Covenant-ends pursued. Mr. Mother faith, pag. 49. "Faith hath no Influence, no not so much as in a way of Instrumentality, to confer upon us a right and title to Christ's righteousness; all the Influence that Faith hath, is only to our actual possession of it." I grant, [1.] That Faith is not our justifying righteousness. [2.] That Christ hath merited, the Elect shall have it. [3.] That it is the Gospel-promise is our title and charter. Yea, [4.] I deny all causal Influence to our possession. But as to him, who ascribes to Faith a Causality, I would ask, (1.) Doth not the Gospel adjust by its Promise, that it is the Believer it will invest in this possession of righteousness? (2.) Doth not this Promise entitle a Believer to this possession, and bar the Unbeliever. (3.) Doth Faith then no way affect our right or title to the possession thereof? Doth it not render us the persons whom it so entitleth thereto? And is this nothing,
nothing, though it be not the righteousness for which we are justified, as legal obedience was to be?

VII. He ventures too far, in making the Crown of Glory and Justification to be effects of strict remunerative justice as to us; which is untrue, notwithstanding Christ's righteousness is imputed to us. Pag. 12, 13, 15. Among many other expressions of this kind, he faith, "It is the constitution of God, that all the saving Good and Blessing which shall be given us, shall be given, not only from Free-Grace, but by the hand of Justice."

Repl. If he mean only, that the Consideration upon which all saving Good was granted, is a Righteousness that answered strict Justice; I grant it. But to say, (which he seems fully to intend,) that the Righteousness of Christ is so imputed to us, as that Benefits are actually conferred on us in a way of remunerative justice as to us, I deny it, and say, It is a thousandfold worse, than they whom he condemns durst ever have a thought of. I own also, it's a reward of Justice to Christ, that Believers should be justified and glorified: But Justification and Glory are given of mere Grace to those Believers, though in a Gospel-way of Government. They cannot plead, "Now, Lord, I have Christ's righteousness on me, I have a Claim to these,
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Sect. III. "these, as a debt or reward due to me from " remunerative Justice:" For tho' Christ give the Crown in his own right, and by his right we have that Crown secured; yet he reserves the Claim of Justice to his own Person, and we must accept of all, even at God's hand, of Gift. Sinners shall not have the Saviour's Plea in themselves, tho' he will plead it for their Good. There is more spiritual Pride in this kind of Talk, than many imagine: The Gift of God is eternal Life, even when he gives it; and it is not only as to antecedent causes, we look for the mercy of Christ unto eternal Life: And it's still for Christ's sake we must intreat and expect, and not for our own, nor for any thing as it's ours, whatever be the effect of the Imputation of Christ's righteousness on us.

VIII. That which he calls telling a Story to us of the deep Counsels of the Wisdom and Grace of God, how this righteousness is upon us, from its first and highest Original, (pag. 56.) is in several things an unsafe account, and greatly to the dishonour of Father, Son, and Spirit. Some parts of it I have already considered; I now shall briefly observe these things, [1.] He strikes at the essential Glory of the Son of God. [2.] He describes the Fall of man in a way very dishonourable to God. [3.] He much mistakes what is most properly the
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the Glory of God. And, [4.] He leaves out man's acknowledgment of the Holy Spirit in the work of Salvation.

[1.] Mr. Mather strikes at the essential Glory of the Son of God. Before I prove this, I would premise, (1.) The Son of God as Second Person in the Trinity, is equal to the Father in Essence and Glory, though he be of the Father, as to the mode and manner of Subsistence. Hence he hath the same Divine perfections and glory. (2.) Whatever is ascribed to Christ, before he assumed the human nature, must be such as is consistent with his divine nature as the Son of God, and proper thereto. (3.) Nothing is added to the divine nature as in Christ, by its union to the human nature, besides relation to that human nature. (4.) The Person of the Son of God was compleat, before he assumed the human nature; and therefore the human nature is no constitutive part of the Second Person; but, as Dr. Ames well faith, is only as an adjunct. If Mr. Mather mean more, it's horridly dangerous, when he faith, pag. 8. "The human nature belongs to the constitution of Christ's Person as he now is:" And it looks the worse for his words, pag. 7. "Christ's dwelling in our nature is no part of the Punishment of Sin, for then the divine nature only is punished, and not the human at all, nor the Person:" As if what terminated on
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Section one: Nature only, did not terminate on Christ's Person; and by the same rule, the acts confined to one nature, as their Principle, are not the acts of his Person, unless they be the acts of both natures. 

(5.) Since the Incarnation, we frequently meet with a personal communication of properties; and what is proper to either of the two natures, is ascribed to Christ as God-Man; as Christ died, &c. (6.) Yet there is neither a transfusion or communication of the properties of one nature to the other; nor must we ascribe to his Person any thing in any manner that would tend to the confusion of the two natures. 

(7.) All the Glory or Humiliation that can be justly ascribed to the Son of God as such, cannot infer any change in or addition to him, and must be confined to what is manifestative and relative: His Glory may appear more, but cannot be added to; it may be obscured, but it cannot be really diminished. (8.) Hence whatever addition of real Glory or afflictive Suffering belongs to Christ, it is with respect to his human nature: This only was capable of rewards, of being exalted, of being deserted, of God's hiding his face, and of dying. I shall now evidence, that Mr. Mather strikes at the essential Glory of Christ, as the eternal Son of God.

1. He makes Christ, as the eternal Son of God, capable of an addition to his real Glory
Glory as God. Pag. 56. "God the Father Sect. III. from eternity begat his Son, the Second Person in the Trinity, and loving him with an infinite Love, designed a special Revenue of Glory, and Honour, and Praise unto him, as from all his Creatures in their kind and way, so more eminently from and in a certain number of mankind:" To which he adds, "The end and upshot, and last Issue, that all his counsels about them come to, is this, that they may be brought to the acknowledgment of the Son of God, &c." And, pag. 61. "You see how the grand original Design of God, to bring in a Revenue of singular Honour, and Praise, and Glory, to his Son Christ, is in this way brought about, &c." I shall presently repeat more: Let us consider,

(1.) It is plain, he intends the Son of God as such: It is he, as begotten from Eternity; he, as the Second Person in the Trinity; it's he, as loved with an infinite Love; yea, from his being so infinitely beloved as God's eternal Son, the Contrivance had its Rise. The Design in the upshot is, that he might be acknowledged to be that Son of God. It cannot be meant, that this additional Glory might be designed for him, as foreseen Mediator, or as in Flesh: For this Design is the first step, and this Glory of the Son is the Original of all the contrivance: He was, pursuant to this purpose,
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Sect. purpose, made a Mediator and legal Head; and he tells us, to confirm this, pag. 56. "That for this end of bringing a Revenue " of Glory to his Son, in the Salvation of " the Elect, God ordained, that he shall " do all with God for them, and that he " shall be all from God unto them;" which is his second step: And therefore what is sub-
sequent to the other in Intention, cannot be before it; his Office and Incarnation are but means to this end. So that no doubt can remain, that Christ is in this Design considered as the eternal Son of God.

(2.) Let us weigh how he describes the Glory intended. It is a special Re-
venue of Glory and Honour: It is a Revenue of singular Honour and Glory; somewhat that made him more glorious than he was, as the Son of God: Nay, it was his being acknowledged to be the Son of God, which is the upshot of the Design about him; as if though he were Son before, yet he would not have been acknowledged to be the Son of God, without this added Revenue of Glory. But again,

2. He makes the eternal Son of God considered as to his Divine Nature, to be for a while under the frowns and displea-
sure of God. Pag. 25. And,

3. He makes the eternal Son of God as God, to be capable of an acquired right, (superadded to his natural right,) even to his essential Glory as God; and also of an ac-
quired
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quired right to that Love, which he enjoyed as the Son of God in the Divine Nature before he was the Son of Man. Take his words, pag. 25. "It is true, Christ hath another title and right, both to the Love of God, and unto Heavenly Glory, viz. by the prerogative of his Birth, I mean his Eternal Generation, as he is the only begotten Son of God: But though he was rich, yet such is his Grace, that for our sakes he became poor; he consented (not to forego his title, but) for a time to forego the actual enjoyment of the full fruit and benefit of it. He was contented to lay aside his Glory for a time, and to dwell here below on earth under the frowns and displeasure of God his Father, until he should fully, to the utmost farthing, have paid our debt: But then he was to be restored and raised up to the enjoyment of his Father's Love, and Heavenly Glory, in the virtue of that forementioned double right or title, viz. both as the Son of God by Nature, and also as having discharged all the debt of the Elect as their Surety; this latter being accumulated and superinduced upon the former, and therefore being not a natural, but an acquired title." Where,

(1.) You see, that it is the eternal Son of God, considered as to his Divine Nature, which was under God's frowns and
Sect. displease. For it was only as to that nature his Person was the subject of God's Love before his Incarnation, and it was that Love alone that he could be restored and raised to, which he had before his Incarnation; and there could not be a restoring and raising to the enjoyment of this Love as to this nature, unless that he was under the frowns and displeasure of his Father as to his Divine Nature. For in whatever nature he enjoyed the Love of God, before he did forego the enjoyment of it, and to the enjoyment of which he was raised and restored, that must be the nature in which he endured those frowns and displeasure, which are opposed to the actual enjoyment of that former Love. He tells us, that he did forego the actual enjoyment of this Love, and so dwelt under his Father's frowns here below on Earth; therefore it must be as to his Divine Nature he did forego the enjoyment of that Love and Glory: And consequently, as to that nature he endured the opposite frowns; since that he had not enjoyed that Love in his human nature, before he dwelt on Earth. And,

(2.) It is as plain, that he makes the eternal Son of God, as to his Divine Nature, to have a superadded right to that essential Glory from God which he had a former natural right to: For the Glory he enjoyed before his Incarnation, was his essential Glory as the Son of God; and it was
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his essentia] Glory he had a natural right to. Again, he had no Glory in his human nature before he was man, to be restored to; therefore the Glory he had an acquired right to, being a Glory to which he was restored and raised, must be his essential Glory enjoyed only by the Divine Nature: He could be restored to the actual enjoyment of no Glory, but what he actually had before he assumed our Flesh, and could not be restored to any Glory which he had not till he assumed our Flesh. The matter is the same, as to the Love that his Father bare to him as his eternal Son: For it is the Love he was restored to the enjoyment of, which Christ is said by Mr. Matter to have an acquired superadded Right to; which must be no other than he was the Object of before his Incarnation: Yea, he declares, it is that very love and glory which was due to him by the prerogative of his Birth, that he had this superadded title to; yea, even that which he did not forego his title to, though he did forego the actual enjoyment of it for a while; and to this he was restored in the virtue of this double right. So he tells us, Christ was rich, yet he became poor: How poor? By foregoing the actual enjoyment of the full fruit and benefit of it, which he enjoyed before. The meaning of the place he refers to is, that though the Son of God was maker and heir of all things, yet, as to his human
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Sect. human nature, he was in a necessitous
III. suffering case. But hence Mr. Mather in-
fers, that Christ, as the Son of God, did
forego the actual enjoyment of the full fruit
of his Inheritance, which he fully possessed
before; and in that respect was poor: This
is plainly his Sense, for he speaks of his be-
ing rich, as he was antecedently to his In-
carnation, as to enjoyment as well as title;
as to which Riches he did not forego his
title, as he was the Son of God; and yet,
the full benefit of those very Riches, he was
so entitled to as Son of God, he did forego
the actual enjoyment of: Whereas he might
as well say, he did forego the enjoyment
of all the benefits as of any, and as well of
his title as of the enjoyment; all being
alike possible to the Son of God, who still
enjoyed that whole Inheritance to the full
as Son of God, as he enjoyed it by his
title before he was the Son of Man. To
forego the manifestation, and the actual en-
joyment, differ as to his Glory: And as to
Riches, it is one thing for the human na-
ture to want; and for the divine nature to
abate any enjoyment of what it was en-
titled to, is quite another thing. A poor
God is a wild Phrase. But should it be
said,

Obj. Had Christ, as our Redeemer, a
right to no Glory as a Reward? I answer,
(1.) Yes, to a Glory and Riches as to his hu-
man nature. But, (2.) That was not a refo-
ration
ration of what the Son, as God, enjoyed before his Incarnation; but a Glory and Riches granted as to his human nature, which fully commenced upon his Exaltation, though eternally decreed: And to both indeed there was a title, from the Union of the human nature to the Divine Person; and also as a Reward of what was suffered and done in the human nature. Yea, (3.) The utmost Glory belonging to or received by Christ as acquired, was of another kind than what belonged to him as God, and which he enjoyed before his Incarnation. The one is dependent, the other independent; the one is Creature-Glory, though above Angels, the other is increated, essential, and divine, even the same with the Father's. Again, if it be said,

Obj. Did not Christ lay by his Divine Glory? I answer, (1.) He could no more part with it, no, nor with the enjoyment of it, than he could part with his Divine Essence. Yet, (2.) He voluntarily agreed to have it veiled as to manifestation for a time; but did not in the least quit the enjoyment of it as the Son of God. And hereupon, (3.) The sensible communications of it, and of the Divine Favour, were a while much suspended from the human nature: But considered as the Son of God, he always alike possessed and perceived the Divine Glory and Favour. The Father could as well be displeased with himself,
Sect. as with his Son, as he was God. And hence, (4.) Though what Christ did and suffered, did entitle him to the restoring of the sensible enjoyments of the Divine Favour to the human nature, yet there was no place or room for acquiring a right to any sensible communications of Love, Riches, or Glory to him, as Son of God: For they were never suspended, they were essential to him; and to suppose an acquired right, were to make that Love and Glory dependent, and to bring them within a Creature's state; whereas you may see Christ in his humbled State, when he speaks as the Son of God, still asserting his title and possession in Equality with the Father, yea, and declaring them to be the same. *Job. xvi. 15. Job. v. 18, 19, 26. Job. i. 18.*

Reader, judge how he honoureth Christ. I could tell him, what names the antient Church gave to such a Heresy; but I better like, that he gives to my opinion causlessly the name of Blasphemy, than that I should give so just a cause, though I met with a man so mild, as should hope it was only ignorant. The Son of God, as God, to be capable of an addition of real Glory; to be the Object of God's frowns and displeasure, and capable of parting with the enjoyment of God's Favour, and the Glory and Riches he had before he was Incarnate; and to have an acquired right to that
that essential Glory, and Love, and Riches, Sect. superadded to his natural right thereto; are such Positions, as should make a man tremble how he ventures afterwards to meddle beyond his depth. My concern for these things prevents my using the advantage Mr. Mather gives me.

[2.] He describeth the Fall of man in a manner very dishonourable to God: For he makes it a designed necessary means resolved on, to bring to the Son of God that Revenue of honour and praise which the Father had before designed for him. This is fully expressed by him in his Model of the eternal Decrees. The first Step is, the design of that Revenue of glory to the Son. The second is, Christ's being to do all for the Elect with God for them, &c. The third is, making man innocent. The fourth is, the Fall of man. The fifth is, the double Union issuing in legal and mystical Persons. The sixth is, that Faith is the means of mystical Union. And the seventh is, that this Faith in its nature is to rest on Christ for all. Pag. 56,—60. The thing I infer is, that the Fall being the fourth Step, must needs be a thing resolved on, in the Father's design of a Revenue of glory to Christ by some men's acknowledging him to be the Son; for that's first in order resolved, and then the Fall appointed (not over-ruled) as a necessary means thereto; as that by which he was to obtain
obtain this Glory, and without which he
must have gone without it, and been li-
mitied to the privilege of his Birth. There-
fore he tells us, pag. 58. "This Fall of
the Elect into a state of Sin, and Death,
and Wrath, may seem somewhat remote
from the point in hand: But it is not;
for hereby a Door is opened to the Son
of God to step in, and do all with God
for them, that in this ruined condition
they need, &c. So that as Christ speaks
of the blindness of him who was blind
from the womb, Job. ix. 3. that it was
that the works of God might be made man-
ifest in him; we may say this of the
Fall of the Elect, it was in the Counsel
of God designed to this end, that the depths
of the riches of the knowledge and wis-
dom, and grace, and power of God,
might be made manifest in them: And
as Christ speaks of Lazarus his sickness
and dying, Job. xi. 4. that it was not
unto death, &c. So must we say of this
falling of the Elect into a state of spiri-
tual death in sin and trespasses; it is
not unto death for ever, but for the Glory
of God, that the Son of God might be glo-
"nified in recovering them."

Repl. (1.) I am sure, the Son of God
did not need any such Glory; he had been
as happy and perfectly glorious as now he
is, though Man had stood. (2.) It seems
very disagreeable to the purity and good-
nes
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ness of God, to design the breaking of his own Laws, the destroying of the greatest part of mankind, the defacing of his own Image, the gratifying of the Devil in the sin and misery of men, such dishonour to his own name, &c. and this as a necessary means to glorify his Son: To decree the permission of the Fall, and to over-rule it to good ends, is another thing. (3.) By this Model it was as impossible for man to have stood, or for the most of mankind to have avoided Sin and eternal Ruin, as it was for man to have hindred God to give to his Son that special Revenue of glory that he designed for him; which I think would be a greater ease to the damned, than their consciences will feel, or the pleadings of God with men will import. (4.) It greatly abates that admiring and thankful regard to God and our Saviour, which the Scriptures always direct us to: For if Mr. Mather's Model be right, it was Love to the Son of God that brought men to need a Saviour, and not Love to Sinners that inclined God to give his Son, and the Son to give himself, to be a Saviour; as Job. iii. 16. The utmost which this Model can rise to is, that since God resolved for the Glory of his Son, that all should fall, into a state of sin, and death, and wrath, that thereby some of them might be to his Glory, they were ordained to be some of those; which indeed is a mercy,
but not so greatly displaying of Divine pity, love, and grace, as the Word represents it. And therefore, (5.) To suppose Man foreseen as fallen and self-ruined, and thereupon a Saviour ordained, to recover and actually save a certain number of these; and for this to be in his suffering nature rewarded, and eternally exalted, receiving the praises of his saved ones; fully answers the account the Scripture gives of the oecconomy of Redemption. Rev. i. 5, 6.

Man is supposed thus fallen, in all the texts which Mr. Mather cites for God's design of a Revenue of glory to his Son from the Elect. Eph. i. 3, 4, 5, 6. We are chosen in Christ; in what State? You'll see that, by the nature of the Blessings we are to obtain by him; to be holy, who were by the Fall unholy; to be without blame before him in love, who were so reproveable and hateful; to the adoption of Children, who had by Sin lost our natural birthright, and become aliens; to be accepted in the beloved to the praise of the glory of his Grace, who had made ourselves unacceptable and condemnable in the Eye of Justice; and to have Redemption in him, and forgiveness of Sin, according to the riches of his Grace, who had enslaved ourselves, committed Sin, and were incapable to redeem ourselves, to make atonement, or merit our recovery: And then it follows, ver. 8, that in all this he abounded towards
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us in all wisdom and prudence. Amazing Sect.

us in all wisdom and prudence. Amazing Sect.

us in all wisdom and prudence. Amazing Sect.

To find a way, to sanctify the III. depreved, justify the blameable, love the hateful, adopt the alien, accept the vile and unworthy whom Justice condemned, redeem the captive, and forgive the guilty Sinner! Here's work for all wisdom and prudence to abound, much more than it was, to resolve first to glorify the Son of God; and then to find out a way for it by designing to make men fall into misery and death, that he might come to this Glory by it. Look into ver. 9. and you'll see, that according to what I have shewn to be the Apostle's Model, he concludes, this is the counsel of God's Will, and his Purpose in himself, even to recover by Christ Sinners, thus in his eye fallen and miserable. The same sense is plain, in Rev. v. 11, 12. 2 Thess. i. 10. and Eph. iv. 13.

I confess, when I consider some men's temper, I am at a loss, whether they are led, by what themselves are, to think of God as so cruel and far from goodness; or whether the strange representations of God, which they believe, do form them to what they think is his Resemblance. Would any Divine else dare to preach, "that God took the Sin of Adam, and squeezed out the Quintessence of it into the human nature, to propagate to the world? And that God took delight to see the Wicked sin: As one that sets Rats-bane to kill T 2 " Rats,
Sect. "Rats, looks through the key-hole with delight to see the Rats eating the Rats-bane, knowing it would kill them; so God looked at the Wicked through his fingers with Pleasure, to see them fasting, knowing it would destroy them. And that the Spirit of God striving with Sinners, did enlighten them, reform them, &c. But why did he thus strive with many, whom he did resolve he would never save? It was, that they might be brought to those higher degrees of Torments in Hell, which he had fore-ordained them to; as Judas went to his own place, that is, to the higher Torments in Hell, which God had decreed him to: He could not come to this, but by falling from his Apostle-ship; he could not fall from his Apostle-ship, if he had not been an Apostle; and he could not have been an Apostle, if the Spirit of God had not striven with him."

Mr. Mather, I suppose, hath not forgotten these unfavoury Passages, which I do not think I have varied a word of; at least I am sure this is the Substance, and not aggravated at all, as I have abundant Witnesses to prove.

[3.] He mistakes what is the Glory of God, as to its principal sense: This consists in his essential Perfections, as in himself; yea, the manifestative Glory of God, Father and Son, is not so much in the Crea-
Creatures acknowledgments, as in the display of his own Perfections, in a way commanding their admiration and love: Men's Hosanna's are a poor thing comparatively even therewith. He made all things for his Glory; that is, to express thereby his wisdom, goodness, power, justice, &c. His Glory shines forth more in the Impresses of his Excellencies on any Being, than in their thankful returns of Gratitude to him, or in the oral mention of his Praises: Men by these do their Duty, and contribute to their own Good, but add not to his Glory; yea, his manifestative Glory is not hereby so promoted by those men, as by his Image on them, and his Authority acknowledged by obedience and good works. God is glorified by Christ, as Redeemer in our nature, as by this means his Government was honoured, his Justice satisfied, his Hatred to Sin expressed, his Image restored, his Authority among men acknowledged, his blessed Nature exemplified in the humane nature and behaviour of Christ, his Love and Mercy to Sinners made manifest by his death: By these, I say, God is more glorified, than by the honour Christ acquires from his Creatures, or by some few being brought to acknowledge him to be the Son of God. Yea, our Redeemer, even as in our nature, is more glorified, by his honouring God, vindicating his Government from contempt, opening a way for Mercy to
to exert itself without injury to God's Holiness or Justice, accomplishing God's Purposes and Promises, having all fulness of Grace in him, all Authority and Judgment committed to him; by his defeating Satan's projects, and breaking his strength and power even by the human nature; by his giving his Spirit, and restoring the Image of God to a degenerate world; by his rendering men subject to the divine Laws, Imitators of his Example, and subject to his Authority; by his raising the dead, and judging the world; by his wise, equal, and effectual managing his Kingdom, &c. By these, I say, he is honoured far more, than by a few persons acknowledging his Sonship. And being that his Sonship became obscured by his dwelling in Flesh, I admire that Mr. Mather would place the upshot of Christ's acquired Glory in the Elects acknowledgment of his Sonship; as if he took a Veil to do and suffer so much, chiefly, if not only, to buy off its being a Veil.

[4.] He leaves out the Holy Spirit, as to the mention of any Glory designed to him in the oeconomy of the Salvation of Sinners. Yet sure, the eternal Spirit hath a Glory superior to Christ's human nature, and a Right thereto superior to Christ's acquired Right. Yea, we are baptized, as redeemed ones, into, or in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. But with these men, his Honour is little regarded; he shall not have a hand,
hand, so much as to render some Sinners Sect. to be the persons, that shall rather than others be invested in Christ's right to any saving Benefits according to a Gospel-rule: Though God hath so wisely contrived the acknowledgment of Father, Son and Spirit, in the saving of Sinners; the Father gives and sends his Son to redeem, the Son pays the price of redemption, and the holy Spirit applies it, by rendering Sinners the objects of the respective effects thereof, as the Gospel determines the distribution of them.

His notion of legal Union, between Christ and the Elect from eternity, as being one legal Person, is an unscriptural notion which I have confuted; though I acknowledge, that Christ from eternity undertook to redeem and save the Elect; but that is far from one legal Person, being that we are not reputed to redeem or save ourselves. And alike ungrounded, is his notion of one mystical Person. But it is time to put an end to my Remarks on his Story made up of Steps; which I wonder he hath acquired no better skill in relating, than to represent the counsels of God, in a manner so inconsistent with; nay, reproachful to, the Glory of the blessed God.

IX. I shall not take notice of such things as these: "That all your obedience " to the Law avails no more to justify you, " than your worst Sins;" pag. 71. "That
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Sect. "the not failing of Faith is not a means of our continuing justified;" pag. 64. And "that Repentance is the effect of Pardon, and not necessary thereto;" pag. 32. These, and the like, being already insisted on in this Book, and elsewhere. Neither shall I demonstrate, as I might; that it must be his Judgment, that all our Sins are pardoned at once, even past, present, and to come; and that God cannot be displeased with, or affliet Believers for their Sins, &c.

X. He vainly supposeth many things possible to be in unbelievers, which are certain evidences of true Faith, and are effects of Faith; yea, they are the execution of the consenting act of Faith, and without them (if a man have time,) all his Faith is but a dead Faith, that will never save. I will admit, that no act of Grace or Godliness can save us without Faith: But I as positively affirm, That there is no one act of real Grace or Godliness without true Faith; nor yet any true Faith without acts of other Graces. Why then should he put the Graces of the Spirit into a war, and tell us of mending our ways, and reforming our lives and our hearts too, so as never more to sin, and living as a Saint dropt down from heaven, &c. yet they are not Faith, neither would the righteousness of Christ be upon thee thro' all these things? Pag. 67, 68. Can men's hearts be changed, and their lives thus re-
formed in obedience to the call of Christ's Gospel, and not accept of Christ, and trust in him? No. And I ask, If any man go out of himself to Christ for all, and yet never repent, nor have his heart and life changed, nor love God, would that man have the righteousness of Christ upon him for Salvation? Yet this is as possible as the other, yea, and more easily mistaken. You'll see, in 1 Thess. i. 5, & seq. that the Spirit of God makes the things concur, which Mr. Mather would set at so great an Opposition.

To me it's evident, that Christ's righteousness extends itself through all the benefits and privileges of a Saint, as the sole merit ing Cause, whatever be the Condition: And all the after-gracious Acts and Godliness of a Believer are the operations of Faith; they are his first conjugal consent executed, as well as the effects of his dependance on Christ for new supplies. And in this manner, (1.) Faith, as it acts upward towards Christ, still craves, prays, hopes, trusts, expects, with affection adheres, and renews Self-dedication and Consent. (2.) As it looks into the Word, it finds motives, excitements, directions, &c. to urge and apply to itself, from invisible things realized. And, (3.) As it acts under the power of both the former, with respect to external and internal effects, it purifies, melts, loves, quickens, strengthens to duty and against tempt-
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Sect. temptations, comforts, reclaims, recovers, 
III. guards, watches, &c. So that our renewed 
Acts of Repentance, Love, and Fear, &c. our Godliness, Reformation, Zeal, and all 
sincere Obedience, are the operations of Faith, 
and the obedience of Faith: Faith is in them, 
and they are in Faith, not formally, but in 
the way above expressed: Whence I con- 
clude, it's a false Faith that omits obe- 
dience to Christ in all these, as it is a false 
obedience which excludes a dependance on 
Christ in or by any of these Acts.

XI. Mr. Mather's Criminations of his 
Brethren are intolerable, becoming neither 
an honest Man, nor a true Believer, and 
much less a Gospel-Minister. More wick- 
ed malice and falsehood hardly any man can 
be guilty of, than his accusations and in- 
sinuations are justly chargeable with; un- 
less they proceed from real Ignorance, which 
Charity prompts me to hope. I have in- 
fanced already, how he hath perverted 
my words; but had he confined his Re- 
proaches to me, I should not think my Re- 
sentments so fit to be expressed: But he 
spares not the Dead, he strikes at the Body 
of our useful Ministers alive, and at their 
Ministry too. Who, or what, could ex- 
cite any man to render the Labours of so 
many Ministers useless, when so adapted to 
promote the Kingdom of Christ in the 
world? Who will dare to attend their 
Labours,
Labours, or avoid being filled with Jealousies, Prejudices, and Abhorrence, who believe this fiery man, when he faith, That they hold Soul-destroying Errors, if there be any such in the world; pag. 46. that it is a dislike and heart-hatred of standing justified in the Righteousness of Christ imputed, and in it only, that lies at the bottom in these Oppositions (to our being as righteous as Christ;) pag. 76. and that the Devil (by them) laboureth to foretell and shut up men's hearts against (what he calls) the blessed Truths. Pag. 26. Nay, his malignant Spirit riseth so high, as to call them oft Semi-Socinians; and he studiously brands them with that name (as what he would have them called by,) in his Preface, as well as with that of Socinians in his Sermons; and adds, that the Gospel of our Salvation is craftily and insolently assaulted by them in the very vitals and fundamentals of it. This and much more, as an Apostacy from the Truth, he fixeth on old and young, even many of the rising Generation, not only among Conformists, but Dissenters also. Pref. pag. i.

Repl. The Angel said, The Lord rebuke thee; when he durst not bring railing Accusation. Sure he knoweth not what Spirit he is of, nor who doth instigate him to these things, any more than holy Peter did, whose design was better. After long working at this Trade under ground, he proclaims it when he comes into open air, and hides
hides not his Spirit or his Purpose. I hope others injured so deeply, will join with me in forgiving him, and praying for his Repentance, that the blood of prejudiced Souls may not be required at his hands, nor these injurious Reproaches be imputed to him. I shall make a few Remarks on the Names he gives us.

1. He of all men seems least allowed to give us any Name; for we are not the Children of his Church-members, and others he will not baptize. He pleads, that the antient Church called the Off-spring of Pelagius his Heresy Semi-Pelagians: May therefore one, that utterly denies a Catholic visible Church, pretend to it; yea, who thinks he ceaseth to be a Minister, when his relation to his particular Flock is at an end? Nay, he is of so rash a Spirit, of such small Skill in the reason of Names, and so lavishly disregardful of Truth in this matter, that a Nick-name must be the effect of his giving any to such as are not of his own Faction.

2. He quits all Truth and Modesty, in giving us the Name of Socinians, or Semi-Socinians. He faith, our opinions are the off-spring of Socinianism: But what meaneth he by off-spring? Is it only, (1.) That Socinianism was the occasion thereof: Or, (2.) That they are of the same genuine nature with Socinianism. The last is an abominable Slander, hatch'd by no good Spirit. It is enough to answer,
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(1.) The former may be pretended, but then an immediate descent must be denied. Socinianism tempted weak men to the opposite Extremes of profane Antinomianism: This Extrem was perceived equally fatal to the Vitals of practical Christianity, as Socinianism; and also to give advantage to the Socinians by its wild Positions, and weak Arguments consonant thereto: Therefore our best learned Divines, at once to prevent the triumph of the Socinians, and the growth of Antinomianism, waved many of those terms, which had obtained among the Orthodox in speaking of Christ’s Satisfaction without any due regard to either of these fatal Errors. Hence Dr. Owen, of the Trinity and Satisfaction, pag. 153. says, "It appears from what hath been spoken, that in this matter of Satisfaction, God is not considered as a Creditor, and Sin as a Debt, and the Law as an obligation to that Debt, and the Lord Christ as paying it." He then shews the difference; and tells us, "God must be considered as a Rector, &c." pag. 113. And pag. 141. "There is an allusion in them, [the Socinian argument,] to a Debt and Payment, which is the most improper expression used in this matter." The same you'll find in Effenius, Triumphus Crucis, pag. 391, 399, and in Turretin, Institut. Theol. par. ii. pag. 264, 462. In like manner, they place Satisfaction in an equivalent
valent in many things, and not the same for kind in all. See Effenius, pag. 340, and Dr. Stillingsfleet of the Sufferings of Christ, pag. 244, 245. Many more instances might be given. But,

(2.) Our Principles are far from being the offspring of Socinianism, as being of the same nature with it, which he meaneth. They are nothing which is properly Socinian, or condemned as such either by Synod or by men of Learning: So far are we from being half-Socinians. The Socinian Principles are summarily reduced to that of the Trinity, and that of Christ's Satisfaction. They deny the Deity of Christ, as the Son of God by eternal generation; we affirm it: They deny the Personality of the Holy Ghost; we affirm it. The malice of our Author cannot pretend to touch us there. The Socinians deny, that Christ died a proper Sacrifice for Sin; we affirm it. They deny, that Christ's Sufferings were the Punishment of our Sins; we affirm it. They deny, that Christ satisfied Divine Justice, or died in our place: We affirm, he satisfied Justice, and that Christ died in our place and in our stead: He died, that we might not die, who were liable to die; he gave his Life for ours. They say, Christ died for our Good, not by way of Merit at all strictly: We affirm, that Christ properly merited all the saving Good we enjoy. The Good they say
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Say Christ died for is, the giving us an Example of patience, confirming his Doctrine, and at highest, the ratifying the Covenant wherein our own Faith and Obedience is by Acceptilation accepted instead of a perfect legal Righteousness, and this exclusive of Christ's Satisfaction and Righteousness; and that he attends to this is what they mean, when they say Christ in some sort may be said to give us Life. But we affirm, that the Good Christ merited is, Reconciliation with God, Pardon of Sins, and eternal Glory, &c. as well as that he gave us an Example of patience, &c. And we truly affirm, that we have no Righteousness that answers the Law but Christ's; and that Christ's Righteousness is imputed to us, as that wherein we stand before a just God, and is as available to us for Salvation, as if we had done and suffered what Christ did; and we renounce all our own Obedience and Works, legal and evangelical, as any part of that Righteousness, in or for which we are pardoned, accepted, or glorified. Our very Faith, and much less our Repentance or other good Works, is not any merit or procuring cause of our Justification. The whole use and place we assign to Faith in our Justification, and to Repentance in the pardon of sin, is, that they are the things which the Gospel requireth in those, to whom God will impute the Righteousness of Christ for actual Pardon, and
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sect. and a title to eternal Glory; as promising III. to impute Christ's Righteousness to Believers, and actual Pardon to the believing Penitent; as also, the possession of Glory to such as persevere in Faith and Holiness; and all, in, by, and for the only Righteousness of Christ, as the sole meriting, inclining, and procuring Cause.

Reader, judge between us, yea, let the Searcher of hearts judge, whether we are not wronged by this Brother. I have in this Book, as well as formerly, shewn, that by Reward is meant no more than an encouragement to a Duty established by the Gospel, as a Law; not a Law, whereby governing Justice enjoineth us to work out a Righteousness as our title to eternal Life; but a Law, wherein Grace in a way of government appoints Conditions, that render us the subjects of saving Benefits, as the effects of Christ's Righteousness, and to be received and enjoyed in his Right. Again, whereas some call Faith our subordinate Righteousness, I have evidenced, that they intend no more than a performed Condition of the Gospel, and no way a Righteousness of the same kind, or to the same end or purpose with Christ's Righteousness. Also when any of us say, that we are justified by Faith. as an Act, Justification is then taken in quite another sense from Justification by Christ's Righteousness; the last being universal as to our Persons and State;
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State; while the former only relates to a Sect. particular Point, viz. Are we Believers? and but consequently, Are we the Persons whom the Gospel promiseth to deal with as Believers? Also I have shewn, that Justification is entire in all its Causes; and that Faith doth no more than connote us the Objects or Subjects, on whom this Justification is conferred by God as a Benefit, or the Objects on whom the Justifying Act terminates by the Gospel. If these be Semifocinian Principles, I undertake to shew, that all or most of the noted Protestant Confessions of Faith, and the Body of our Protestant Divines of name, yea, especially such as have written against Socinianism, are Semifocinian. Sure then our Author either reads our Principles in a falfe glass, or he knows no more of Socinianism, than that it is a scandalous word, and so fit to brand those with, whose worth, acceptance, and usefulness, he beholds with an envious eye; wherein I except myself.

Mr. Mather hath done more to favour Socinianism, than all those whom he accuseth: In that,

(1.) He calls such Semifocinian, whose Doctrine and Principles will approve themselves to most men to be Orthodox. Many will thus abate their prejudice against the real Socinian, as not being so bad as the word imported.

(2.) He falls in wholly with the Socini-ans,
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Sect. III.

In denying Christ's Incarnation to be a part of his Humiliation, and deprives us of the force of one of the greatest Texts for the Deity of Christ, Phil. ii. 6, 7.

(3.) He supports the Socinian cause, and one of their strongest topics against the Satisfaction of Christ; by speaking still of God as a Creditor, Sin as a Debt, the Law as a Money-Bond, and Christ as a Money-Surety: Whereas all our Divines find it impossible to defend that Doctrine, without denying this Metaphor; and therefore plead, that God is to be considered as a Recltor, Sin as a Crime, Sinners as Criminals, and Christ as a Sponsor, in consistency with his being Redeemer, Mediator, Saviour, Sacrifice, and Priest, &c. For if Sin were a Money-Debt, why could not God forgive it without Satisfaction, as well as other Creditors do? &c.

(4.) He grants the absurdity, in the sense objected by the Socinians, and still opposed by our Divines, viz. That we are as righteous as Christ in equality. Turretin proves, (Instit. Theol. pag. 714, 715.) that "licet, &c. though we are justified by Christ's Righteousness imputed, non se-quitur nos non minus justos esse quam Christum; it doth not follow that we are no lefs righteous than Christ." So doth Dr. Owen of Juslif. pag. 509, 510. And all our celebrated opposers of Socinianism do the same. Mr. Mather may say as well
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well of these, as he doth of us, for denying it as they do; They have a heart-hatred of standing in the Righteousness of Christ.

(5.) The Socinians have their whole cause favoured against the Deity of Christ, (or at least the Arians,) by what he afferts concerning the Person of the Son of God. He makes him such a God, as was capable of a real glory to be added to him: He tells us, that as God he might be under God's frowns and displeasure; that he might quit and forego the actual enjoyment of that love, glory, and Inheritance, which as the Son of God he was entitled to, and possessed of, before his Incarnation, (and this, not in a way of manifestation only, nor as to his Human nature, but in reality, and as to his Divine nature, in which alone he acted before his Incarnation;) that he was capable as God, of an acquired Right, superadded to his natural Right, to those very riches, love, and glory, which he enjoyed before he was Son of man; and tells us also, pag. 8, that the human nature belongs to the Constitution of the Person of the Son of God, as it is now, &c. Are not these bold Strokes, which I have before fully proved to be his assertions? though Charity binds me to acknowledge, that I think, he designeth not to oppose the eternal Deity of the Son of God, by assertions so unsuitable to the Divine Essence; but that he mistaketh what God is, rather than who he is.
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Sect. (6.) I might add, that he blasts all the opposition made by our best Authors against Socinianism, by branding even them as Semisocinians: To say nothing of his representing the Doctrine of imputed Righteousness, in a manner not defensible, and tempting to most men's being Socinians, unless they have a better notion of it. Few will believe, that we did legally do and suffer what Christ did; that we are as righteous as Christ; and that the Gospel enjoineth no Duty as a Condition on us, for obtaining the blessed effects of Christ's Merits; which be the only ground of his quarreling thus hotly with us. Men of his suspicious temper will judge, he designeth to favour Socinianism, by calling us Semisocinians.

XII. Mr. Mather attempts to instruct us how to preach, but with an evil insinuation, and in some things very contrary to Apostolical preaching. Pag. 69. "Thus your Teachers should instruct and lead you: This is the Apostle's direction to Titus, that he should teach them that have believed, to be careful to maintain, or to excell in good works; Tit. iii. 8. not to teach and press Sinners in their unbelief, to fall to doing of good works first, and overlook believing wholly, or to postpone it after them."

Repl. [i.] Which Teacher of his hearers
ers doth teach any to postpone Faith, or overlook it wholly, or delay it at all? if by believing he means a due accepting of a whole Christ. Yea, do not they direct them to expect all from God through Christ, and to look to Christ as him in whom all fulness is? But our Author is one of them who think, Christ is never preached, unless his name be mentioned, and that as a Priest too. To teach men his revealed Truths, and his enjoined Laws, &c. is not preaching Christ. But,

[2.] May one call Sinners to no Duty, till they are Believers? Must they not be press'd to examine themselves, to pray, to read the Word, to hear it preached, to fear God, to teach their Families, to love their Wives, to meditate, to consider, to strive with their Hearts, to resist Temptations, to believe the Scriptures, nor to relieve the Poor, till they be Believers? Peter was to learn of our Author to preach; for though he knew Simon Magus to be in the gall of bitterness, yet he bids him then repent of this thy wickedness, and pray God, 

Acts viii, if perhaps the thought of thy heart may be forgiven thee: Perhaps he'll say, be believ-ed; true, in such a manner, as I fear some that pretend high to Faith exceed not.

Paul also gives such an account of much of his Ministry at first to Jews and Gentiles; that they should repent and turn unto God, 

Acts xxvi, and do works meet for Repentance. The

Baptist
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Sect. Baptist too was an ill Teacher; and Christ's faith to unbelievers, *We are men of like passions with you,* (thus far he'll agree,) and *preach unto you, that ye should turn from these vanities unto the living God that made heaven and earth,* &c. Here a good Work is pressed before they believed; and Mr. Mather would have told him, *You Paul should not teach thus.* But what are his Reasons?

(1.) They that believed in God should be charged to excell in good works; therefore they that believe not in Christ, should not be pressed to endeavour doing any good work: They must not so much as frame their doings, *to turn unto the Lord.* And, (2.) A few words after this he says, "Through Faith that Righteousness will be upon you; and being upon you, it will produce good works." Here it seems, (as I have oft heard it urged,) Ministers should not urge you, nor should you strive and labour after good Works; *this Righteousness will produce them.* But are all, that I hope have Faith, so abundant therein, as not to need Spurs? Do all that pretend to it, *shew that they have it by its fruits?* and how else can we know them? And is *this Righteousness being upon us* the next principle of good works? for though it be the meriting cause of all as it is in Christ, yet holy
holy habits are the next principle with the Spirit's influence. And above all, must we cease to declare the whole Will of God to all that hear us, till we know is Christ's Righteousness upon them? Yea, is it because they are dead in Sin before Faith, that we must not press them to repent, to fear and love God, &c. The same reason will hold against pressing them to saving Faith, which of themselves they can as little perform. And if it be by the Word that God regenerates our hearers, why may not the Spirit infuse Life, by calling men to repent, &c. as well as to believe? and a true principle of Life will act duly, though I think not in the same order of discernable actings, in every Convert. But however, it is certain, that if by preaching Repentance the Spirit quickens a Soul, that Soul is as sure to believe when quickened, as it is to repent when it believes. And so our Author makes but a spiteful Flourish, when he would induce our Hearers to think we teach them amiss, because we learn not of him.

SINCE the printing of my Answer, to what Mr. Mather calls my Second damning Error, viz. That I make the State of Believers to be undecided, and in suspense during this Life: I have found the word Undecided in my Gospel-Truth stated, pag. 61, which I then was ignorant of, though
though I cast my eye on the bottom of that very Page. My words are, "The Covenant, though conditional, is a disposition of Grace. There's Grace in giving ability to perform the condition, as well as in bestowing the benefits: God's engaging one in order to the other, makes not the benefit to be less of Grace; but it is a display of God's wisdom, in conferring the benefit, suitably to the nature and state of men in this life, whose eternal condition is not eternally decided, but are in a state of trial; yea, the conditions are but a meetness to receive the blessings."

But as I have shewn in my Answer, pag. 184. & seq. that I oft in Gospel-Truth stated, affirm, That the Elect shall persevere in Faith, and that every true Saint is now in a state of Salvation: So I shall only add,

(1.) I do not here mention believers, but men in general, yea, rather unbelievers.

(2.) By eternally decided any man may see, that I had an eye only to God's judicial decision at Death, and the more solemn Sentence at the last Judgment; when we die, our warfare is finished, and our State, as Viatores, is at an end. And, (3.) What mean all the Scripture Cautions, (even to believers,) such as, Watch, &c. Pass the time of your sojourning here in Fear, &c. if all our State be decided so, while we have many years, temptations, and persevering work before us; as it will be beyond the grave.
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grave? Alas, how many are long deceived Sect. by the mere form of Godliness? and they III. that are godly, are called to caution and care, on this very consideration, that they are to be judged; (1 Pet. i. 17.) which were useless to such as are in termino. 2 Tim. iv. 7, 8. Rev. ii. 10. See more in my Answer to the Second Charge.

The Point of the Embrio was not fit for my large insisting on; or I could have proved, that an Embrio is not an unformed unorganized mass, or lump, &c.
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S I R,

YOUR First Letter misrepresents my Judgment in many things, as if you little considered my Books, from whence you pretend your Objections. This Letter I suffer to pass without further animadversion, than to inform you, that my Adversaries have boldly assured the world, that I say, "The Righteousness of Christ is imputed only as to effects;" whereas you truly represent my words, "that besides the effects, the Righteousness of Christ itself is imputed to us." It is true, you had prevented your Plea against it, had you consulted Man made Righteous, pag. 88,—92. Yet have I no reason to complain of my Treatment; whilst struck at by both Extremes,
Extremes, when deeper thoughts would perceive the Truth stated against the excess of both.

But your Second Letter necessitates a Vindication of myself from the Falshoods imposed on you; the publication whereof is poorly excused by saying, You have not my Books now to examine the Quotations. Will your Experience allow you to be a Tool to a man you call learned? because industrious to divide Brethren, under a pretence of reconciling a Breach, which is made and maintained to serve a turn, against all the self-denying methods that were possible on our part. This Sheet allows not arguing any point; my concern is to shew, how unjustly I am represented by the Objections offered by your Author.

I Obj. Christ, where he is called a Surety, was the Surety of a better Covenant, and therefore not of the Law of works: It was not the Covenant that obliged us to die for sin, or perfectly to obey in a way of merit, of which he is called a Surety. Man made Righteous, pag. 117.

Ans. [1.] He leaves out the word here, and so changeth the sense. My words are, "The Covenant of which he is said to be the Surety here," viz. Heb. vii. 22.

[2.] In stating the Question that leads to these words, (pag. 104. & seq.) I declared, what I affirmed concerning Christ's Surethip, and what I did deny. (1.) I granted,
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granted, that "Christ hath undertaken in the Covenant of Redemption, that he would make Satisfaction to Justice for us, and obey the whole Will of God, &c. He was a real Sponsor, engaging to do all that belonged to him. Christ accordingly died in our Nature, and that not only for our good, but in our stead, nostro loco. We were liable to die, but he stepped in and died, that we might not die; who otherwise must have died, but now live by his dying for us. He was a proper antecedent, he gave his Life for ours; yea, and this to vindicate the glory of God, in exempting us from death, &c." Then I proved, "that Christ did suffer properly in our stead, was a Sacrifice for us, &c." And concluded, "Thus far the Word of God directs us to call Christ, either Surety, Sponsor, Representative, &c." But, (2.) The thing that I denied, was, "That Christ by his obedience made atonement, or merited for us, as a proper pecuniary Surety in the Law of works." This I confuted by several Arguments; and the words objected are the sixth Argument, viz: "That in Heb. vii. 22. where Christ is called a Surety, it is of a better Covenant; which is not the Covenant of works." Sir, judge you, whether I affirm not Christ to be a Surety, name and thing; though I affirm, that it is a better Covenant he is called
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called Surety of, in Heb. vii. 22. and deny him to be a Money-Surety.

II Obj. Christ can be bound by the Covenant, of which he is Surety, to no more than what we are engaged to do and suffer by the Gospel-Covenant. Man made Righreous, pag. 122.

Ans. My words are, "The Covenant Christ is Surety of in this place, [viz. Heb. vii. 22.] is the Gospel-Covenant; and if so, he can even as a Money-Surety hereby be bound with us to no more, than what we are engaged to do and suffer by this Gospel-Covenant: It is true, by the Covenant of Redemption, he was engaged to suffer death in the human nature for Satisfaction, and this in our place, and also to obey the whole Law.”

Sir, can you not see that the Objector leaves out, in this place, Money, and hereby? and he also makes that to be my Assertion, what I only infer from a Supposition, which I denied, and leaves out if so. He would suggest me to say, Christ is to repent and believe for us; which as I expressly deny, pag. 105. so I oft declare, that his Suretiskip, as to the Gospel-Covenant, consists in his undertaking that the Covenant shall be performed on God’s, and on the Believer’s part. And lastly, he stops just at the words which confute his whole Imputation, viz. “That Christ was engaged
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"engaged by the Covenant of Redemption to suffer death, &c."

III Obj. Though in Gal. iv. 4, 5. it is said, that Christ was made under the Law, it is not meant of the Moral Law, but the Ceremonial Law. Ibid. pag. 127.

Ans. I was proving, "that though the Righteousness of Christ, for which we are justified, be a Righteousness adequate to the Law, yea, supra-legal, as well as in substance truly legal; yet that Righteousness is not a Suretship-righteousness, that can infer us equally righteous as Christ." Pursuant hereto I consider Gal. iv. 4, 5. as an Objection, to which I answer, among other things, "That the Context confines this to the following sense, viz. that Christ was made under the Jewish Law, delivered Four hundred years after the Promise, &c. And in this sense, it is not the Law of Innocency, as a proper Covenant of Works, &c." The Objection is pretended hence; but I said, the Jewish Law, not the Ceremonial Law, which is but part of it: The Moral Law was also a part thereof, though not delivered to them as a proper Covenant of Innocency. My next Answer, and in the very same page, was, "I grant, that Christ in taking our nature, became a Servant, and was thus subject to the Law of Innocency, to its precepts, and its punishments, as a Mediator, according X to
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to the terms adjusted in the Covenant of
Redemption." Here I affirmed, what
he faith I deny. My fourth Answer was,
Christ did not then become a Surety,
or an undertaker to die for us, by being
made under the Law; but he was made
under the Law, because he had under-
taken to die for us. His very being
made under the Law of works, was but
the performance of a previous engagement
to the Law-giver; this being one Article
in the Covenant of Redemption, That
he should take our nature, and be a
Servant under the Law, and make his
Soul an Offering for Sin."

IV Obj. Calling God Creditor, and Sin
a Debt, is metaphorical; and using such
words as proper, hath given advantage to
the Socinians.

Ans. I acknowledge it; and such as un-
derstand the way of confuting the Socini-
ans, are of the same mind; and therefore
grant, that if God were a Creditor, and Sin
a Debt, God might forgive without Satis-
faction; and if the Idem be paid, it's not a
Satisfaction, nor is there room for Pardon,
nor for Gospel-terms. See this urged by
Leideker, in his Synopsis Theol. lib. iv. cap.
6. §. 4,—7, 11, 20, 45. by Bishop Stilling-
fleet, of the Sufferings of Christ, chap. 1.
by Grotius, de Satisfact. pag. 60, 71. and
by Effenius, Trium. Crucis, pag. 340, 390:
Dr. Owen, of Satisfact. pag. 141. faith,
"They
"They are the most improper expressions in this matter."

V Obj. There is no Change of Person between Christ and the Elect, or between him and Believers. Gospel-Truth, pag. 41, 45.

Anf. [1.] If by Change of Person be meant simply a change of persons or men; that is, that Sinners were to die for their transgressions, but Christ, by God's appointment, and his own consent, was substituted to obey and die in Sinners stead; and that Christ stood obliged so to obey and suffer what for substance the Law required; I have hundreds of times asserted it in my Books. I have not room to instance. See in Man made Righteous, eight Propositions clearing this: In one I say, (pag. 12.) "Divine Grace and Sovereignty exert themselves to answer the ends of the Law, by substituting Christ a Saviour of lost Souls."

[2.] The Change of Person which I there denied, is only that, which Dr. Crisp and his Followers assert, and which is the strict meaning of a Change of Person, viz. a mutual compleat change of condition and character; and not a transferring a Punishment from a criminal to an hostage. This is evident,

(1.) By the Error I there confute, viz. that every Elect person is as righteous as Christ; and that there is a perfect change of person and condition between Christ
"Christ and the Elect; that he was what we are, and we are what he was, viz. perfectly holy, &c. Christ himself is not so compleatly righteous, but we are as righteous as he; nor we so compleatly sinful, but Christ became as sinful as we, &c. That very Sinfulness that we were, Christ is made that very Sinfulness before God: So that there is a direct Change of Person."

(2.) It is plain that I denied this Change of Person in Dr. Crisp's sense, by what I offered to overthrow it; wherein nothing opposeth Christ's dying in our stead, by God's Substitution or Surrogation. My words are, pag. 45. "Christ was the Saviour; we are the saved, and not the savours: Christ was the Redeemer, and never the redeemed; we are the redeemed, and never the redeemers: Christ was he, who by his merits forgives us, but never was forgiven; we are forgiven, and never had merits of our own to forgive our selves or others: He was the dying Sacrifice."

(3.) I do in the very Chapter whence the words are objected, oft assert as much, as the Orthodox intend by Christ's being substituted in our place to die for us. To instance a few of many: Pag. 43. "Christ's sufferings and obedience were so in our stead, that God cannot exact from us any other atonement for Sin, or merit}
"price of any Gospel-blessings." Pag. 47, 48. "The efficient merit of Justification is in Christ; the effect of the judicial absolution for that merit is in us: Had not he obeyed and suffered for us, we could not have been absolved for the sake of his obedience and sufferings." And pag. 57: "Christ suffered in our stead, that the fruit of his suffering might be our deliverance from suffering, and our being saved at last." How many might I add out of that very Chapter?

It is worth the Objector's leisure to consider, how he lays such stress on a Change of Person in Dr. Gres's sense, and yet contends for Christ and us being one legal Person. How could Christ and we be one Person in Law, and yet Christ's Person and our Persons be considered as mutually changed in Law, unless that both Persons were changed from what they once were, into a tertium quid, that neither were before?


Ans. [i.] The first Clause is falsely represented: I will recite my words. After I had said, Pref. pag. ix. "that the Gospel includes the moral preceptive part of X 3 ..." the
the first Law, &c. and that the Gospel is taken in a large sense, when I say, it includes all the moral precepts; but yet the Gospel doth so, and they are the Commands of a Redeemer, as well as the Law of a Creator." I then added, "The Gospel hath another Sanction to the preceptive part of the Law, than the Covenant of works had: Though nothing be abated in the Rule of sin and duty, yet Blessings are promised to lower degrees of duties; and a continuance in a state of death, with a Bar to the Blessing, are not threatened against every degree of Sin, as the Covenant of works did: Doth it threaten damnation, or a continuance therein, on any true, penitent, believing, godly man, because he is imperfect?" Sir, judge you, Is a Change of the Penal Sanction of the moral Law, the same as, the Gospel hath another Sanction to the preceptive part of the Law, as those Precepts are taken into the Gospel? May not the Law have its own Sanction still, as a Covenant of works? and yet the Gospel have another Sanction, as a Covenant of Grace, though it includes the moral precepts as a Rule of duty? It seems the Objector thinks with his Associates, either the Gospel hath neither precept, threatening, nor conditional promise; or if it hath a Sanction, it is this, That though a man be a sincere penitent Believer, yet he shall
die if he be guilty of one evil thought, and shall not be saved if he be not perfect.

[2.] As to the second Clause, my words were, "The Gospel doth not denounce death for the same Sins, as Adam's Law did: That Law threatened death for the least Sin, yea, for one Sin; but the Gospel threatens death, not for every Sin; it doth not bar every Sinner from actual relief, but the impenitent, unbelieving, and utterly ungodly Hypocrite; and it binds not damnation on us, unless we are finally impenitent Unbelievers." But the Objector wisely leaves out the last part, to traduce me by the first.

VII Obj. Christ purchased the Covenant of Grace.

Ansf. I speak not of God's Decree or Purpose, but of the actual promulgated Promise to the world, that he that believeth shall be saved: And I can as soon think, God might perform this Promise, without respect to Christ's merits; as not provide for the Glory of his Justice by Christ's satisfaction, in the making this Promise.

VIII Obj. The Condition of the Covenant of Grace, is an antecedent Condition.

Ansfw. My words, in Gospel-Truth, pag. 60. which are quoted from Mr. Flavel, are, "An antecedent Condition signifies no more, than an Act of ours; which though it be neither perfect in every degree, nor in the least meritorious..."
of the benefit conferred, nor performed in our own natural strength; yet, according to the constitution of the Covenant, it is required of us, in order to the blessings consequent thereupon by virtue of the Promise." You see, I mean only antecedent to subsequent benefits according to the Gospel constitution, but do not speak of Election.

But, Sir, you omit one part of the Objection, viz. that I should say, the Conditions are legal, &c. I never call them so. Nay, pag. 63. I affirmed, "that the Conditions of the Covenant of Grace differ from the Conditions of the Covenant of works," and proved it in five instances; one whereof is, "that the blessings of the Covenant of Grace, are merely of Grace; they be for another's sake, and not our own; &c."

IX Obj. Faith and Repentance are not Covenant Benefits.

Answ. He does not pretend to cite any place out of my Books for this, and I never wrote any such thing. But I have said, Gospel-Truth, pag. 67. "God hath promised, and Christ engaged in the Covenant of Redemption, that the Elect shall believe." And pag. 68. "The first Grace by which we are enabled to perform the Condition, is absolutely given." Again, pag. 271. "Christ purchased all Grace for us, and by his Spirit worketh all
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"all Grace in us." And, pag. 73. "There "is a promise of the first Grace made to "Christ, and by virtue of that promise "the Elect do consent to the Covenant." Now Sir, compare all these things, and judge, whether your Author deserveth such trust, as to adventure your publication of these things upon his credit. Sincerity in- clineth you to be too credulous for some Associates. But I proceed to the other Objections your Author makes, though he never vouchsafed me a Copy of what he gave to many others privately.

X Obj. The Father was never displeased with Christ. Gospel-Truth, pag. 34.

Answ. I affirm expressly in that very Chapter, pag. 36. "that the Soul of "Christ endured the effects of God's wrath "against Sin, and was amazed thereat;" though the Father was never displeased with Christ, "nor could he be abhorred or "odious to God, for in him God was al- "ways well pleased;" as I shew afterwards, pag. 37. It seems the Objector would have me say with Dr. Crisp, that Christ was odious to God, hated worse than a Toad, &c. on account of the filthiness of sin upon him.

XI Obj. All Communications of Comfort could not be interrupted, whilst the Personal Union remained. Ibid. pag. 37.

Answ. My words are, "This Union "could not be dissolved; nor could all "com-
"communications of comfort or strength
" from the divine nature be interrupted,
" while the Union remained." He leaves
out, or strength, and changeth a disjunctive
Proposition into an absolute. I distinguish
between the arbitrary communications of
comfort, and those which were necessary
to Christ's hope, trust, peace of conscience
as to his own Innocency, to his holiness,
strength, and the prevention of despair:
What degrees of comfort were necessary to
these, I affirm, were not interrupted.

XII. Obj. Christ and we are not one in
consideration; and therefore he tells us, that
'tis Blasphemy to debase him among the num-
ber of Transgressors. Gospel-Truth, pag. 46.

Answ. [I.] Not one in consideration, is not in any of my Books. The words
partly cited, are part of my argument, a-
gainst the Christian Change of Person,
whereby we are as righteous as Christ, and
be as sinful as we: They are these; "It
" is profane arrogance for us to pretend to
" Christ's Prerogatives; and it is blasphemy
" to debase Christ among Enemies and
" Sinners, for whom he was the dying
" Sacrifice: It is enough, that he, reserv-
"ing the peculiaris of a Redeemer, should
" agree to suffer for our Sins; it is enough,
" that we are pardoned and adopted for
" his sake, who deserved endless woe, and
" are never capable of making the least
" atonement."

[2.] If
[2.] If the Objector pretends to represent me, as denying the guilt of Sin being once upon Christ; he knows, I plainly state and affirm the contrary. Pag. 8. “Our Sins were imputed to Christ, with respect to the guilt thereof; so that he, by the Father’s appointment, and his own consent, became obliged, as Mediator, to bear the punishment of our Iniquities; and he did bear those punishments, to the full satisfaction of Justice.” And, pag. 10. “Christ did bear the guilt of our Sins, which is that respect of Sin to the threatening of the Law, whereby there is an obligation to bear the punishment.”

[3.] I suppose the Objector is now offended, that I did not say with Dr. Crisp and his Party, that Sin itself, the very filth and fault, the avarice as opposed to the guilt, was laid on Christ; and that on this account he was in God’s esteem the very murderer and Idolater.

[4.] I grant, that God esteemed Christ and Sinners as one; as he that freely engages to die to redeem Sinners, by dying in their stead, and they in whose stead he so dieth, are one. But I shall ever deny, that Christ and Sinners were so one in respect fori, as that God esteemed Sinners to die to make satisfaction; tho’ they, when Believers, are saved by Christ’s death, as if they had made atonement: And also, that Christ was the Sinner in God’s account,
account, when he died sustaining the person of a Mediator.

XIII Obj. Mr. Williams differs from himself, having in his Writings several inconsistencies and self-contradictions.

Answ. [1.] This is put in for a provision against all that occurs in my Books, to debar the false Charge against me: Oh he contradicts himself, when he utters things in fullest opposition to Socinianism, &c.

[2.] And wherein do I contradict myself? The Objector thinks, If I deny the Cripian Change of Person, or pecuniary Suretisit, and one legal Person, in a sense inferring our making Satisfaction by our own dying in the Law’s estimate; then whatever I say of Christ’s Satisfaction, must be Socinianism; and all I can utter against Socinianism, is self-contradicting. But if he call me to it, I shall demonstrate, that Christ being a Mediator, Sponsor, or subsequent Surety ex re gestā, constituted such by the Covenant of Redemption, and made under the Law, pursuant to that prior engagement to obey and suffer in our stead what answered the ends of the Law, that we might be saved in a way consistent with God’s glory as our Law-giver; will argue as great a Change of Persons, and Suretisit, as will solve his feigned contradictions. And yet I shall deny such a compleat Change of Person, as argues Christ to be the Sinner, and the redeemed to be as
righteous as Christ; and in like manner shall deny such a legal oneness and strict pecuniary Suretship, as argues, that we paid all our own Debts, that we satisfied the Law by obeying its precepts and enduring its penalty, and so the Law of works, not the Gospel, absolves us. You may see the point partly stated, at the close of my Defence of Gospel-Truth. As to what he faith, of my pretending an agreement with some modern Divines, who disagree with me; I am sure, I have truly recited their own words, which so far express my sentiments; let him prove them self-contradictors if he can.

His flying Charge from the premises, as if Socinianism were abetted, deserves no farther reply, than to call it slanderous. All my arguments against Christ's pecuniary Suretship, he never read in any Book; and had a Socinian urged them against a Truth, they are not the less valid if urged against Errors destructive to Christianity. And what if some Socinians use some Expressions, in a sense contrary to that wherein I plainly use them? They do also own a Commutation of Person; and then they must be Socinians by as strong a consequence, who use that phrase. If I have not in my Books said enough to clear me from all suspicion of that Error, the Objector's malice must be the standard of Socinianism, and not the fundamental positions,
tions, which have by all its celebrated opposers been hitherto confuted. To omit Christ's eternal Generation as the Son of God, of one Essence with the Father, which I oft affert; Could I say more as to his Satisfaction, than I have ex professo done, and oft with enforcing reasons? See Man made Righteous, pag. 8, 10, — 18, 40, — 45, 272, &c. I place the necessity of Satisfaction in God's essential Justice: I describe it, by Christ's perfectly obeying the Law of works in its essentials, and doing much more; as also, in his suffering death in our stead: I affert his Sufferings to be Punishments satisfactory to Justice for our Sins; that Christ was a proper Sacrifice, and himself the Priest that offereth it on earth: I make his Obedience properly meritorious of all our saving benefits, and himself a proper αὐτοδίκαιος in his death; with much more, which I challenge him to prove consistent with Socinianism. But some men think, they can gain a point among their credulous silly Admirers, by branding with a scandalous name all they bear an ill will to, if not affright the Persons injured, or at least their Friends. But I bless God, I have found more of his defence, and am more assured of the goodness of my cause, than to be affrighted from my duty by such Bug-bears: And should all they of the same judgment with me expose the truth by
by little arts and trimming methods, in pretence of designs never so plausible, I shall have peace, when my testimony is faithfully given, as occasion shall offer, by whatever implacable rage I am pursued.

I CONCLUDE, Sir, blaming your credulity in printing things as mine, before examination; though in most you declare your self to be of my side, and in the rest farther from my Enemies. Nor perceive I your Author's self-denial, or peaceableness; unless you think, because I have been so injured, therefore I must still by farther suffering justify the injurious; and bear the name of a binder of the Union, because they who never were of it, persecute me for my diligence in making, and my care to preserve that Union, against their various and unwearied attempts from the first to break it. And let me tell you, that as they rested not, till by their Errors, noise of Doctrines, and other arts, they had gained several to make this breach; to a Compliance, even to the allowing their Errors, and sacrificing the Truth to their lusts, would be insignificant to bring such into the Union, who refused it long before any of my Books were written; or firmly restore such, who by their influence deserted it; unless God give a Spirit, that shall prefer publick good to little designs, and incline to Love and Peace, above division and wrath. Experience of the
unsuccessfulness of many overtures for Peace, (a narrative whereof would amaze the world,) induceth this Conjecture: And yet no hardships I have endured, shall abate a desire of a solid Union upon honest terms. You will find, that Dr. Bates, Mr. Howe, and Mr. Alfo, design no more, than what is agreeable to what I affirm, and that they hate the Errors I oppose. These Errors, though so dangerous, Mr. Lobb for Party-fake will promote, by blasting my confutation of them, and pressing an implicit disowning my Books, as a term of Union with those, who rejected it as sinful, long before my Books were written; yea, who influenced the dividing of Pinner's-Hall Lecture, to break the Fund for poor Ministers; that both these added to their stated separate Meeting of Ministers, (at the same hour the united Brethren met,) a perfect Breach might be proclaimed: And for a Grave-stone over it, the only four pastors in London, who never came into the Union, are with two more the only Lecturers at Pinner's-Hall. Could then the Subscribers to my Book be so false to Truth and their Ministry, as to abate their Testimony, will a general Union ensue? No, unless the Dissenters former Declaration against it were a Trick. Why then is it so insisted on? It's because it will not be yielded to, and so they get an Excuse long after this Subscription, why they united
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united not before it: Or if complied with, then besides a countenance to their Errors, men will judge, the Presbyterians cause these Divisions; although they ask nothing of the Dissenters, but to meet with them, and be quiet: And lastly, the English and Foreign Churches would affix the Crispian dotages to the Presbyterians, for thus revoking their Testimony against them; a Censure of which sort, on a lighter occasion, was going into the press, just as my Book so subcribed came out.

I am,

Your Brother and Servant,

DAN. WILLIAMS.
THE
ANSWER
TO THE
REPORT, &c.
Which the
United Ministers
Appointed their
COMMITTEE to draw up.
ALSO
LETTERS of the Right Reverend
the Bishop of Worcester, and the Reverend Dr. Edwards, to Mr. Williams; against whom their Testimony was produced by Mr. Lobb.
AND
Animadversions on Mr. LOBB's Defence of the Report.

Printed in the Year 1698.
I shall give a true Narrative of the composing and publishing of the following Sheets. The United Ministers, after their usual recess, met at St. Helen's, Sept. 6. 1697. After previous debates, it was unanimously voted, "That the Committee should take notice of the Papers called, The Report, and the Remarks; and if any Brother had anything to offer about the same, that he should communicate it to them, in order to their drawing up an Answer." The Committee consists of Dr. Bates, Mr. Hammond, Mr. Howe, Mr. Alsp, Mr. Williams, Mr. Stretton, Mr. Woodhouse, Mr. Spademan, and Mr. Nath. Taylor.

Sept. 20. 1697. "The Answer of the Committee to the Report, &c. was read, and ordered to be read a second time next Monday." Note, (1.) They of the Committee, who applied themselves to this work, were Mr. Hammond, Mr. Alsp, Mr. Williams, Mr. Stretton, Mr. Woodhouse, Mr. Spademan, and Mr. Nath. Taylor. Six of them severally perused this Answer.
The Preface.

...sVER to the Report; and after several Meetings, all the Seven unanimously agreed thereto, and brought it to the Meeting as the Answer they had prepared. The most material parts were read to Dr. Bates, (particularly, the Proposal, pag. 359 & seq. the account of the Subscription to the First Paper, and concerning my Book, pag. 379, 380, &c.) and approved of by him. Our Rule is, "that no matter of moment shall be determined, unless it hath been openly and freely debated and agreed to in one Meeting, and then re-assumed and concluded in a Second Meeting."

(2.) This Answer was debated and agreed to in this Meeting; though a Brother had objected against its being in the name of the Body.

Sept. 27. 1697. "Resolved, that the reading of the Answer to the Report be deferred to this day fortnight, that the Committee may have time to consider."

Note, (1.) The occasion of this delay, was not any thing objected against any part of this Answer: But three of the Brethren insisted, that it was too great a condescension in the Body, to answer so insignificant a person as the Author of the Report; that this present Answer should be published by a particular Brother; and that some inconvenience might attend putting forth any Answer in the name of the Body. (2.) The thing to be considered by the Committee was,
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was, what expedient could be offered, or reason given, why this Answer should not be published in the name of the united Ministers as such. (3.) The Committee met, and debated: But one of the foresaid three Brethren remaining unsatisfied, that any Answer should be printed in the name of the Body of the united Ministers, the Debate was put off to another time.

October 11. 1697. "Mr. Hammond acquainted the Brethren, that the Committee was not ready to give in their Report." Upon some of the Brethren beginning to express their resentments at these delays, I spake to this effect: "Mr. Moderator, Though I have met with no reason, that is cogent with me, or with many of the Brethren, why any be unwilling, the Answer should be published in the name of the Body of the united Ministers; yet the dissatisfaction of any worthy Brother, &c. is so inconvenient at this juncture, that I shall not insist on the present reading of our Answer here:—But I shall acquaint you, that some or other of the Brethren will cause this Answer to be printed, with an account how far it hath proceeded among us." This proved a satisfying expedient, of which no man expressed any dislike. Hereupon a Vote, which passed nemine contradicente, Sept. 27. 1697. (when all were present, who desired further time.
to consider whether the Answer should be in the name of all the united Ministers,) was now repeated and unanimously approved: The Vote was, "We judge it needful, "that there be an Answer to two Papers, "called the Report and the Remarks, in "vindication of the united Ministers from "the Charge therein made against them."

Thus far, and no further, did this Answer to the Report proceed in our Meeting of Ministers: Nor did I keep it a secret, when in the Press; but most of the Brethren were informed thereof, whereat none expressed (that I know of) any dissatisfaction. As for the Epistle, with which the Answer to the Report is introduced, and the Reflections on the Remarks that follow it, they went no further than the Committee, and were not to be brought to the Meeting till after the Answer had past.

Though this Narrative informs you, that this Answer is not published in the name of the Body of the united Ministers; because the Confirmation of it by a second reading is suspended, and only so: Yet the original Papers, and the matters of Fact declared, are as unquestionable, and the Doctrines herein acknowledged are as much their common sentiments, as if the Answer had been published in the name of the Body. For I appeal to the Book of St. Helen's, for the truth of this Narrative; and to the Copy perused and marked by the Committee, that
that there is no Change in the Answer to the Report, except one amendment in the date of time; nor in the Epistle, or Reflections on the Remarks, besides one expression softened by the Committee's direction.

Could the Answer of a particular Brother, as well express the Doctrines assented to by the united Ministers, and obtain the same credit in a recital of matters of Fact, (in both which lies their Vindications,) as this Answer, [which their Committee was appointed to draw, and which they brought in to the Meeting as their prepared Answer, and which was once agreed to by the Body, and unexcepted against in any one passage, when it was suspended to gratify three of the Brethren;] I should have preferred the liberty of answering alone, if I had not judged it needless after so great an Answer as the Faithful Rebu.ke, which was so acceptable, that only the modesty of the Author prevented the thanks of the united Ministers, for his putting a stop to the evil effects of the Report, whilst their Meetings were discontinued.

I have subjoined that Second Paper, mentioned in the Report, &c. As also one of the Letters of the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Worcester, and one of the Reverend Dr. Edwards; both whose Books Mr. Lobb cites against me; and therefore I thought none fitter, to vindicate me against his
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his Charge, and their own Books from the ill use he wrested them to serve.

Lastly, Mr. Lobb's Defence of the Report, with a challenge to me, coming forth when these were in the Press, friendship and justice to the Rebuker prompted my bestowing a few hours to stop the ill effects of this grand piece of art and misrepresentation, (for it is nothing else,) until he shall better sift, and more expose it: And one thing I hint, which I thought proper for him to overlook. If after all this Evidence Mr. Lobb can find a people so credulous and bewitched by prejudice, as to say, That the united Ministers, or myself, are Socinians; that the difference on our part (tho' it is so on theirs,) hath been about mere words or trifles; that we have opposed any thing but gross Crispianism; that we brake the Union, or refused Re-union, from a zeal for Errors against the Satisfaction of Christ, or Justification by his Righteousness; they deserve pity rather than argument. That at last Truth and Peace may prevail, is the Prayer of

Nov. 17. 1697. Daniel Williams.

S E C T.
SECT. I.

The Answer to the Report, &c. drawn up by the Committee.

TO THE READER.

NONE are more afflicted than ourselves under those unseasonable Dissentions, which we would have concealed, when our utmost endeavours and compliances could neither prevent, nor yet put a period to them. But the Authors of the printed Papers which we confute, have contrived so to proclaim our Differences, by sending those sheets in Letters to most of our Ministers in the Kingdom, yea, to foreign parts, and to multitudes of private persons; that our Defence, instead of making our Divisions more known, will scarce reach those already mis-informed.

Had the Charge contained only small mistakes, or lesser Errors, christian prudence might forbid an Answer: But when they publish us guilty of such destructive Opinions,
To the Reader.

Sections, as they say subvert the doctrine of Christ's Satisfaction, yea, and make it impossible; and this, not as rash Censurers, but pretending to cite our own Paper for their Charge; a Vindication is necessary, unless we ought to prostitute our Ministry, betray the Truth, lie under the brand of Heretical Opinions, induce others by our example to entertain such Errors, and confirm those who are already infected.

Had the Accusation been still confined to some particular Brethren, our Practice hitherto may convince the world; we had not as a Body set forth this Vindication: But when the Authors of the Report, &c. accuse all who sent the Third Paper, that is, the Body of the united Brethren in and about London; nothing short of our own publick Testimony can be sufficient to declare what our Principles be, or acquit us from holding those horrid Errors, they so confidently as well as falsely ascribe unto us. A particular Brother's Defence of us would be incompetent to those Ends, had any one been willing thereby to expose himself.

And yet tho' the Reporters write for, and pretend to give the sense of, all the dissenting Brethren, as well as to arraign and condemn all us the united Ministers; nevertheless, we direct our Confutation only to the Authors of the Report, and of that called Remarks, with such as consented to and approved thereof. We are so far from intending
To the Reader.
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tending any other persons, that we hope, none besides them will esteem themselves reflected on in this our Defence: Nor had we given any Narrative of the rise and progress of our Differences, (left more might appear intended;) but that the Report and Remarks do so frequently declare, that our Divisions hitherto have been caused only by our contending for Socinian Errors against Christ's Satisfaction.

We also desire the Reader to observe, that what we call the First Paper, is that which several Congregational Brethren contend for. That which we call the Third Paper, is that which the united Brethren sent as a means of Re-union to those who have left the Union. And when we term such as left the Union, and approve of the Report, Dissenters, it is not from any dis-respect, but because the Report chuseth to call them by the name of dissenting Brethren, pag. 4. And whereas once or twice we have occasion to give a Narrative only of some things declared by some of our Brethren, we do not therein determine concerning such things, further than to report that those Brethren have declared such things as we there mention.

With this necessitated Vindication of our selves and Ministry, we think it incumbent on us to warn all persons, especially such of you as stand more peculiarly related to us; that you be not shaken in mind, but that you
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Sect. you remain steadfast in the Faith in this Time, when Seducers not only abound, but under various disguises are so unusually active and successful, to the reproach of Christianity, and the apparent danger of the Souls seduced by them. Lament with us, to see all revealed Religion exposed by some, the Godhead and Satisfaction of Christ our blessed Redeemer denied by others, and Doctrines which have a direct tendency to Libertinism espoused by too many. All which, with the residue of the great Errors at this time propagated, do (however inconsistent they seem,) jointly contribute to the subverting of the true Religion, and threaten misery to these Kingdoms.

And as we would excite your godly Zeal for the Truths and Laws of Christ, against Opinions, subverting the foundations of Faith, and militating against practical Godliness: So with equal concern we must exhort you, to have fervent charity towards all Christians, and to walk in peace with all who call upon the name of the Lord out of a pure heart. Notwithstanding differences in lesser matters, whereunto we have attained, let us all walk by the same Rule; waiting with mutual forbearance, till God shall reveal those things to such, who at present are otherwise minded than our selves.

PEACE
PEACE is so desirable, that we have suffered ourselves to be long misrepresented, in hopes that Time at least, would so abate the prejudices of our dissenting Brethren, (as the Report calls them,) as not to necessitate us to a publick Vindication of ourselves. But to our grief we find, that the more we submitted, the more some were encouraged to serve their own purposes, by exposing us and our Ministry. Yet we continued passive, until a printed Paper, entitled, A Report of our Differences, (written by some of them, as if in the name, if not with the consent or countenance of the rest,) compels us at last, to state matters of Fact, as they stand, with respect to Doctrinals, between us the united Ministers in and about London, and such as have deferted our Union; which we can freely submit to the Judgment of the unbiass'd Reader, altho' we forbear to mention several things, which would irritate more than those we are forced to recite, for our Defence against the Paper we are now taking into consideration.

The Title it bears is, A Report of the present State of the Differences in Doctrinals, &c. But upon perusal, we find it neither an impartial, clear, nor true Report of those
those Differences: Nor can the design it is to serve be concealed, especially when it is so industriously sent throughout the Kingdom, to impose on such as are unacquainted with our Case.

Before we examine the particulars of this Report, it is needful to give an account of the rise, and progress of our Differences; wherein it will appear, Whether we did any thing to break the Union; or omitted any thing within our power to induce those Brethren to re-unite, who had separated from us; or were not inclined to live in peace, when their unpersuadableness made us so unhappy, as to be deprived of their desired Society,

About the beginning of the Year 1691, were published the Heads of an Agreement between the Presbyterian and Congregational Ministers (as then distinguish'd) in and about London; which were drawn up by a number deputed by those of both Denominations: Of the first were, Mr. Hammond, Mr. Howe, Mr. Williams, Mr. Stretton, with Dr. Annesley and Mr. Mayo, who both of them are now at rest in the Lord; Of the other were, Mr. Griffith, Mr. Mead, Mr. Chauncy, Mr. Lobb, with Mr. James and Mr. Mather, which two also are now fallen asleep in the Lord. These Heads of Agreement were assented to (as far as we know,) by all the Presbyterian and Congregational Ministers then in and about London,
don, except Mr. Cole, Mr. Mather, and Sect. Mr. Richard Taylor. Among other things, we therein declared, "First, That we would meet and consult, without the least shadow of separate or distinct Parties. And, Secondly, That as to what appertains to soundness of Judgment in matters of Faith, we esteem it sufficient, that a Church acknowledge the Scriptures to be the Word of God, the perfect and only Rule of Faith and Practice; and own, either the Doctrinal part of the Articles of the Church of England, or the Confession, or Catechisms, shorter or larger, compiled by the Assembly at Westminster, or the Confession agreed on at the Savoy, to be agreeable to the said Rule."

By the first, we thought our meetings of Ministers were secured, and opposite meetings prevented. By the latter, we provided, that our Union should not be dissolved by every different Opinion; especially such, as were known to be espoused by persons when admitted Members of the Union, as the Reverend Mr. Baxter, Mr. Cockain, &c. This Union was tolerably maintained for a while, notwithstanding the attempts of some to break it, (as we have reason to fear,) and of others to make it serviceable to purposes not fit to be mentioned.

About October, 1692. Mr Chauncy, in a meeting of the united Ministers, after many
many warm Expressions, declared, he would leave their meetings, and break off from their Union. The Cause he alleged was, our taking no cognizance of a Paper of Objections, subscribed by Mr. Griffith, Mr. Cole, Mr. Mather, Mr. Chauncey, Mr. Trayl, and Mr. Richard Taylor, against Mr. Williams's Book, called, Gospel-Truth stated, &c. written in confutation of Dr. Crisp's unsound Opinions, which had been revived and divulged by his Works re-printed; to which Book of Mr. Williams's, an Approbation is prefix'd with several of our names. There were many reasons, we should take small notice of those Objections in our meetings; seeing that three of the six Objectors were not of the Union; and the material Objections were not only ungrounded, but they recited as Mr. Williams's words in his Book, what we found quite contrary to the letter of his expressions: We might add many more.

But notwithstanding we were convinced, That particular Brethren's subscribing Mr. Williams's confutation of Dr. Crisp's Errors, (which were openly propagated to our common danger and reproach,) did not affect the Union, nor the united Ministers as such; and therefore could be no just cause of any Brother's deserting us: Yet we appointed a number of the Brethren to consider those Objections against Mr. Williams's
drawn up by the Committee.

liams's Book, who together with the Ob-
jectors accommodated that affair, by a Sub-
scription to certain Doctrinal Propositions,
of which you have an account, printed
1693. called, An Agreement in Doctrinals;
out of which we shall only collect these
passages.

Pag. 1. "Whereas some differences
have of late arisen, occasioned by a Book
written by Mr. Williams, entitled, Gos-
pel-Truth stated, (wherein Dr. Crisp's
Works re-printed are considered,) and
by certain Books written by Mr. Chaun-
cy in opposition thereto, and by an Ap-
probation of divers of us prefixed to Mr.
Williams's Book, and by a Paper sub-
scribed by Mr. Griffith, Mr. Cole, Mr.
Mather, Mr. Trayl, and Mr. Richard
Taylor, in conjunction with Mr. Chaun-
cy: It is hereby declared, that neither
they who subscribed that Approbation
prefix'd to Mr. Williams's Book, did
therein more than signify, (as their own
words express,) that they judg'd he had,
in all that was material, fully and right-
ly stated the Truths and Errors therein
mentioned as such, without delivering
their sense about the Preface, Explica-
tions, or Proofs thereto belonging; which
Declaration is not to be esteemed as a
disapproval of the said Preface, Explica-
tions, or Proofs; &c." Here it is
plain, that whatever ground of difference
was
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Sect. was pretended from that Book, or the Approbation to it, it was then considered and adjusted; that being the very express and sole matter, which that Agreement refers to: And therefore how unaccountable is it, to maintain Divisions so long after, upon that same pretence?

Pag. 2. We and they say, "That in order to the composing of matters in Controversy, &c. we do subscribe these following Propositions, as what do most fully provide against the Arminian, Antinomian, Socinian, and Popish Errors, &c." Here was declared a full provision against those respective Errors. And is it not strange, that now such phrases and words must be the Standard of Orthodoxy, which neither this Agreement, the Church of England, the Assemblies, nor the Confession of any Church require?

Pag. 15. "We shall always, through God's gracious assistance, in our future Ministry, to our utmost avoid all appearances of opposition to one another, so as not to hinder or prejudice, but as far as in us lies, to promote the success thereof, and the common benefit thereby."

When the following behaviour of some of our dissenting Brethren is observed in many signal instances, it might be well suspected, whether ever they subscribed an engagement so solemn; or if they did, what
what can be contrived to oblige them? But
that they did subscribe, see pag. 16.

"December 16. 1692. This day the
Brethren, who endeavoured to accom-
modate this Controversy, did with Mr.
Williams, and Mr. Chauncy, and those
other five, who with him objected a-
gainst Mr. Williams's Book, subscribe to
this Agreement, and these Doctrinal Pro-
positions.

Daniel Williams, Isaac Chauncy,
Sam. Annesley, Stephen Lobb,
John Howe, Sam. Slater,
Matth. Barker, Geo. Griffith,
Geo. Hammond, Tho. Cole,
Edw. Veal, Nath. Mather,
Vincent Alsop, Rob. Trayl,
John James, Rich. Taylor,
Rich. Mayo,

"On December 19. This expedient was
brought to a meeting of the united Mi-
ners, who unanimously expressed their
approbation in the following words, viz.
"That those Brethren, who, at the desire
of the united Ministers, considered some
Objections against Mr. Williams's Book,
having brought in the abovementioned
expedient for Accommodation of the
matters in controversy; the united Mi-
ners have weighed it, and approve of
the same. Besides, it was further de-
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Sect. " clared by them, That whereas the uni-
I. " ted Ministers collectively considered, and
" as such, have not been desired to ap-
" prove of Mr. Williams's Book; in like
" manner, they do not by any thing in
" this Agreement, imply an approbation
" of Mr. Chauncy's Writings in this con-
" troversy: Nevertheless they do rejoice,
" that both Mr. Williams, and Mr. Chaun-
" cy, have accepted this offered expe-
" dient."

We hoped after this Agreement, union and peace were well secured: But (alas!) in a little time (without any occasion given on our parts,) we found; besides the endeavours of those, who came not into the Union, to prejudice people against us and our Doctrine, as well as against the Union; that several of those called Congregational, who were members of the Union, frequented not our meeting, but oft joined with the former in a meeting at Pinners-Hall, the very day and hour of the week, in which our meetings of Ministers are statedly kept: Yea, and some of them in print reflected on our meetings in very unbefitting terms, as will be made appear if occasion require. Nevertheless, our zeal for Peace, did not only prevail with us to be silent under these publick affronts, but set us on making a new essay for a Re-
union, about the latter end of the Year 1694. To which end, we appointed a number
number to meet, both with the dissenting sect.
Brethren who had left us, and with such I.
who had always refused to be of us. These
dissenting Brethren pretended nothing for
their separation, but that there were erro-
neous persons in the Union. To gratify
them as to this, the persons deputed by
us admitted such provision as pleased those
Brethren, against whatever Errors they
suspected any of our number guilty of.
This you will find in the former part of
the following paper, which was brought
to our meeting, as what would satisfy the
Dissenters, if assented to by us. Some of
us were sensible of this new imposition of
theirs, (against whose Opinions we had
so much to object,) and of the dangerous
consequences of thus multiplying Confessi-
ons, as also of favouring such unjust suspi-
cions of our Principles, which we knew
they had no reason for, as to any of our
number. Nevertheless, we submitted in
prospect of a Coalition; only finding
their paper to want due provision against
Crispian and Antinomian Errors, which
many did publickly espouse and abet, we
desired Mr. Howe, Mr. Stretton, Mr. Wil-
liams, and Mr. Lobb, to supply the said
defect. The result whereof you have in
the ensuing paper, which was unanimous-
ly agreed to in our meeting, and sent
from us by Mr. Lobb to our dissenting
Brethren, on Jan. 7. 1694.
Answer to the Report,

After a Preface it thus follows,

"We the united Ministers in and about London, considering of a way whereby to preserve the Union, and prevent any mistakes and remove any prejudices, that may arise amongst us to interrupt the foresaid Union, do declare, That we still adhere to the Terms thereof, and do still submit to the holy Scriptures as the Rule of Faith and Practice, and do own the doctrinal part of those commonly called the Articles of the Church of England, or the Confession, shorter and larger Catechisms, compiled by the Assembly at Westminster, or the Savoy Confession; and do renounce, and testify against, all Opinions and Doctrines dissonant therefrom: As for instance, among many others,

"[1.] That there is no definite number of Persons elected from all eternity, whom God will by his appointed means certainly save, and bring to eternal Life; leaving the rest, who fall under a just Condemnation for their original and actual Sins, especially for their neglect and contempt of the Means of Salvation.

"[2.] That Christ died equally for all Men, not intending the final Salvation of some more than others.

"[3.] That
drawn up by the Committee.

[3.] That Men have it in their own Sect. Power, by the use of the natural faculties of their Reason and Will, unassisted by the special Light and Grace of the Holy Ghost, to perform all that is necessary to Salvation; or that his special efficacious Light and Grace is not necessary to their conversion, perseverance, and final salvation.

[4.] That any of them whom God hath foreknown, predestinated, and called effectually according to the purpose of his Grace, shall fall away, either totally, or so as not to be finally glorified.

[5.] That Faith, Repentance, a holy Conversation, or any Act or Work whatever done by us, or wrought by the Spirit of God in us, are any part of that Righteousness, for the sake of which, or on the account whereof, God doth justify any man, or entitle him to eternal Life.

On the other side,

(1.) That Men are under no obligation to make use of their natural Faculties, with such external Means of salvation as God affords them; praying in hope, for his gracious assistance, in order to that blessed end.

(2.) That God hath not made Offers of Grace by Christ, to all within the sound of the Gospel; testifying that whoever
Anfwer to the Report,

Sect. I. "whoever believeth shall be saved, without excluding any, and commanding them to believe accordingly.

"(3.) That any are in the sight of God justified, or entitled to eternal Life, before they are effectually called, or while they remain unregenerate, or in unbelief.

"(4.) That any may expect Pardon without Repentance.

"(5.) That continued Repentance towards God, and Faith in our Lord Jesus, and Holiness of heart and life, are not in the nature of the thing, and by the constitution of the Gospel, necessary to Salvation.

"(6.) That the Moral Law is not of use to unregenerate men, to awaken their Consciences to fly from the Wrath to come, and drive them to Christ; or that it is not a rule of Life to them that live under the Gospel, as well as others.

"(7.) That Believers falling into grievous Sins, do not incur God's displeasure thereby; or that they may expect Assurance otherwise, than by the evidence of those Graces to which the promises of Salvation are made, and by the Testimony of the Spirit of Adoption witnessing with our Spirits, that we are the Children of God.

"We have thought it our Duty to bear our Testimony against all these erroneous
drawn up by the Committee.

"ous Opinions, or any other contrary to the plain tenour of the Gospel of God.
"And we do further protest against any design of undermining one another in any matter of Church-Government, but do heartily desire to maintain Communion with each other, according to the Heads of Agreement we have affented to. And if any thing hath been done or spoken by any of us, through mistake or inadvertency, that may cause any just offence to the prejudice of the said Union, we are ready upon better information to rectify the same; still desiring, and mutually resolving, a Brotherly forbearance towards one another, in any lesser points wherein we may differ."

Our concern for Union will appear, if it be considered, that (to the best of our knowledge) we retained all the very words lent by them to us, as a guard against each of the Errors of which they suspected any of us: The provision we added, is generally, in the words of the Assembly, to which we hoped they would be more easily induced to assent, than if we had expressed ourselves in other words; and we limited our additions to such Errors, as are the other extremum to the Articles they had chosen to insist upon, whereas we might have provided against each of Dr. Crisp's Errors.
A good issue of this Paper was expected by many of us: But to our grief it was rejected, and no Answer sent us concerning it to this very day. Yea, a Coalition hereupon was cheerfully hoped for by us, even after their Friends had (Nov. 7. 1694,) necessitated Four of our number to leave the Lecture at Pinners-Hall, and all such of the dissenting Brethren, who were managers of the relief for poor Ministers, had deserted their Associates; with other things, not so directly belonging to the Body of united Ministers as such. But alas! (as they had generally absented from us long before,) all the Brethren called Congregational (except the reverend and upright Mr. Barker, and a very few more,) joined as a separate Party from us, in the Monday's meeting at Pinners-Hall, with the Ministers who had opposed the Union ever since it was concluded.

The temper of our Brethren's Spirits, the methods taken to expose us, their disappointing us so often, when we thought they had been obliged, and the unsuccefulness of so many probable attempts for Re-union, might well discourage any further endeavours: Yet when we heard that any of these Brethren had the least disposition towards Peace, we applied ourselves to an Accommodation. In order thereunto, the Reverend Dr. Bates, Mr. Hammond, Mr. Hill, and Mr. Slater, in con-
drawn up by the Committee.

concurrence with Mr. Howe, and Mr. Sect. Williams, were desired to draw up a proposal, which they brought to our meeting, as that wherein they were all agreed; and after we had several days considered the same, it was unanimously assented to, and sent by us in a Letter to our Brethren.

The Paper, by the Report called the Third Paper, which was sent by the united Brethren to such as had left the Union.

WHEREAS some unhappy Differences have arisen among us, principally about the Doctrine of Justification, as set forth in Mr. Williams’s Book, entitled, Gospel-Truth stated, to which several of our Names are prefixed, we being willing to give all reasonable satisfaction therein, for the removing the present, and preventing all future Differences, which will otherwise tend to the dishonour of God, disquiet of his Churches, and danger of Souls; do hereby declare our Judgment concerning the same.

That we adhere to our former Approbation of the Doctrinal Articles of the Church of England, or the Confession of Faith compiled by the Assembly at Westminster, or that at the Savoy, as agreeable to the Word of God; and particularly, to the Articles collected by us
Answer to the Report,

Sect. I.

"us out of the Confession with the Catechisms compiled by the same Assembly, printed 1693. And further we declare, "That if any shall express himself disagreeably thereto, in any momentous Points of Doctrine, we will with brotherly candour and kindness endeavour to give, and receive, just satisfaction therein; bearing with one another's Infirmities, and different Sentiments in matters of lesser weight; not contending about Logical, or Philosophical Terms, or mere human Forms of Speech; nor judging it reasonable or just, to charge upon any such consequences of any expression or opinion of his, which he himself shall disown.

"And we further declare, as to the special matters in difference,

"I. Concerning Justification. That altho' the express Word of God do assert the necessity of Regeneration, to our entering into the Kingdom of God; and requires Repentance, that our Sins may be blotted out; and Faith in Christ, that we may be justified; and Holiness of heart and life, without which we cannot see God: Yet that none of these, or any Work done by Men, or wrought by the Spirit of God in them, is, under any denomination whatsoever, any part

* Note, It was declared, that by the words, [under
drawn up by the Committee.

"part of the Righteousness, for the sake, Sect.
"or on the account whereof, God doth I.
"pardon, justify, or accept Sinners, or entitle them to eternal Life; that being only the Righteousness of Christ without them, imputed to them, and received by Faith alone.

"II. Of a Commutation of Persons between Christ and us. As we are to consider our Lord Jesus Christ in his obedience and sufferings, as God and Man invested with the office of Mediator; so it is apparent, this Commutation of Persons with us was not natural, in respect of either nature, by which his individual Substance should become ours, and ours his; nor moral, in respect of qualities or actions, whereby he should become inherently sinful, and we immediately sinless; nor was it any change, whereby his office of Mediator should be transferred on us: But it is to be understood in a legal, or judicial Sense, (as we may call it,) viz. He by agreement between the Father and him, came into our room and stead, not to repent and believe for us, which the Gospel delivers any denomination whatsoever,] we exclude all Righteousness from being meritorious, or atoning, yea, or a procuring cause of those benefits; none is at all so, but the Righteousness of Christ: But we intended not to exclude, what the Gospel requireth in order to our interest in those benefits, given for the sake of Christ's Righteousness.
"pel requires of us as our Duty, (though due time be enabled thereto;) but to answer for our violation of the Law of works: He being made sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him. 2 Cor. v. 21.

III. Of God's being pleased or displeased with Christ, as standing, and suffering in our stead. We judge, that God was always pleased with Christ, both in his Person, and in the execution of all his Offices, (which is expressed most particularly in that of his Priestly, John x. 17, 18. Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life, &c.) and was no otherwise displeased, than as having a dispassionate Will to inflict upon him the punishment of our Sins, which he had undertaken to bear, that God might, without Injury to his Justice or Honour, pardon and save penitent Believers, for his Satisfaction, and Intercession founded thereon.

Mr. Williams freely declareth his concurrence with us in these Three particulars, and that his Judgment was never contrary to the sense of this Paper, for which he appeals to the said Book: So it is manifest, that when he useth the phrase of no change of Person between Christ and the Elect, it could not be in-..."
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"tended as a denial of a Change of Per-Sect.
sons between Christ and us in the general sense, but only in opposition to the opinion of his adversary he wrote against; for in that very place he expressly affirms, That Christ suffered and died, in our room and stead.

"AND we do declare, that whatsoever shall be found to express themselves in their preaching or writing, agreeably to this Paper, and to the mentioned Articles or Confessions, we shall esteem them to deliver the sincere Gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; and it shall be remote from us to oppose or reflect upon, but we shall to our utmost encourage, and give countenance to, one another's Ministry therein.

"Such of us, whose Names are prefixed to the said Book, do declare, they were given to the State of Truths and Errors, as formerly expressed in the Paper, entituled, The Agreement in Doctrine, subscribed and published, Anno Dom. 1692."

They who framed this Proposal, had before them two Papers; one which the Report calls the First Paper, which one of our Brethren had, with great condescension and inclination to Peace, concerted with some of the Dissenters: Which Paper, although it was never proposed to, nor A a read
Anfwer to the Report,

Sect. I. read in any of our publick meetings of Mi-

nisters, and was unanimously agreed to be laid aside with a Second Paper, that had been brought unto us by another Brother; yet it is manifest, the Brethren in the framing of this Third (which is our only Pa-

per,) greatly accommodated themselves to the model of the First. For they admit a new Debate concerning Mr. Williams's Book, after a solemn accommodation of that whole matter, when the Dissenters had unjustly made it an occasion of difference so many years before. They also re-
cite two passages of Mr. Williams, as ex-
cepted against by the Dissenters, and limit the declaration of our Judgment to the Three Heads, the Objectors did chuse to in-
sist upon; whereas you will presently read a Vote of us united Ministers, where-
in we require a disowning of very many Antinomian Errors, published by several of these Dissenters, whenever they shall make the disowning of any passages out of Books written against Antinomianism, a Term of Union. Yea further, we retain the whole provision of the First Paper, against any of our surmised Errors in the Doctrine of Fustification, and what we add is in Scripture words. And in the other Two Heads, we come as near as we can with truth, and freedom from ambiguity, in Points of so great concernment, and in a time when so many are at work to propagate Crispia-

nism.
drawn up by the Committee.

nism, and Antinomianism. A Coalition Sect:
could be no indifferent thing to such, who to obtain it do thus condescend, and deny
themselves.

But to give our attempt a yet greater advantage, we omitted not to address our-
selves to our Brethren, with the most af-
fecationate, fervent, and humble intreaties
and supplications, as well as persuasive Ar-
guments; as you will see in this Letter which we sent to them, with the foremen-
tioned Paper.

To our reverend, and duly respected, and beloved Brethren in our common Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, Mr. Griffith, Mr. Mead, Mr. Chauncy, Mr. James, Mr. Lobb, and the rest of the Brethren of the Union, who for some time have forborn to meet with the united Ministers at Dr. Annisley's meeting place.

"Reverend Brethren,

"YOUR forbearing to meet with us at our ordinary times and places for so many months, hath made a deep and smarting impression on our Spirits, and filled our hearts with Grief and Wonder: With Grief, because we have been so long deprived of much of that satisfaction and assistance, which your presence with us was wont to afford us: With Wonder, because we could nei-
A a 2 ther
that apprehend, nor receive any certain Information of, those Reasons, which prevailed with you to keep off so long from our Conventions. For to this day you never acquainted us, directly, and clearly, of any Offence that was ever offered to you, by the united Ministers, as standing in that Capacity. Had you been pleased to signify your Resentments to them, they take themselves to have been obliged to have fought out proper ways and means, for the removal of all prejudices, and of rendering to you reasonable and due satisfaction.

All the light that we have received about matters in difference between us, hath been from a reverend Brother, who told us, That by Conference with some who forbear to come to our meetings, he understood, that they apprehended, there are those in our Union, who have sentiments about the Doctrine of Justification, different from the common Faith of all Orthodox Protestants, and so, dissonant from the holy Scriptures, and the Confessions, which have been owned and approved by us. The same Brother added, that if there were sufficient evidence and assurance given them, that the Body of the united Ministers would approve themselves found, clear, and stedfast in that most weighty and important Doctrine, (which we all acknowledge...
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"acknowledge to be Articulus plantis vel Sect.
"cadentis Ecclesiae,) they would then I.
"maintain all Brotherly communion with us.
"When this was notified to us, we presently conceived great and good hopes, that all Jealousies might be easily removed, and that a Redintegration of Affections would immediately follow. And what should hinder? For if you attentively and deliberately weigh what is asserted in the Article of Justification in the inclosed Paper, (which was unanimously agreed unto, after open reading, and that upon several days,) we are confident, that it will evidently and undisguisedly appear, that we perfectly agree with our Brethren in the evangelical Doctrine of Justification, even in the very phrases and modes of Expression.
"Our Agreement in the Doctrine of Justification, which was as the Test and Cement of our Union, being so happily established and fixed; we shall need to say but little, touching the other two points mentioned in the inclosed Paper; which (as we think) are so clearly and candidly stated, that we believe, (as we suppose, upon sure and certain grounds,) there will be nothing remaining (upon that account,) to obstruct our entire and hearty Union.
"It would be superfluous to lay before you
you any considerations, to set forth the desirableness, usefulness, and (we may add) the necessity of Ministerial concord; or to represent the sin and mischief, that will inseparably cleave to our unbrotherly breaches. We all find (by sad experience,) what advantage is given thereby, to some who seek occasion to reproach us, and to hinder the success or acceptableness of our Ministry. They do certainly wish, and will endeavour to make, our wound incurable. But we trust, the Lord will blast their designs, and frustrate their expectations, by enlightening our minds, to receive and hold fast all Truths, and especially those which are fundamental; and will, by his Grace, most sweetly and effectually draw our hearts to love as brethren, that we may closely, strongly, and intimately knit together in inviolable bonds; and so guide us, that we may all follow after the things that make for Peace, and the things wherewith one may edify another.

And now (dear Brethren,) we do, with all sincerity and ardor, beseech you to meet us with the like frame of Spirit; that our only emulation and contention may be, who shall be most industrious to promote the interest of our Lord Redeemer; be most useful to the Souls we are set to watch over; and be most forward to embrace each other in the arms of Love,
drawn up by the Committee.

"THAT these blessed Ends may be the more effectually pursued, we do (with all importunity and fervor) beseech you, to return to and frequent our meetings, as ye have formerly done: That we may join with you there in your holy Prayers, be assisted with your wholesome Counsels, and be refreshed with your much desired Society; that we may with one mind, and one mouth, glorify God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

"IF, after the perusal of the inclosed Paper, ye meet with any thing therein, that may seem to need further explanation; and ye be willing to entertain a Conference about it: Be pleased to appoint the time and place, when, and where, a determinate number of the united Ministers may meet with a like number of the Brethren nominated by you, and we shall most readily and cheerfully comply with your Proposal. Howbeit, we must add, That we hope, we have already set down our sentiments, as nakedly and perspicuously as we could express them, in pursuance of our End, which was to give you all possible satisfaction.

"WE conclude this Paper with two earnest requests to you: (1.) Upon the hopes which you have conceived, that (thro' the grace and blessing of our God)
**Answer to the Report,**

the differences which have risen among us, will be brought to an happy com-
position; We importunately beseech you, to use your uttermost endeavours, to persue those Brethren who have not as yet entred into our Union, that they will join with us in it. And, (2.) That you would (as soon as conveniently you can,) vouchsafe us an Answer to this our Letter.

"**Finally,** Brethren, Farewell; be perfect, be of good comfort, be of one mind, live in peace; and the God of love and peace shall be with you." Signed at Dr. Annesley's, October 27. 1696. by George Hammond, Moderator."

To our Letter so submissive, peaceable, and importunate, we received this and no other Answer.

"**Reverend Brethren,**

HAVING received from you a Letter with a Paper inclosed, in Answer thereunto suffer us to acquaint you, That a Paper was subscribed by a considerable number of you, and approved of by us some months since, which we have reason to believe some of you have had the perusal of: We therefore to whom your Letter is directed, do not reckon it brotherly in us, to forsake them who have subscribed the fore-
drawn up by the Committee.

"foresaid Paper; but do rather judge our-

"selves bound in conscience, to intreat your hearty Concurrence with them, "and us, in that First Paper; which, as "we have already said, hath been sub-

"scribed by very principal and reverend "Ministers, highly esteemed both by you "and us: And this we hope, may, thro' "the Blessing of God, be the speediest "way to obtain the desirable End. Sub-

"scribed in the name of several of the Bre-

"thren, to whom your Letter was commu-

"nicated."

This is the Letter our Reporter com-

 plains we gave no reply to; wherein we think we paid a great regard to them who sent it: And we shall still overlook it, other-

wise than to note, First, It is more than probable, some of us perused, what a con-

 siderable number of us subscribed. Secondly, Our Brethren who subscribed, could not judge it unbrotherly, to be forfaked in lay-

 ing aside the First Paper, when every one of them had laid it aside before, and joined in the Third Paper, and in the Letter whereeto this Answer is given; (which it's strange any of the Dissenters could be ignorant of.) Thirdly, What is the desirable End? Had they said Union, it would have been more acceptable to us, than it seemed to be to such of themselves, who declared in one of the meetings about this expedi-
ent, "That it was not intended by this attempted Agreement, that they would join with us in our meetings as united Ministers, but that an agreement in Doctrine might be a step to further Union:" Yea, we can scarce hope, they would have re-united, could we have submitted to their Paper, because, as we are informed, Mr. Cole and Mr. Mather refused their assent to it. And this their Letter was subscribed in the name, but of several, (not of all,) to whom it was communicated; nor (as we find,) was any Union or Agreement, engaged or expressed, except in Doctrine, had this expedient obtained.

This is the true State of the case between our Brethren and us. Could we have obtained a Re-union, upon mutual forbearance wherein we differ: Had any of these Accounts of our Principles satisfied them; (tho' we therein admit so rigid and full a tryal wherein they suspected us, and propose so very short and easy a Test, when we affirm the Truths denied by them:) Had our importunity for Peace, attended with much patience and condescension, been accepted; the mischievous effects of our Differences had been prevented. Nor can we guess, what would prevail with the Authors of these Divisions, unless that a Book should be disowned, which, the Subscribers are convinced, is of great use for the
the Defence of the Gospel in a time Sect. abounding with Errors; and such Truths betrayed, as the usefulness of our Ministry and practical Religion depend upon: Things we are sure Christ would not approve, nor could we expect a Peace bought to prove a Blessing.

We were well assured, that a faithful Account of the State of things among us, must acquit us of the blame of those unhappy Differences, and prevent the advantages some made by mis-representing us: Nevertheless, we had still remained silent, if this so unjust a Report (with a paper of Remarks following it,) had not been obtruded on the World, and with art scattered throughout the Kingdom, yea, sent to foreign Nations, as can be proved. After this indeed, our silence would proclaim us stupidly insensible, and unconcerned for the common Good, as well as for our own reputation and usefulness.

We shall proceed to consider what is material in the Report.

First, The Report faith, Our differences may be reduced to Christ's Satisfaction, and the Penal Sanction of the Law; tho' hitherto, the greatest struggle hath been about the first.

Answ. 1. The first was no part of the difference, till of late, that Mr. Lobb contrived to make it so, tho' without any Reason;
Answer to the Report,

Sect. Reason; for Mr. Williams rightly and fully asserted the first in his Books. And the utmost that can be made of the latter is, that Mr. Williams asserts, that if the Precepts of the Law of works be considered as taken into the Gospel, they fall under the Gospel-Sanction; and tho' in this respect there is a change of the Sanction, yet the Precepts being considered still as a part of the Law of works, they are under the same Legal Sanction as at first; which is to say, The Covenant of works and the Gospel-Covenant differ. And yet this seems to be reserved for a new Controversy, if we had agreed to their very mode of expressing the point he insisteth on.

Anfwr. 2. It is a very great mistake, that our difference with them is reduced to these two points: Alas! It extends to many other things, viz. most of Dr. Crisp's Opinions, as to which they refuse to give us satisfaction; tho' he granteth, these two are all they quarrel with us about, and how unjustly will presently be seen. We shall detect his mistake by a brief Narrative.

(1.) The difference originally appeareth to be about most of those Positions, called Truths and Errors in the State of them in Mr. William's Book: For Six of the Dissenters did not only object some particular passages, but they deny those to be Truths which are called Truths, and such to be Errors which are called Errors,
in the ii, v, vii, viii, xii, xvi, xviii, and Sect. xix Chapters of that Book: Yea, they say, "They find not Truth and Error rightly stated in other places besides these:" Thus they say, in Mr. Chauncy's Neonomianism unmasked, par. iii. pag. 96, whereas many of our Brethren subscribed, that each of these were rightly stated. He that will read the Truths and Errors in those several Chapters, may judge of the difference, and whether any of Dr. Crisp's Errors will be disowned.

(2.) In the forecited Articles of 1694. you will find, that when we had owned such to be Errors, which they required of us, yet they refused to disown those Errors which we added; and therefore the difference at that time, respected whatever they refused to agree with us in, and was not ever since accommodated.

(3.) The Reporter cannot be ignorant, that September 15. 1695. this Vote unanimously passed among the united Brethren, "Upon reading a Paper relating to several dangerous Expressions in favour of Antinomianism, it is agreed, If any thing objected out of Books written against Antinomianism be required to be disowned as a Term of Union, that those things read this day, and further to be collected of that kind out of the Books on the other side, shall be required to be disowned."
Some things collected out of the Books of Mr. Chauncy, Mr. Cole, Mr. Mather, and Mr. Trayl.

"To talk of a Gospel threat, is a Catachresis at best, and nothing else can save it from being a Bull.—Pardon is rather the Condition of Faith, (and much more, having a causal influence thereunto,) than Faith and Repentance are of Pardon.—It was Sin, as to the _αὐτοία_, that Christ bore; the fault of sin was laid upon Christ, the sin itself as opposed to guilt: Christ was reputed a Criminal, not only by Man, but by God.—As to the Elect, there was never any Guilt upon them, in respect of the righteous Judgment of God, _in foro Dei_; but that which accompanied the letter of the Law, setting in with the Conscience.—Justification is before effectual Vocation: The Doctrine of Justification before Faith, is not an Error, but a great and glorious Truth. Justification in regard of Application, must be before believing: The first Application, _ordine naturæ saltem_, is to an ungodly man, _eo nomine_, that he may believe: We believe, that we may be justified declaratively.

"It is denied, that God requires Faith as an indispensable Qualification, in those
those whom he will justify for Christ's Sect.

merits.—Unbelief is not the Cause, why

men are barred from Justification, and

obnoxious to Misery.—You talk of an

offer to the Non-elect, and that offer

you say must be serious, &c. But I

pray, where is any offer of Grace to

the Non-elect at all, as such? And

shew me any Grace given, or Gospel

Duties required of the Non-elect, or Be-

nfits promised to the Non-elect, upon

their performance of Grace and Du-
ties, &c.—And what if the Non-elect

be in as bad a case as the Devils, Is

God bound to be any better to them

than to the Devils? God hath not said,

I will save a Non-elect Person if he

believe; more than he hath said, A

Horse shall be a Man, if he can use

reason, or speak; or a Man shall be a

Horse, if he hath four feet.

God was reconciled to the Elect at

Christ's death, but we are reconciled to

God by the Gospel-ministry.—Union

with Christ is before Faith, at least na-
tural, and we partake of the Spirit by

virtue of that Union: There is a com-
plete Union with Christ, before the
act of Faith.—All that a Believer can
pray for, is the further manifestation
of Pardon; for he knows that all his

sins are pardoned.—A Believer is to

work from Life, and not for Life.—
Sect. "It is a great Truth, that God sees no sin
in a Believer: Sin can do no real hurt
to a Believer. God is not displeased
with his people, and is not angry with
the persons of Believers, for their sins.
---Legal Convictions before saving Faith
are no more than sin; it is but the fil-
thy, Conscience-polluting, Guilt of sin.--
There is no preparatory work, distinct
from God’s act in effectual Calling.
"The Gospel is no Rule of Judgment;
that’s the Law only: The Gospel is not
any part of the Rule of Judgment at
the last day; that’s only the Law of
Creation. --- It is denied, that at the
Judgment Day there will be a Trial,
upon which some will be justified, others
condemned. —Christ’s precepts are not.
Laws with a Sanction. —Sanctification
is not the way of a justified Person to
Heaven.—If you look upon Graces and
Duties, and Salvation, as two distinct
things, I deny, that they are necessary
to give a right to Salvation. All imper-
fecf Holiness is Sin. —Turn ye, turn ye,
why will ye die? is but the triumph of
the Law over a dead Sinner.—An un-
saved person can do nothing in order to
Salvation.
"God was displeased with Christ as
our Surety.—We in Christ satisfied the
Justice of God.—We through Christ’s
Righteousness have a right to Glory, by
"Adam’s
Adam's Covenant.—Adam for one good work, should have entered into full possession, and a confirmation therein:

But to teach that a Christian, upon the actings of Graces, and performance of Duties, may in the virtue of the Promise made to the exercise of those Graces or Duties, expect any of those promised Blessings, is to teach a low and servile Spirit.

The Eternal Life in which the Angels were created and confirmed by Christ, differs from that Eternal Life which Believers have in Christ; the one is a Creature Life, or a created Life; the other is the Eternal Life of God communicated in time.—Believers are as righteous as Christ; I mean, not in a way of Similitude, but in a way of Equality.—Christ's Incarnation was no part of his Humiliation.—We coalesce upon believing into one mystical Person with Christ, which is distinguished from Legal Union, which is before Faith.—The Gospel hath no Law-Sanction. It is plainly denied, that the Gospel is a Law of Grace.—Faith is neither a condition, nor qualification, in the office of Justification;—with several things of the same sort as above recited.

Most of these were then included in the Paper, that the Vote refers to; which, with
Answer to the Report,

Sect. with the other things further collected, I. shall be proved to be in the printed Books of the foresaid Authors, and Book and Page cited for each, when it shall be required: Yea, a great deal more, if not worse, of the same sort.

By these things it is manifest, what the Difference is about; though a noise hath been raised about things remote from the true occasion, that while we seemed to be only on the defensive part, their Errors might receive countenance as if unopposed, and the Abettors thereof might less appear the cause of our Divisions.

Answ. 3: Although our Brethren from a zeal for Peace condescended to mention but three particulars in the Third Paper; yet it is too evident, that the Dissenters adhere to their own Paper, (called the First,) and refuse ours, because this doth provide some defence against some of the Errors, which our difference is about; (the same cause, for which they rejected the Articles in 1694.) And it is plain by what their Paper faith of Justification, they had this our Paper of 1694. before them; and therefore must know, that we insisted under that Head to have it clearly expressed, "That none are justified in the sight of God, or entitled to eternal Life, before they are effectually called, or whilst they are unregenerate, or in unbelief:"

And, "that men must repent in order to
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"forgiveness:" As also, "that continued Sect. Repentance, Faith, and Holiness of I. heart and life, are by the constitution of the Gospel, as well as in the Nature of the things themselves, necessary to "Salvation, &c." Our dissenting Brethren knew this, and yet insert nothing in that First Paper sufficient to this purpose. By the Reporter's way of arguing against us, their not mentioning those things is their disowning of them, and owning the contrary: Yea, we have more reason to infer thus, because what they omit was sent by the body of united Ministers to them as a means of Union; whereas what is omitted by us, was not sent to us, much less to that end, nor adjusted by our appointment. But we need not to insist on this, when by comparing the First and Third Papers, it is evident, that the foresaid Errors are inconsistent with the few variations in our Paper, but very-consistent with theirs, though not in the sense designed by our subscribing Brethren.

In the first part of the Head of Justification, their Paper faith, " Repentance, Faith, and a holy Conversation, are by God's express word manifestly necessary to Salvation." They do not say, Repentance is necessary to Pardon, nor Faith to Justification, though that be the Head treated of: No, these are necessary to no more than a holy Conversation is necessary.
An answer to the Report,

Sect. I. to, that is, to eternal Salvation: Nor do they say, that the necessity of these to Salvation itself is by the Gospel-constitution, or any enacted connection between duty and benefit. Things being thus worded, it may pass with such who tell us, "The Gospel hath neither precept, threatening, nor conditional promise: Repentance is not antecedently necessary to Pardon, nor Faith to the Justification of our persons, but only to manifest to our consciences for our inward Peace, that our persons were justified before God whilst in our unbelief." But such things are prevented by our Paper, which faith, "That the Word of God requires Repentance, that our Sins may be blotted out, and Faith that we may be justified:" And afterwards, "The Gospel requires of us as our Duty, that we repent and believe; and God pardons penitent Believers." In like manner, their Paper in the other Heads expresseth things so, as that such may subscribe it, who think, the filth and fault of Sin were transferred on Christ; that he was the Criminal, the Murderer, &c. in God's account; that God was really displeased with Christ, and abhorred him as our Surety, though not considered in himself; and sundry the like, (that our Paper gives no countenance to,) which our subscribing Brethren do abhor.

It is not then without Reason, that the
drawn up by the Committee.

Dissenters insist on the First Paper; whether they be such who hold those Errors, or resolve to indulge such as do so. And yet, there wants not Art in placing the difference upon our omitting a Phrase in the Third Paper, wherein the true sense of it is expressed; for the Reporter well saw, a quarrel with us for the omission of a Phrase of so uncertain a sense, is as yet more plausible, than their struggle for Errors of so ill a sound would be.

Answ. 4. But if the Doctrines about which we differ are not yet sufficiently evident, we shall with a desire of Union make this Proposal:

If our dissenting Brethren will declare their agreement with us,

(1.) That Repentance towards God is commanded, in order to Remission of Sin.

(2.) That Faith in Christ is commanded by the Gospel, in order to the Justification of our persons before God, for the sake of the alone Righteousness of Christ.

(3.) That the Word of God requires Perseverance in true Faith and Holiness, that we may be partakers of the heavenly Glory.

(4.) That the Gospel promiseth Pardon through the blood of Christ to the penitent, Justification before God to the believer, and the heavenly Glory to such as persevere in Faith and Holiness; and also
Answer to the Report,

Sect. declareth, that God will not pardon the I. Impenitent, justify the Unbeliever, nor glorify the Apostate or Unholy.

(5.) That justifying Faith is not only a persuasion of the understanding, but also a receiving and resting upon Christ alone for Salvation.

(6.) That by Change of Person is meant, that whereas we were condemned for our sins, the Lord Jesus was substituted in our room, to bear the Punishment of our sins, for the Satisfaction of divine Justice, that whoever believes on him, may be acquitted and saved: But it is not intended, that the Filth of sin was upon Christ, nor that he was a Criminal in God's account.

(7.) That by Christ's being our Surety is meant, that Jesus Christ our Mediator obliged himself to expiate our sins by his Blood, and to purchase eternal Life for all that believe, and Faith and every saving Grace for the Elect: But it is not intended, that we were legally reputed to make Satisfaction, or purchase eternal Life.

(8.) That by Christ's answering for us the Obligations of the violated Law of works is intended, that whereas the Law obliged us to die for our sins, Christ became obliged to die in our stead; and whereas we were, after we had sinned, still obliged to yield perfect obedience, Christ perfectly obeyed the Law, that upon the account of his
his **active** and **passive obedience** believers might be forgiven, and entitled to eternal Life: But it is not intended, that the Sense of the Law of works should be, that if we or Christ obeyed we should live, and if Christ suffered we should not die, though we sinned: Nor that Believers are **justified**, or to be judged by the Law of works, but by the Gospel; although the Righteousness for the sake of which they are justified, be as perfect as that Law of works required, and far more valuable.

If our dissenting Brethren will subscribe to these Propositions and Explications, we will subscribe with them even to the words, *Change of Persons, Surety, and answering for us the Obligations of the violated Law of works*; as well as we have already subscribed, "That no work done by men, or "wrought by the Spirit of God in them, "is any part of the Righteousness, for "the sake, or on the account whereof we "are justified; that being only the Right- "eousness of Christ without us, imput- "ed to us, and received by Faith alone," which is the procuring cause of all saving Good. How gladly would we re-unite with them, might this but remove the difference!

And since we are content, to use their very words and phrases explained in the Orthodox sense, (the omission whereof is what is excepted against us,) we hope, that
Answer to the Report,

Sect. that such of the Dissenters as shall refuse to agree with us, will not hereafter say, that a difference in the Doctrines pretended by the Report is the reason why they unite not with us; but will acknowledge, that they keep up the difference from their zeal for the foresaid opinions of Dr. Crisp and the Antinomians, which we think to be very erroneous.

Secondly, The Report faith, That the Third Paper was taken and sent from some who meet at Little St. Helens.

Anfwr. These some had with them, all of our Brethren who subscribed the First Paper, yea, several of them were the Framers of it; as well as the whole Body of the united Ministers (as far as we know,) consented to it.

Thirdly, The Reporter gives the Reasons why the Dissenters did not approve of the Third Paper; which are these.

i Reason. He faith, pag. 4. "The Third Paper omitted to mention, that a Change of Persons is the common Doctrine of Protestants:" And adds, "That neither justification, nor Christ's Satisfaction, can be duly explained, or defended without it; and that Grotius, and the Reverend Bishop of Worcester, have proved a Change of Persons."

Anfwr. i. The Third Paper asserts a Commutation of Persons, therefore we wonder, he affirms, pag. 5. that we have not men-
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mentioned it. But having therein fully af- sect.
ferted it in opposition to Socinianism, is it not strange, our Paper should be scrupled, because we duly explained Justification and Christ’s Satisfaction thereby, but did not say, They could not be explained without it, &c? which though we may think, yet the mere saying so is not the hinge of the Controversy, nor would it add any strength to the hedge which we have made without it; or else surely, some of our Protestant Confessions would at least have made mention thereof, and therefore these Brethren must reject every one of those, as well as ours.

Answ. 2. We have affirmed and explained a Change of Persons, in the same Sense as Grotius and the Reverend Dr. Stillingfleet Bishop of Worcester have done, (as will appear to any who consult those Authors:) But they are far from approving the Crispian Explication of that Phrase, as we shall evidence by a Letter of the said Reverend Bishop to Mr. Williams.

Answ. 3. As we durst not imitate the Reporter’s liberty, persuading the world, we denied and rejected a Commutation or Change of Persons, when we asserted it in express terms; so we assure him, we designed not to offend our Brethren, who, he faith, pag. 6. are grieve, because our Letter faith, That on our so happy establishing the Doctrine of Justification, we need say
Answer to the Report,

Sect. say but little in the Point of Commutation of Persons. By which words it is plain we meant not, that we said little of it in our Paper; where in the second and third Heads we said enough to clear it, even twice more than what we said of Justification: But we say little of it in our Letter, where we have enlarged on Justification; because for several years the Dissenters pretended, all their great Quarrel was about that Doctrine. And may not we justly grieve, that for our Industry in clearing ourselves beyond all their challenges as to this, we should be hereticated by this Report, in the new Controversy started by Mr. Lobb?

2 Reason. This occurs so often, that we cannot avoid answering it again and again.

3 Reason. He says, pag. 6. "There is such a wrong description given of a Change of Person in the Third Paper, as perverts the Doctrine of Satisfaction?" Yea, pag. 7. he tells us, "Christ did not, yea, could not make Satisfaction upon what you affirm."

Answ. 1. We shall first enquire what description the Reporter gives of a Change of Persons, which is such, as must with wise men justify our careful expressing our Sense of this Phrase. Pag. 7. he faith, "A Commutation is the same with a proper Surrogation, where the Surety puts
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"on the quality, state, and condition of the Sect.

"Debtor:" Pag. 5. he tells us, "We are all by nature under the Curse of the Law, and destitute of a Righteousness entitling to eternal Life," and adds, "This is our state and condition, this is the place we are in:" And a few lines after he faith, "That Christ put himself into our place, state, and condition; so that, whereas we were Sin and under a Curse, by this blessed change Christ was made Sin and a Curse." Here he plainly expresseth his sense of the Change of Persons. As to what he speaks of Christ's being a Curse, we object not further, than that Christ was not so by Nature: But the things we observe are, That he faith, Our state, place, and condition was, that we were destitute of a Righteousness entitling to eternal Life; this was our state and place; to which he adds, that Christ put himself into this our state, place, and condition; and if so, then with him Christ was destitute of a Righteousness entitling to eternal Life. To make this more evident, he faith, we were Sin; this was our state, place, and condition, into which Christ put himself; and by this change was made Sin: Now, how were we Sin? We were not a Sin-offering, but sinful vile offenders; we were sinful, and destitute of all Righteousness; that was our condition: Yet he faith, Christ came into our condition as we were Sin;
Answer to the Report,

Sect. Sin; which must be, that he was changed to be a sinful vile offender, not an offering for Sin, for that was not our Condition. By which it is evident, our Reporter's Commutation of Persons is not, that Christ became a Sin-offering, and in our stead subject to the punishments, which by the Law Sinners deserved, that we might be delivered. No, that will not content him; but that Christ was changed to be a sinful person, destitute of a Righteousness entitling to eternal Life: This is his Change, this is his Christ's taking on him the Person of Sinners; which is a position, not only unworthy of the praises he bestows on it, pag. 5. but so horrid, that we hope, some of our dissenting Brethren will be provoked to clear themselves from the Imputation, this Reporter seems fond to lay them under.

Ans. 2. The Arguments must be strong, by which he faith, our account of a Change of Person is attacked; if they will prove, that we have thereby perverted the Doctrine of Satisfaction, yea, and rendered it impossible. Whether the Arguer and Reporter be the same Person, we enquire not; but that they are of the same Spirit none can doubt: In return whereto, we wish them more charity and modesty for the future. However, some might expect, they would have consulted their own Credit so far, as not to proclaim the very same men, the
most learned and most orthodox, and yet very ignorant and grossly heretical; and that, as to the very same Point: The first character the Reporter bestows on them, for subscribing the First Paper; yet it abates nothing to them of the last, seeing they will frame and approve of the Third Paper. But it greatly concerns all of us, to peruse the Arguments which follow.

I Arg. "When we discourse of a Commutation, we should consider Christ (who is invested with the Office of Mediator,) as our Surety in the execution of his Priestly office, &c. But wording it as they do, is calculated for their Meridian, who hold Christ suffered only in the Person of a Mediator, not in the Person of Sinners: For which Reason we may perceive, why there must not be the least mention of Christ's Surety in the Third Paper."

Answ. I. Christ's Suretyship did not divest him of the office of his Mediatorship, but connotes, that as Mediator he engaged himself to suffer for condemned Sinners; yea, and to do much more for them, than what is included in the execution of his Priestly office, viz. to teach them, to overcome their Enemies, &c. Nay more, all Christ's Sufferings as a Priest, were his Sufferings, as one mediating for Sinners, and not as one become himself a Sinner; as he is represented to be,
Anfwr. 1. Be, by making such a vast difference between him as our Mediator, and as Surety.

Anfwr. 2. Tho' we mention not the word Surety, (which we scruple not,) yet we did plainly express the thing designed by that word; so far as belongs to a subsequent Surety in criminal causes, (tho' not pecuniary,) and as is consistent with Christ's being a Mediator in all his engagements and performances for us: A disregard to both which, occasioneth such confused and mistaken notions concerning these Doctrines.

2 Arg. "Their account of a Commutation is; It's to be understood in a legal, or judicial Sense, as we may call it; not that it is really so, only we may so call it."

Anfwr. 1. As we may call it, is not opposed to really, but we use it as an Apology for the term judicial, as added to legal, and as unscriptural. We mean, that wherein Christ suffered, he was judicially dealt with, as if he had been the condemned Sinners, in whose room he suffered: But knowing that many give a dangerous sense of the word legal, when used without explication or limitation, we added judicial thereto.

Anfwr. 2. The Reporter might have spared saying, They'll not quarrel about the Term, may the Thing they contend for be granted them. Instead of complaining of a dif-
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a disrespect to Fifty or Sixty Ministers, Sect. we'll desire all our Brethren were as temperate; which would end all Quarrels about human words, when the Sense is granted: Nor would this disparage the Reporter, who seems so fond of a Set of words, as if he highly valued himself, for his discovery of them to his Associates; and therefore he will contend for them so stiffly, that neither union, orthodox explications, nor his reverence for some of us, (when useful to him,) shall signify or amount to anything, if all his Phrases be not still made use of.

3 Arg. "We apprehend this to be their meaning, because in their Explication, there is not a word proper and peculiar to a Commutation in a legal Sense, &c. What tho' Christ died in the Person of a Mediator, to answer for our violation of the Law of works, yet if he died not in the Person of Sinners, to answer for them the violated Law of works, he did not, he could not, make Satisfaction to vindictive, or remunerative Justice."

Answ. 1. We shall not insist, how proper Satisfaction is to remunerative Justice, nor how unfair it is to argue, as if we had said, Christ died only in the Person of a Mediator, (when our Paper hath no such thing;) only because himself had said, our words are calculated for the Meridian of such who hold so.
Answer to the Report,

Sect. Answ. 2. Our own words will convince the unbiassed, whether there be strength or truth in this Argument. Take what we say in the second and third Heads in our Paper, which must be connected to express our Sense. "Christ our Mediator, by agreement with the Father, came into our room and stead, to answer for our violation of the Law of works; he being made sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him: And with Christ as standing in our stead, God was no otherwise displeased, than as having a Will to inflict on him the punishment of our Sins, which he had undertaken to bear, that God might, without injury to his Justice or Honour, pardon and save penitent Believers, through his Satisfaction, and Intercession founded thereon."

Can any read these words, and honestly infer, That we have not a word proper to a Commutation in a legal Sense, or that we denied Christ's Satisfaction, or that Christ's Satisfaction was impossible by the account we give thereof? And yet we are charged in the Report with each of these. But for the better information of the Reader, we shall shew what our account containeth.

(1.) The Father, as the offended Rector, proposeth and agrees upon Terms with Christ our Mediator, upon which con-
condemned Sinners shall be pardoned and saved.

(2.) The Terms proposed and agreed are such, as sufficiently secure God's Honour, and make amends to Justice, so that neither are to suffer any injury by pardoning the Sinner; and they are such, as answered for all our violations of the Law of works; and such, as render Christ's Sufferings a punishment for our Sins.

(3.) The Father and Son agree, not only that these Terms are sufficient, but that also they shall be accounted to us, and be performed in our room and stead; (we mean, vice nostrâ, & loco nostro;) that therein he was to answer for our violations of the Law, and that we should be pardoned and saved thereupon.

(4.) Upon this agreement, the Father, as a just Ruler provoked by us Sinners, doth justly inflict the punishment of our sins on Christ, for Satisfaction to his Justice, (which is the same, as that his Justice might not be injured.)

(5.) Christ suffers those punishments in our stead, and is therein a Sin-offering for us, (tho' not deputed by us,) that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.

(6.) What he suffered is a Satisfaction; and his Intercession is founded upon that Satisfaction; for and by which the penitent Believer is pardoned and saved.

If we have not herein affirmed and explained...
Answer to the Report,

Sect. plained a legal Commutation and Christ's Suretieship in a sound sense, (tho' not in the Reporter's,) and affirmed Christ's Satisfaction, yea, enumerated the essentials of it; we despair that we ever can. And if men will not acknowledge, the Reporter doth misrepresent us, and intend his Phrases to be a cover for several Errors, when this orthodox sense of them could not satisfy him; we can but bewail their prejudice and partiality.

Anfwr. 3. We do not see, why our words, viz. Christ died in our room and stead (which he leaves out) to answer for our violations of the Law of works, &c. should not make Christ's Satisfaction possible, yea, and affirm it, as well as their words, viz. "Christ put on the Person of Sinners, and came into their room and stead, to answer for them the obligations of the violated Law of works."

Putting on the Person of Sinners, can have no good sense, beyond Christ's coming into our room and stead, which we have asserted: The words, [for them,] have but the same import: And seeing the violated Law obliged us to die for our violations of that Law; if Christ in our stead answered for our violations of that Law, for which it put us under those obligations to die; then Christ died to answer for us the obligations of that violated Law, that is, its obligations on us to die for our sins; to which Christ's Satis-
Satisfaction (which is the point in hand) Sect. I.

Answ. 4. From what we observe so oft repeated by the Reporter, had he justly represented the Third Paper, and dealt sincerely, he must have reduced all his Reasons and Arguments to prove his heavy Charge against us, and to justify the Dissenters refusal of that Paper, to this one Argument, viz.

They, who in a Paper expressly affirm and explain the Satisfaction of Christ, omitting to mention these words, *Christ took upon him the Person of Sinners*, do pervert, deny, and make the Satisfaction of Christ impossible: But the Presbyterians (in the Third Paper) expressly affirm and explain the Satisfaction of Christ, omitting to mention these words, *Christ took upon him the Person of Sinners*: Therefore the Presbyterians do in the Third Paper, pervert, deny, and make the Satisfaction of Christ impossible.

Upon this Argument, the true weight of the Reporter's cause and charge doth hang; and if the Major be true, the Consequence will be, that all the Churches of Christ in their Confessions pervert and deny, and make impossible the Satisfaction of Christ. For to our remembrance, these words, *Christ took upon him the Person of Sinners*, are omitted in the Confessions of all the Churches; and we had much more reason to omit them, when we knew for...
Answer to the Report,

Sect. what End they are insisted on by such as the Reporter.

4 Arg. "They impose a Sense in express contradiction to the letter and general Scope of Mr. Williams's Book, [that when he faith, There is no Change of Persons between Christ and the Elect, it could not be intended as a denial of a Change of Persons between Christ and us in the general Sense, but only in opposition to his adversary he wrote against; for in that very place he expressly affirms, Christ suffered and died in our room and stead;] for his words are as exclusive of a Change of Persons in every Sense, as words can be. Gospel-Truth, pag. 41, to pag. 46."

Answ. 1. Mr. Williams no where faith, There is not a Change of Persons in the Plural number, but of Person in the Singular; yet the Paper as subfcribed made him to say the first; however the Report doth change it now. Nor is this a small mistake with Mr. Williams; when he takes a Change of Persons, to refer thus to intelligent beings, viz. Christ's dying in the room of condemned Sinners, which he affirms: But a Change of Person he takes, to denote a Change, as to office, acts, qualities, adjuncts, &c. really inseparable, and peculiar to either Christ on the one part, or Men on the other; as is plain by all his Arguments against a Change of Person, pag. 45: "There
There is no Change of Person between Sect.

Christ and the Elect: For Christ was I.

the Saviour, and never ceased to be so;

we are the saved, and not the saviours:

Christ was the Redeemer; we the re-

deemed, and not the redeemers: Christ:

was he, who by his own merits forgives

us, but never was forgiven; we are

forgiven, and never had merits of our

own, to forgive ourselves, or others.

It's profane Arrogance for us to pretend

to his Prerogatives; and it's Blasphemy

to debase him among them, who were

Enemies, without strength, and Sinners,

for whom he was the dying Sacrifice. It's

enough, that he, reserving the peculiars

of a Redeemer, should agree to die for

our sins: It is enough, that we are par-
doned for his sake, when we deserved

endless woe, and are never capable of

making the least atonement." Here

you have all which Mr. Williams hath

written against a Change of Person, where-
in is not a word against Change of Persons;

and it's evident, he took Change of Person

in the afore-recited Sense.

Answ. 2. When he confutes the Sense

wherein Dr. Crisp explains a Change of Per-

son, he must, in denying his Sense, deny it

under that Phrase [Change of Person] of

which the Doctor gave that Sense. Take

then the words of Dr. Crisp, "Christ him-

self is not so compleatly righteous, but
Answer to the Report,

Sect. "we are as righteous as he; nor we so compleatly sinful, but Christ became as compleatly sinful as we; that very Sinfulness we were, Christ is made that very Sinfulness before God. So that here is a direct Change; Christ takes our Person and Condition, we take Christ's Person and Condition," with much more of this sort, as quoted, pag. 42. Here is the Change of Person which Dr. Crisp affirms; and this is the Change that Mr. Williams denies.

Anfw. 3. Mr. Williams is so far from denying a Change of Persons in the general Sense, that in that Book he oft afferts and proves what the Orthodox intend by that Phrase, yea, in the very places where he denies a Change of Person. See pag. 41, 43. "Christ’s sufferings and obedience were so in our stead, that God cannot exact from us any other atonement for sin." Pag. 46. he thus explains the Imputation of Christ’s sufferings: "To impute to one what is suffered by another, is to esteem the one undertaken for in the sufferings of the other, and to deal with him as if himself had suffered the same things." And pag. 48. "Had not Christ suffered for us, we could not have been absolved for the fake of his sufferings." Again, pag. 52. "God hath provided for his Justice and Honour [in saving true Christians] by the
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"the Satisfaction of Christ." And pag. Sect. 270. "The Punishment of our Sins, "yea, the Guilt of them as an obligation to punishment, was laid upon Christ "our Sponsor." See also pag. 8, 10, 15. What words can more distinctly and properly express the Orthodox Sense of a Change of Persons?

Answ. 4. His Cavils against Mr. Williams, pag. 9. as not affirming the Sense of a Change of Persons, though he say, Christ suffered and died in our room and stead, are weak and invidious: For,

(1.) Mr. Williams, when he had a fit occasion, (as the Reporter knows,) duly afferts Christ's Suretyship, and proves, "That Christ suffered, not only for our "good, but in our stead; and that he was "a proper αντιλυγος, &c." See this instated on at large, Man made Righteous, pag. 105, & seq.

(2.) The Racovian Catechism in the Amsterdam Edition, and not only modern Socinians, affirm, Christ died in our stead; and Socinus, Crellius, and others, asserted a Change of Persons between Christ and us: And the Sense in which the first take dying in our stead, is as metaphorical and improper, as the last do take a Change of Persons in. But if our Reporter finds a Socinian to use a Phrase explained in an ill Sense by themselves, and others make use of that Phrase in a contrary Sense never so express-
Answer to the Report,

Secr. ly, his way is presently to charge upon them the use of that Phrase in the Socinian Sense. The same dealings towards him were equally just, when he useth the Phrases the Antinomians are wont to do.

(3.) After all he hath said, to make the stress of our cause against the Socinians, to depend upon the Terms, Change of Persons, &c. an insight into that Controversy would convince him, that there are other things which do far more certainly define that Controversy about the Satisfaction; viz. Was Christ in his death an expiatory Sacrifice? Did he make atonement to the Justice of God? Did Christ endure the Punishment of our Sins? &c. All these Mr. Williams in Gospel-Truth asserts. To what is repeated before out of that Book, we will add, pag. 8. "Our Sins were imputed to Christ with respect to the Guilt thereof, so that he, by the Father's appointment and his own consent, became obliged, as Mediator, to bear the Punishment of our Sins; and he did bear those Punishments, to the full satisfaction of Justice, and to our actual remission when we believe." If he that writes thus must Socinianize, none are free besides the Antinomians. But what can be safely said, in the opinion of the Reporter? who tells us, pag. 10. It was a ridiculing Dr. Crisp, when Mr. Williams...
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I.

shewing the ground of the Doctor's mis-

 Sect. takes faith, pag. 57. "Because Christ " suffered in our stead, that the fruit of " his suffering might be our deliverance " from suffering, and our being saved at " last; therefore he thinks, there is a " Change of Person:” Which very words do evidence plainly, that Mr. Williams by [in our stead.] allows the sound Sense of a Change of Persons, while he opposeth Dr. Cripp's erroneous Sense of his Change of Person: And that Mr. Williams took a Change of Person, and a Change of Persons, in a very different Sense; though the Dis- puter, or Reporter, seems not to distinguish between a Surrogation, upon which an innocent person expiates another's Crime, and his becoming the very sinning Criminal; or, (to use his own Metaphor,) with him, He that is a Surety to pay the Drunkard's Debt, must in quality, nature, and condition, be the Drunkard too.

(4.) Wha tever the Reporter faith of the Scope, or offensiveness, of that Book of Mr. Williams's, called, Gospel-Truth stated; those Brethren whom he calls of biggest Name, who subscribed the First Paper, have declared, They intended not by that Paper to censurc the passages against which the Dissenters objected; but were so far from condemning any passage there- in, that they subscribed the First Paper, because they were sure, that upon enqui-
To the Report, Sect. I. it would appear, there was nothing in that Book of Mr. Williams's contrary to the Sense of that First Paper: And they still as well as formerly declare, it is an useful Book; and that it is the cause of Truth it pleads; and have given it under their hands, that the State of Truth and Error is not at all enlarged or changed, since they first subscribed; nor did they mean so in the First Paper, but only that there were in the Book, besides the State of Truth and Error, several Explications and Arguments added thereunto. Nor indeed could the State of Truth and Error be enlarged or changed, because (as it is attested by several, even of those Sixteen, that were the first who subscribed to the first Edition,) the Book as far as it contained the State of Truth and Error was printed before they subscribed the Attestation. Nor do we know of any of the Subscribers of that Attestation, who do disallow the said Book; nor any, whose Names are affixed thereto without their consent.

We shall conclude with these further remarks.

First, Besides the mis-representation, of the points in difference, and of the account given by us (in the Third Paper) of these Doctrines, &c. we could detect great mistakes as to Matters of Fact. Some refused to subscribe the First Paper, as Mr. Slater; some, who say they never subscribed
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ed it, as Mr. Barker, are yet set down as Sect. Subscribers; others are said to express their approbation of it, who vehemently declared their disallowance of it, as Dr. Annesley, &c. The Reporter faith, he cannot learn, there are Five Pastors of Churches dissenting from it; when it is notorious, to persons more retired, that from the first about Twenty Pastors of Churches assented not; yea, we know not one of our meeting who did subscribe it, but were soon convinced that an Explication of it was needful, and therefore agreed to the Third Paper. Other mistakes might be added.

Secondly, It was unjust and disingenuous, for the Reporter to publish this First Paper with the Names of our Brethren affixed thereto. They, from a zeal for Union, condescended to prepare a way for it by subscribing; but then they declared, they subscribed not as their conclusive act, but agreed thereto upon condition the meeting of the united Ministers would approve of it, and to whom they did wholly refer it. Yet he publisheth it as a consummate Instrument, (though the Copy was never delivered as such, and the Original not at all,) and this without their consent, and after he knew they had laid it aside, and agreed to another Paper as the Instrument of Union. Such a course must minister Jealousy, that the Reporter, when
Answer to the Report,

Sect. when active in carrying on that Paper, did I. more design a Breach among the United, than Union with the Dissenters; and that his disappointment produceth this Report; when he saw our Union among ourselves consolidated of late, and that one of our Articles is to this effect, that we will suffer none commonly called Lay-men, to preach in our Pulpits.

Thirdly, The Reporter hath no reason to glory in any of our Brethren's agreement with him in Doctrine, in any point wherein the First Paper differs from the Third: By which Third Paper they supply what was wanting, and explain what was doubtful, in the First Paper, and determine their sense of those Doctrines: Nor did they ever intend the weight of their Assertions should be laid upon any unscriptural words, but upon the orthodox sense of them, which our Paper stateth.

Fourthly, It is matter of grief to us, that in opposition to the Preface of both Papers, Law terms and human Forms of speech, in Doctrines so fully expressed in the Gospel, and capable of being expressed in the words used and appointed by the Holy Ghost, should be made Engines of Division among persons, who agree in the sense of such phrases, and yet dare not say, that God designed to limit or extend his Revelations by what such terms may signify in human Laws or Usages; especially when
when they need Explications and Limita-
tions to prevent what is grossly erroneous.

For instance, Christ took upon him the Person
of Sinners; if it be taken in its extent, it
will not only be true, that it was of all Sin-
ers, but that he took upon him all that
belonged to Sinners as such, and he was to
be reputed as sinful as they, yea, as all of
them: But the Churches of Christ have
been wiser, than to insert such phrases in-
to their Confeffions; knowing it would con-
found the minds, and perplex the con-
scences of Christians, in points of greatest
concernment to their Salvation.

Fifthly, This Report gives a pregnant
instance, what Zeal for a Party will tempt
men to; even, to misrepresent Persons and
Things; to invent and applaud slight pre-
tences against Union with their Brethren;
to break all rules of Decency in praising
or disparaging men, as their turn is served;
to raise endless noise and clamours, let the
juncture be never so unseasonable; nay,
to cover and plead for the Errors of their
Associates, which at other times they them-
selves have condemned.

There is occasion enough to invite our
enlargement; but we design to irritate no
man. The Vindication of ourselves from
a printed Charge so severe, (as the per-
verting, denying, and making the Satis-
faction of Christ impossible,) is so necessary,
that all men must justify our publishing
this
Answer to the Report,

Sect. this Defence. Without a Narrative of matters of fact as to doctrines, (for other things we omit,) transacted with the Brethren who left the Union, our Apology had been dark and imperfect; otherwise we had mentioned nothing of that kind. It is this Reporter must bear the blame, that we are compelled to say so much to convince the world, that if the Brethren had such a disposition to Peace, as we have all along expressed, the Union had never been broken; after they had made a Breach, we had soon re-united; and when a Re-union was refused by them, we yet had lived in quietness, and prevented their heats, which have stumbled the well-meaning, and advantaged our enemies, by producing such clamorous debates, and unjust reflections and misrepresentations.

We have not to our knowledge omitted any thing consistent with integrity, to prevent our Breaches, or to heal them. Another supplicatory Letter to the Brethren for Union was written in Reply to the discouraging Answer they had given to our former; being contented to repeat those self-denying methods, which many would judge hardly meet or prudent. But this Report hath prevented the sending of this Letter, which was delayed by the time taken up in confirming the Union among ourselves.
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In this our Answer to the Report, we have for a Re-union proposed to subscribe the very Phrases they insist on; provided their Sense may be duly adjusted, and those plain Truths secured, upon which practical Godliness and a true Gospel-ministry so much depend. By which Proposal we hope, many of our dissenting Brethren, who have been imposed on, will be so undeceived, as to re-unite with us, and leave such to themselves who will still divide for the sake of such Errors as these Brethren cannot approve; and therefore will not, for the strengthening of their hands, be longer contented to bear the Imputation of those Opinions, and to contribute to the Propagation of them; neither of which can be avoided, if they continue to be of a Party with those, who so publickly plead for those Errors, and divide from us only for defending the opposite Truths.

Their own observation will furnish them with many more Arguments, at last to change their course; especially, if they will consider where it is like to end. It is already come to this pass, that with a stock of these Errors, their ignorant Laymen set up for the only Gospel-preachers, and are crowded after. Many of their own people are so infected, as to decry themselves for Legalists, when they dare preach of any thing besides Believers Privileges, and the Priesthood of Christ. Such things
Reflections on the Remarks, 

Sect. things cannot but affect all them, who mind the Interest of Christ above their own; of which number we are persuaded many of the Dissenters be, and will approve themselves.

We conclude, unfeignedly praying, that the God of Peace will increase all our Light and Love, that with a truly Christian Spirit we may jointly serve the Interest of our common Lord.

S E C T. II.

Reflections on the Remarks, &c. annexed by the Committee to their Answer to the Report.

We shall add some Reflections on a Paper called, Remarks, &c. which soon followed the Report; and too much resemble each other. But having already answered what is most material, a few further Reflections will suffice; and we shall speak of the Authors as if but one man.

[1.] It was needful to applaud the publishing his reported Paper, as refreshing to himself, pag. 1. because it is so offensive to all serious Persons; nor see we, how even he could be refreshed thereby, further than as he glorifieth in deceiving the simple, loves divisions, and hath a prospect of attaining
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taining some mischievous purpose by our Sect.
Breaches.

[2.] These his Papers, instead of removing, do proclaim and fix that Reproach upon him and his adherents, (pag. 6.) that they divide for dividing sake, and know not about what they differ: For he assigneth their Divisions to one or two mere words or Law-terms, as to the syllables and letters, and not to the Sense, upon which they will not openly fix their disagreement. But if he would remove this Reproach, let him plainly and honestly contend for their Errors which we oppose, and no longer deceive the world by impertinently nibbling at a few Expressions, and from thence charging us with opinions, which, he is convinced, we all of us abhor. Only he thinks it will be a greater Reproach to acknowledge, they divide for such horrid Errors, than that they divide for dividing sake, and differ about they know not what; custom and nature being some excuse for both these.

[3.] The confidence of this Remarker is more than ordinary, that can tell the world, (pag. 7, 15.) that the Points in Controversy are by his Paper made manifest; which, he faith, is about a Change of Persons. Whereas this Change of Persons never was the whole, nor any part of the Controversy between us. Not a part; for it is ascertained expressly by all of us in the Third Dd Pa-
II. the found Sense of it was affirmed in Mr. Williams's Book long before. Far less was this the whole of the Controversy; for tho' he accounts the bottom in the First Paper to be generous, because our Brethren therein made so little provision against the Crispian Errors; yet we must mind him, these Errors gave rise to our differences, and the abettors thereof still refuse to give us satisfaction; yea, even as to the most pernicious of their opinions.

[4.] Sure he is conscious, what we must think of him, when he heaps so many words (pag. 7, 8, 9.) to shew, that the Difference among us, concerning a Commutation of Persons, is not about trifles, or matters of lesser weight, but what is essential to Salvation. He cannot blame us to ask, Is it the mere phrase, [Change of Persons,] or the sound sense of that phrase, which, he faith, is the Corner-stone of Christ's Satisfaction, and what is so applauded by Justin Martyr and Dr. Edwards, &c. If it be the mere phrase, all the Churches of Christ are condemned, because their Confessions omit it. If it be the sense of the Reporter and the Crispian, then the Reverend Bishop Stillingfleet, Grotius, Dr. Edwards, and our celebrated Antisocinian Authors are in as bad a case as we, for they reject that sense. But if it be the sound sense expressed by Dr. Edwards, as cited in the Re-
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Remarks, which deserves these praisies, this Sect. cannot be denied to us, no, not to Mr. II. Williams; for his Book asserts, not only that Christ’s blood was shed instead of ours, and his life went in exchange for ours, and that to satisfy Justice and answer the Law; but also, that Christ’s Sufferings were Punishments. You will presently see the Judgment of the learned Dr. Edwards, whom he recites as a favourer of his cause against Mr. Williams.

[5.] If the Congregational Brethren have no more than their signing the First Paper, to clear them from the charge of Antinomianism, they must still abide under that charge, notwithstanding all that is said, pag. 9, 10, 11. The invalidity of the Reasons he has offer’d will appear by our Answer to each.

(1.) How can their present Declaration of their adhering to their approbation of the Articles of the Church of England, or to the Confessions of Faith, &c. prove, They are far from being tainted with Antinomianism? when several of them have published their Antinomian opinions, both before and since the like Declaration.

(2.) They do still affirm, that neither Repentance nor Faith are necessary to a Sinner’s Pardon, or Justification before God; (but only follow that;) whatever they be to final Salvation: Nor doth this Paper say any thing against it.

D d 2 (3.) It
Sect. (3.) IT is palpably false, That the First Paper affirms, “that God doth not par-
“don, justify, or accept a Sinner, nor “entitle him to eternal Life, before the “Righteousness of Christ be applied and “received by Faith:” It is strange he said not, before Repentance too: But it is not true, as to Faith itself. The Paper faith, The only Righteousness for the sake of which God pardons, justifies, or accepts Sinners, or entitles them to eternal Life, is the alone Righteousness of Christ without them, imputed to them, and received by Faith alone. Note, he puts applied for im-
puted; which he would not say, is by Faith: And here is not so much, as that it is only the believing Sinner who is justi-
fied. But above all, he knows of his Party, who explains such words by publi-
lishing, that Christ's Righteousness when applied and received by Faith, is only for a manifcstation to their Consciences for their quiet, that Christ's Righteousness had been applied to the Justification of their persons before God, long before they believed. This is all the Justification by Christ's Righteousness, as received by Faith; but they were pardoned and entitled to Life as much before, though they knew it not: And this opinion the Paper denies not.

(4.) The Paper faith, Christ came into the room of Sinners, not to repent, or be-
lieve
The Remarkker knew, if the Gospel requires these by its Precepts, it was a Slip overlook'd by such of them who deny the Gospel to be a Law; therefore he word-eth it, The Eleci are not exempt from an obligation of doing it themselves. But he as well knows, they hold, There is no obligation on them to repent or believe as a Condition or Term of obtaining any Benefit purchased by Christ; as to that, they have nothing to do: Also, That it was the Law of works, and that only, which commandeth Faith and Repentance with any Sanction: And the Paper contradisteth them not.

(5.) Tho’ the Paper faith, There is not such a moral Change, whereby Christ became inherently sinfull, and we immediately sinles; yet they do and may still hold, That the filth, fault, and fafl of Sin are so transacted on Christ, that he was in God’s account the very Criminal, the Blasphemener, &c. and that we are as righteous as Christ in equality: And the legal Sense of the Change is such, that we are legally reputed to have made Satisfaction ourselves by obeying and dying; because Christ did it in our persons, and we did it in his person.

(6.) The Paper faith, The Father was not offended with Christ, much less abhorred him, considered as he was in himself; but as

D d 3
in Relation to us, as our Surety; and the Father was displeased with Christ, as the guilt of our Iniquities was laid upon him. And he knows, his Friends do hold, That God was displeased with and abhorred Christ, because of the fault and filth of Sin upon him as our Surety; which the Paper at least forbids not. It's worth observing, that this Article was formed in opposition to one of the two only Errors objected here against Mr. Williams's Book; whose words are these, pag. 34, 36. "That God testified his threatened indignation against Sin, in the awful Sufferings of Christ's Soul and Body, &c. (and that Christ endured the effects of God's wrath;) yet the Father was not displeased with Christ, much less abhorred him, because of the filthines of Sin upon him." Here's the Error, (and but once mentioned,) that required one of the three Articles to oppose it. Our Third Paper hath given them far more ground, to make this the point in Controversy, than that of Change of Persons, (which it afferts, both as to name and sense:) But they insist not on this, because of the odious sound of what they must assert in opposition to it. As to the Remarkers hint from the Assembly's words, that Christ endured the weight of God's wrath; let us mind him, that Displacency is opposed to complacential Love, and therefore none can be the object of God's displeasure, but one
one who is evil and wicked in the fight of the Lord, and therefore hateful to him as such: But the effects of God's rectoral wrath may fall on Christ, tho' beloved, as our Saviour; yea, who was not hated, but loved, for dying according to his own voluntary engagements. Review these things, and judge what a poor Vindication from Antinomianism the First Paper affordeth: Unless they think, he must be far enough from this Error, that owneth the Law of works to be in full force, and the only Law; altho' they also hold, that the Elect have fulfilled this Law perfectly in Christ, and therefore are themselves to yield no sort of obedience in order to any benefit, or preventing of any punishment. Here's all the Zeal for the Law, which they think enough to acquit them from being Antinomians; and all who think that we under the Gospel are any further obliged, are to be Neonomians. But yet,

(7.) As great a Liberty as this Paper gives Antinomians to subscribe it; observe, in what a faint and dark manner they do subscribe even this poor defence: Their words are, We are glad to find so good an Agreement among us as this Paper doth express. This is all. But wherein? or how far? or under what limitations? or in hopes of what future advances, this Agreement is to be construed? they have reserved sufficient liberty to explain, as occasion offers;
Reflections on the Remarks,

Sect. and cannot deny the Reader a leave to guess, especially when he feeth the Reporter already to differ so very much from our Brethren, in his explication of a Change of Persons, and other things contained in that Paper. But yet further,

(8.) As poor a defence against Antinomianism as the Paper is, if plainly assented to; and as mere a nullity as the Subscription is; there were several of the Congregational, who would not do even thus much, and refused to set their hands to this: Which the Reporter well knows, whatever Art he hath used to hear what they all have done.

May not we hope upon so plain evidence, That such of our Congregational Brethren as are not Antinomians, will be convinced, it's necessary to do yet more for their Vindication, than thus signing this Paper? seeing that, not only they who are far from being tainted with this Poison, but they who are most infected, may safely subscribe as it requires; and even they have done, who in the adjusting of this Paper could not be brought to grant, that Regeneration is necessary to bring us into a good State.

[6.] Notwithstanding his compliment to a few Subscribers, pag. 12, 13, 15. The Presbyterians need not subscribe the First Paper to acquit them from the Socinian slander, that they are Arminians: No, nor yet
yet from the Reporter's slander, that they Sect. are Socinians. They have done it more effectually, in the published Agreement in Doctrine, 1692. They have done it yet more, in the Articles of 1694, which had been also published, if these Dissenters could have cleared themselves of Antinomi-
anism, as the Presbyterians did of Arminian-
ism. Yea, they have done it as fully by the Third Paper, as can be by the First; for that retains the same words in the Head of Justification, and in all the rest, as far as they oppose Arminianism. Nay, do not we and Mr. Williams's Book, assert Christ's Sufferings to be a Punishment in Satisfaction to punitive Justice? which the Remarker, pag. 14, 15. declares to be the distinguishing point. Are not our words, "Christ " came into our room and stood to die, to " answer for our violations of the Law of " works; and that the Punishment of our " Sins was inflicted on Christ, that God " might, without injury to his Justice or " Honour, pardon Sinners for his Satis-
" faction?" What a slanderous Spirit act-
theth this man, that makes Christ's Satis-
faction to punitive Justice, to be that which distinguisheth the Arminians and Socinians from the Orthodox? and yet ranketh us among the former, tho' he knows, all of us assented to the Third Paper, which affirmeth Christ's Sufferings were a Satis-
faction to punitive Justice.
But how long will this man acquit any of the Presbyterians, from the slander of being Arminians, and Socinians too? He is sure, the world will soon know, that even they of our Brethren, who subscribed the First Paper, have several of them framed, and the others attented to, the Third Paper, as an Explication of their Sense of the First. The Reporter faith, the Third Paper perverts and denies the Satisfaction of Christ, in the Account given of a Change of Persons: If so, he must account these Brethren hereafter, no other than Arminians and Socinians, in common with the rest of us; perhaps he'll proclaim them Apostates too, for not adhering to the First Paper, in opposition to the Third. And he is too well known, for us to doubt that when it serves his turn, no Presbyterian shall be found in the Faith, because he is not a Crispian in Doctrine.

All his artifice (pag. 15, 16.) hath not, nor ever can reduce the Controversy among us into a narrower room than this; Is Repentance required by the Gospel, in order to the Forgiveness of Sin? and Faith in Christ, in order to the Justification of our Persons before God? Unless he'll reduce it to this, Is any Duty on man's part required by the Gospel in order to his obtaining any saving benefit, or any kind of Sin a bar to his title to any such benefits?
drawn up by the Committee.

benefits by the Gospel-constitution? Here's Sect. the Controversy, and the Third Paper is II.

refused, because it is express for the affirmative beyond the First.

[9.] We are sorry we have so much reason to fear, that if this pretended point of a Change of Persons were accommodated to the Crispian's liking, Mr. Lobb would find some occasion to continue our heats and divisions; wherein he had the greatest hand, under the name of a Pacificator, as soon as other Agents became a little quiet. What design he proposeth, or some others by him, if detrimental to the common Good, we hope, God will disappoint it, and at last favour such who may be repairers of our breach, and restorers of paths to dwell in.

Reader, Note, that our Answer comes out so late, because the Reporter published his Paper, when he knew our meetings were laid down, and that we were not to come together till September.

S E C T.
S E C T. III.

An Account of the Second Paper, mentioned in the Report and Answer.

S E C T. III.  

THE Report and Answer make mention of a Second Paper; which, to render the whole matter more plain, is here annexed, with the Occasion of it.

Septemb. 7. 1696. At a meeting of the united Ministers, Mr. Williams spake to this effect: "Mr. Moderator, I hear by some persons, that since our recefs, there is a disposition in some of the Congregational Brethren to Peace, if not to Re-union; and that the only pretended obstacle is the want of satisfaction concerning the Orthodoxness of all of us in the Points of Justification, Commutation of Persons, and the Father's displeasure with Christ. For their dissatisfaction, they instance somewhat out of my Book as a denial of a Commutation of Persons, and insinuate as if the other two were not duly asserterd. All proposals for Re-union should begin with this Board; nor ought particular Members to conclude themselves in a matter of this kind, till you are consulted. But though,
though, I confess, I know not what Sect. III.
can be justly offered which we have not
done already, and all that concerns my
Book is long since adjusted; yet that
nothing may seem wanting on our part
to promote Peace, I would not lose the
advantage of their present inclination to
it. And being that only my Book is
objected against, I have drawn up in
this Paper the heads of a Proposal, to
be sent to Pinner's Hall, which I submit
to the Judgment of this Board.”

That called the Second Paper.

The Preface is made up of what is ci-
ted above, (pag. 325, 326.) out of the
Agreement, 1692; and what is in the
Preface of the First and Third Papers.
The Three Doctrinals are in these Words.

We declare,

“I. Of Justification: As the Gospel
plainly requireth Repentance towards
God in order to a Sinner's partaking of
the Remission of Sins, and Faith in our
Lord Jesus in order to Justification, and
a godly Conversation in order to eternal
Glory; promising Justification and For-
giveness of Sin to all penitent Believers,
and eternal Life to such as persevere in
Faith and true Holiness; and also de-
claring all impenitent Unbelievers (while
such) to be in a state of Condemnation:
So by the same Gospel it is evident, that
none of these, nor any Work done by
Men,
The Second Paper.

Sect. III.

"Men, or wrought by the Spirit of God in them, are, under any denomination, any part of that Righteousness, for the sake, or on the account whereof, any Blessing is merited or procured, much less Justification or eternal Life: But God justifies, pardons, accepts, and entitles Sinners to eternal Life, only for the sake of the Righteousness of Christ without them, imputed to them, and received by Faith alone.

II. Of Commutation of Persons: Whereas Sinners were obnoxious to suffer the Punishments threatened by the Law for their transgressions; the Lord Jesus by his compact with the Father, became our mediating Surety; and as such, he obeyed the Law, and our Punishments were judicially transferred on him, which for our Redemption he endured in our room and stead, to the Satisfaction of Justice, that we might be justified when we believe, and be dealt with accordingly. Nevertheless we deny, that by a Commutation of Persons there is such a reciprocal Change of Condition betwixt Christ and Sinners, or such an imputation, or translation of qualities, as implies, that Christ was as sinful as we, and we as righteous as Christ. And though we assert, that Christ hath undertaken, the Elect shall in due time repent and believe; yet we deny,
deny, that Christ came into the room of
the Elect to repent or believe for them,
or that Believers are accounted to have
done and suffered what Christ did, or
that they are justified by the Law of
works.—See more in the next Head.

III. Of the Father's being displeased
with Christ: (Tho' the Phrase be not pro-
per, yet we declare,) That the Lord Jesus
having engaged in the Covenant of Re-
demption, as our mediating Surety, to suffer
the Punishment of our Sins for the expiat-
ing thereof, He did bear the guilt of our
Iniquities, so as to suffer as Sinners suffer,
and to be dealt with as God threatened
to deal with them whom he is displeas-
ed with, as far as was consistent with
Christ's being innocent, and one who
became subject to those Punishments by
his own consent, in Obedience to the
Father, and for the Redemption of Sin-
ers. And therefore, Christ was under
the wrath of God, as that was his Will
to punish him; yea, he endured the
weight of that wrath in the punishment
of our Sins; which Sins, as to the obli-
gation to endure those punishments, were
laid on Christ: It pleased the Lord to
bruise him, having laid on him the In-
quities of us all. But we deny, that
our Sins, as to their filth or fault, were
transferred on Christ; or that he was
inherently, or in legal esteem, or looked on
by the Father as one contrary to his holy nature and Will, either as he was our Surety, or in any other respect. And therefore, if by displeased with Christ is meant, that the Father hated or abhorred Christ (which is proper only to one evil in the sight of the Lord,) because of our Sins imputed to him; so the Father was not displeased with Christ: But on the contrary, the Father was always well-pleased with him, at all times accounting him (even as our High Priest,) holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from Sinners; and therefore such, when he offer'd himself an expiating Sacrifice; yea, that for this he loved him.

Then follows Mr. Williams's Concurrence in these three Points, with Citations at large out of his Book, that he had oft affirmed the very same, and that the places objected did not all contradict any of these things.

And then it is further declared, "That as he had oft proposed it, so now he is willing to an Union with the dissenting Brethren, either by mutual forbearance, wherein we differ in Judgment; or if satisfaction be insisted on as to any other expressions, that have been or shall be objected out of any of his Books, (where he knows nothing but what is orthodox,) he is willing to give it, in the same time and manner as Mr. Cole, Mr.
The Second Paper.

Mr. Mather, Mr. Chauncy, Mr. Trayl, Sect.

&c. shall be obliged to give satisfaction as to many material exceptions he hath made, and shall yet make, to what they have published in their Books. But otherwise he will no farther concern himself, but keep to the Vote pass'd, Sept. 15, 1695. notwithstanding that now for Peace's sake, he hath waved the demand thereof, in answering the above mentioned Exceptions, when they are not required to do the like.

Lastly, There is the Form of words for the Subscribers of Mr. Williams's Book, which you have before, pag. 325. cited out of the Agreement, 1692; only with this Addition, "That Mr. Williams did not write his Book, nor they subscribe the Approbation, with any design to oppose our Congregational Brethren as such, or to divide from them."

This Paper was read and received; but Mr. Williams desired it might be waved, when a Proposal was made by a Subscriber of the First Paper, that we should draw up the Third Paper out of this and another Paper, called the First; which were both voted to be laid aside, altho' that called the First Paper was never read in the Meeting, nor once proposed to be received there.
SECT. IV.

Letters of the Bishop of Worcester, and Dr. Edwards, to Mr. Williams.

SECT. IV. A LETTER from the Right Reverend Dr. Stillingfleet, Bishop of Worcester, in Answer to one from Mr. Williams, who desired his Judgment as to the following Questions; because his Lordship's Book is pleaded against Mr. Williams, in the First Paper, and the Report.

SIR,

I RETURN you Thanks for the Papers you were pleased to send me, by which I am able to understand something more than formerly, of the present state of the Difference about the Change of Persons between Christ and us: But I shall meddle no farther in it, than I am obliged to do in Answer to the Questions you propose to me. And I wish I may be able to do any service therein.

The First Question is, about my Sense of Commutation of Persons. It is said in the First Paper, "That I do, with Grotius, " expressly
expressly affirm, and irrefragably prove it, in concurrence with the common sentiment of Protestants; and that the doctrines of justification and Christ’s Satisfaction, cannot be duly explained and defended, consistently with the Denial of any Commutation of Persons between Christ and Believers.”

This had been fairly represented, in case there could be no other Sense of Commutation of Persons than what is asserted by Dr. Crisp; but there is a threefold Sense of it, very different from each other.

(1.) Such a Change of Persons, as implies that one is appointed and allowed to act on behalf of others, and for their advantage. And this sort of Commutation of Persons the Socinians never denied; as I have shewed in the Discourse of Satisfaction, pag. 62, 190, 191. It is not therefore the Use of the Words, but the Sense of them is to be enquired into. For some may affirm a Change of Persons, and yet be Socinians; and others may deny a Change, and be far enough from Socinianism, according to the Sense in which they are understood.

(2.) Such a Change of Persons, as supposes one to be substituted in the place of others, to become an Atonement for them in order to their Redemption and Deliverance. And when such a Substitution is by the Will of God, and Consent of the Person
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Sect. Person who suffers; here is a real Change of Persons as to that particular End which is designed by it. And in this Sense I did assert a Change of Persons between Christ and us, because by the Will of the Father and his own Consent, he became a Sacrifice of Propitiation for our Sins, in order to their Remission, and our Reconciliation with God, on such Terms as are declared in the Gospel; as may be seen at large in the Discourse already mentioned; particularly, Chap. iv. §. 4.

(3.) Such a Change of Persons, as implies an actual Translation of the personal Guilt of all the Sins of Believers on Christ, and of his personal Righteousness on them, without regard to any Conditions on their part, but merely by the free Grace and favour of God. And this I take to be Dr. Crisp's Sense of the Change of Persons; of which I shall discourse, when I come to the last Question.

But the Authors of the First Paper, and of the Report, pag. 4, seem to take it for granted, that there can be but one Sense of Commutation of Persons; wherein they do not discover their profound Knowledge in these matters, if they thought so; or their Ingenuity, if they knew otherwise, and designed to impose upon those who did not. For it appears, that there is a Sense, in which it may, and ought to be denied, without the least prejudice.
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judice to the Doctrine of Christ's Satisfaction: And tho' that cannot be explained, or defended, without some kind of Commutation of Persons; yet it very well may, and ought to be defended, without and against Dr. Crisp's Sense of it; as will be made appear afterwards.

The Author of the Report, pag. 5, faith, "This is the very Hinge, on which the Controversy between the Orthodox and Socinians doth turn," which shews him to be not very deeply skilled in it. For the Hinge of the Controversy is not about the Words, but the Sense of Commutation of Persons. And even the Sense is not the original Controversy, but consequent, upon our asserting Christ's Sacrifice to be a Propitiation for our Sins: For upon this they ask, How the Act of one Person can be so beneficial to others? and to that we answer, That tho' one man's Act cannot become another's, yet if by Consent both of the Father and Son, he becomes our Mediator, and suffers in our stead, in order to our Reconciliation, then 'as to that End and Purpose, here is a Change of Persons: For, whereas in strictness we ought to have suffered the desert of our own Sins, God was pleased to accept of his suffering instead of ours; and so by virtue of that Propitiation, we hope for the Remission of Sins and the Favour of God, according to the Terms of the Gospel. And therein consists the
the true Controversy between the Socinians and us: viz. Whether the Sufferings of Christ were to be considered as a Punishment for our Sins, and as a Propitiatory Sacrifice to God for them; or only as an Act of Dominion over an Innocent Person, in order to his advancement to Glory.

But it is said in the Report, pag. 5.

"That if there be no Change of Persons between Christ and us, there can be no Translation of the Guilt, nor a just infliction of the Punishment of our Sins on Christ; that is, there can be no proper Satisfaction."

To this I answer, That there is a two-fold Translation of Guilt to be considered:

1. Of the Personal Guilt, which results from the acts of Sin committed by such persons. If this Guilt be translated, Christ must become the very Person who committed the Sins; and so he must be looked on, not only as an actual Sinner, but as the Person that committed all the Sins of those for whom he died: Which comes so near to horrid Blasphemy, that I wonder, persons that bear any reverence to our blessed Saviour, do not abhor the very thoughts of it.

2. Of Legal Guilt, which lies in the Obligation to Punishment, by virtue of the Sanction of the Divine Law. Now this Guilt implies two things;
(1.) **The Desert of Punishment**, which follows Personal Guilt, and cannot be transferred by a **Change of Persons**: For no man can cease to deserve Punishment for his own faults; nor deserve that another should be punished for them.

(2.) **The Obligation to undergo the deserved Punishment**: But because the execution of Punishment depends, both on the wisdom and justice of the Legislator; therefore here a **Change of Persons** may intervene, and by the Wisdom and Justice of God a Mediator may be accepted in such a manner as himself determines; and upon the Acceptance of his Sacrifice the Offenders may be pardoned and received into the grace and favour of God, on such Terms as he hath declared in the Gospel. And **in this Sense** the Guilt of our Sins was charged upon Christ as our Mediator, who was to bear the Punishment of our Sins; so as by virtue of his Sufferings, we may not only hope to escape the just Punishment of our offences, but to be admitted to the Privileges of the Children of God.

But the Reporter out of a certain **Manuscript** gives another Account of **Commutation of Persons**, viz. "That Commutation " in a legal sense is the same with a proper " *Surrogation*, where the Surety puts on " the Person, and stands in the quality, " state, and condition of the Debtor, and " lies under the same Obligation to answer " for him."
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Sect. IV. But this I have shewed long since to be a very wrong notion of Christ's Satisfaction; and which in effect gives up the Cause to the Socinians: For if Sins be considered as Debts, God may freely forgive them (without disparagement to his Wisdom and Justice) without any Satisfaction; and the Right of Punishment then depends on God's absolute Dominion; and Satisfaction must be by way of Compensation; of which I have treated at large, Chap. i. §. 2, ult. But I cannot but wonder at the learned Author of the Manuscript, that he doth at the same time assert our Sins to be considered as Debts, and the Necessity of vindictive Justice: For, what vindictive Justice belongs to a Creditor? May not a Creditor part with his own Right, and forgive what and whom he pleases, without any violation of Justice? I can hardly think, that those who write so rudely and inconsistently, ever penetrated into these matters in their own thoughts; but only take up with a Set of Phrases and common Expressions among those they converse with, which they look on as the standard and measure of Truth about these matters.

But he finds fault with some men, who hold that Christ only suffered in the Person of a Mediator, and not in the Person of Sinners. What is the Meaning of this? I had thought, that a Mediator interposing for
for that end, that by his Sufferings there might be a Propitiation for sins, did so upon himself the Punishment of their sins, and procure grace and favour for them. But if he means any thing beyond this, he must explain himself. 

**IV.**

far sustain the Person of Sinners, as to take upon himself the Punishment of their fins, and sustain the Person of Sinners: Is it, that he suffered, that others might not suffer? That is not denied by those, who say that Christ suffered in the Person of a Mediator: For a Mediator is a publick Person, and acts in the stead and on the behalf of others; and if this be called sustaining the Person of Sinners, I suppose they will not quarrel with the Expression. But if more be meant by it, viz. that the Personal Guilt of Sinners, in Dr. Crisp's Sense, is transferred upon Christ, that they have to deny; as I hope to make it appear in Answer to the third Question.

**The Second Question is, Whether the Author of Gospel-Truth stated, viz. Mr. Williams, be chargeable with Socinianism, in what he said, pag. 41, 44?**

The Charge stands thus in the Report, pag. 4. "That he faith, there is no "Change of Persons between Christ and "Sinners;" which is there said to be "in- "consistent with the Doctrine of Christ's "Satisfaction, which must suppose a Com- "mutation of Persons; and therefore he "that
that denies any Change, cannot assert the
Doctrine of Satisfaction."

This is the force of the Objection. And
being desired to give my Opinion of it, I
examin'd and compared several passages in
that Book, that I might judge truly and
impartially concerning it. And I found
the Author, pag. 4, saying concerning the
Difference with Dr. Crisp, "It was not,
whether Christ had made full Atonement
for sin;" which he there owns to be his
sense. And pag. 8, more fully he owns,
that "our Sins were imputed to Christ
with respect to the Guilt thereof; so
that he, by the Father's appointment,
and his own Consent, became obliged, as
Mediator, to bear the Punishments to the
full Satisfaction of Justice, and to our
actual Remission when we believe."
Can any thing be more clear and express
against Socinianism, than this? There are
other passages, pag. 11, 21, 30, &c. to
the same purpose; but these are sufficient
to shew, that he could not absolutely deny
any Commutation of Persons.

But in what words doth he deny it?
For it is possible, there may be such
words used, as may restrain and limit the
Sense; and then it is very hard to force
such a Sense upon them, as is inconsistent
with what he had said before; for no man
loves to contradict himself; especially
when he knows what advantage will be
taken
taken by it. The words are these, pag. Sect. 44. "The Difference lies in these points: (1.) Whether there be a Change of Person between Christ and the Elect; yea, or betwixt Christ and Believers? This the Doctor affirms, and I deny." How can any Persons, in common Ingenuity, understand this otherwise, than that he denied such a Change of Persons as Dr. Crisp affirmed? But against this it is urged by the Author of the Manuscript, in the Report, pag. 18. "That his Denial of a Change of Persons, is so express and full, as leaves no room for any distinction, limitation, or restriction, or for an owning it in any Sense." What! not in the Sense that himself had owned it in before? This is very hard; especially when he mentions what the Doctor affirmed, and be denied. There is a very good passage to this purpose in the First Paper, mentioned in the Report, pag. 12. Not thinking it reasonable or just, to charge upon any Brother such Consequences of any expression or opinion of his, which he himself shall disown. Why then should such a Sense be charged upon him, which he disowns at the same time? There must be something farther in this Matter, than appears to an indifferent and impartial Reader; what it is, is no part of my business to enquire.

But that which must give the best Light
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Sect. Light into it, will be the resolution of IV. the last Question.

The Third Question is, concerning Dr. Crip's Sense of the Change of Persons, whether it be true or false? Which, I suppose, is truly set down by the Author of Gospel-Truth stated, in these words, pag. 42. "Mark it well, Christ himself "is not so compleatly righteous, but we are "as righteous as he; nor we so compleatly "sinful, but Christ became, being made "Sin, as sinful as we: Nay more, we "are the same Righteousness; for we are "made the Righteousness of God; that very "Sinfulness that we were, Christ is made "that very Sinfulness before God. So that "here is a direct Change; Christ takes our "Person and Condition, and stands in our "stead; and we take Christ's Person, and "stand in his stead."

Here is indeed a Change of Persons supposed; but I do not find it proved; and therefore is only to be look'd on as an imaginary Change, which it is possible for men to fancy: But that is no ground to build a Matter of Faith upon; and such as the Salvation of their Souls is so nearly concerned in. But to deliver my Opinion freely and distinctly about it, I shall shew,

[1.] That it hath no Foundation in Scripture. [2.] That it is contrary to the Tenor of it, and the Terms of Salvation con-
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tained in the Gospel. And, [3.] That it is attended with very bad Consequences, which naturally follow from it.

[1.] That it hath no Foundation in Scripture. For which I desire it may be considered, that our blessed Saviour himself in all his preaching, who came to reveal the Will of God to mankind, faith nothing at all of it: And can any possibly think, that he would omit such a Point, wherein, I perceive, some do think the Substance of the Gospel is contained? All that our Saviour faith to this purpose, is, That he came to give his Life a Ransom for many; Mat. xx. 28. and that his Blood was shed for many for the Remission of sins. Mat. xxvi. 28. What other Change of Persons is herein implied, but that of a Ransom, and a Sacrifice of Propitiation? He that knew best for what End he suffered, faith not one word of his taking upon himself the Person of Sinners, in any other sense than as he suffered in their stead, and for their advantage. Here is nothing like his being as compleatly sinful as we; and our being made as righteous as he. And yet certainly he communicated to his Disciples those Points on which their Justification and Salvation depended. But how could they apprehend any such Change of Persons in this sense, from any words used by himself to them? And all necessary Points of Faith were deliver'd by our Saviour to his Disci-
s: And therefore to make such a Change of Persons necessary, and yet not mentioned by him, is to charge him with failing in his *Prophetical Office*, which all those ought to consider, who lay such stress upon this matter.

But doth not St. Paul say, that God hath made him to be Sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the *Righteousness of God* in him? 2 Cor. v. 21. I grant he doth so. But do not these words imply such a Change of Persons as Dr. Crisp asserts? By no means: Which I thus prove. Dr. Crisp's notion of the Change of Persons, supposes the benefits of this Change to be antecedent to any Conditions on our side, *viz.* that it was by a Transaction between the Father and the Son, without regard to any Act of ours: But when the Apostle speaks of Christ's being made Sin for us, and our being made the righteousness of God in him; he supposes, that before we can have the benefit of it, we must be first reconciled to God, which is an Act on our part. For to this purpose he saith, *ver. 18, 19.* that after the Reconciliation made by Christ at his Death, he had given to the Apostles the *Ministry of Reconciliation*. To what purpose? Was it only to let them know, what Christ had already done for mankind? That were to set up a *Ministry of Consolation for Believers*; but not of Reconciliation. But the
the Apostle lays great force upon it, that 

**sect.** God had committed to them the word of re-

conciliatory. Now then, faith he, ver. 20. we are Ambassadors for Christ; as though 

God did beseech you by us, we pray you in 

Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God. They 

were by this Ministry of Reconciliation, 

after what Christ had done and suffered, 

prayed, and with great earnestness, to be 

reconciled to God? To what End? when 

according to this Change of Persons, they 

were more than reconciled to God already, 

if they were true Believers; for they 

were as righteous as Christ himself, and 

therefore must be in the grace and fa-

vour of God. If they were not Belie-

vers, then, according to this Scheme of 

the Change of Persons, they could have no 

benefit by it; and consequently, this Mi-

nistry of Reconciliation is wholly subvert-

ed, as to the great purpose and design of 

it; for either they were reconciled already, 

or they never could be. And yet the Apo-

file, after those words in ver. 21, imme-

diately subjoins, Chap. vi. 1. We then as 

workers together with him, beseech you also, 

that ye receive not the grace of God in 

vain. What can the meaning of these 

words be, if Dr. Crip's Sense of the 

Change of Persons hold good? Can they 

who are compleatly righteous, ever receive 

the Grace of God in vain? And to what 

purpose doth he speak of their working to-

gether.
gather with God, and beseeching them not to do a thing utterly impossible? for it would be to undo what had long since been done between the Father and the Son in the Change of Persons. So that this notion of the Change of Persons is as different from St. Paul's, as may be; for that supposes no conditions on our side; and the Ministry of Reconciliation in St. Paul, is wholly founded upon it, and really signifies nothing, as to the Ends he proposes, without it. For to what purpose is that appointed to persuade men to be reconciled to God, if all that ever shall be admitted to Heaven were long since reconciled at the Death of Christ, and they were made as compleatly righteous as Christ himself?

It may be said, That the Ministry of Reconciliation is not useless, because it is the means whereby God doth effectually convey his Grace into the Hearts of Believers. But this cannot satisfy any one that considers St. Paul's expressions: For his words are, We pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God. If he had said, That God had made Christ to be sin for you already, and you as righteous as Christ was; how would it have looked to have said after this, We pray you to be reconciled to God? For, what need they any Reconciliation, who were already so much in his favour?

But is there no Change of Persons then implied?
implied in those words of St. Paul; He hath made him to be Sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the Righteousness of God in him? Yes certainly: Such a Change, whereby Christ did undergo the Punishment of our sins. And so Erasmus observes, that Christ is not called a Sinner here, (as Dr. Crisp would have it,) but Sin; that is, a Sacrifice for sin, according to the Scripture sense: And we are made the Righteousness of God in him; that is, That God, upon the account of his Sacrifice and our Reconciliation to him, would treat us as righteous persons, or receive us into his grace and favour: Which is all that I can find, that St. Paul understood by this expression. I am now to shew,

[2.] That this notion of the Change of Persons, which Dr. Crisp afferts, is contrary to the whole Tenor of the Scripture, and the Terms of Salvation contained in the Gospel. I am sensible, how large a Field I am entered upon; and if I should pursue this matter as it deserves, it would take up much more room than I can allow to this Answer. I could easily prove, that in all the Transactions between God and Mankind, some Conditions on our side were required in order to his Favour. So it was in the State of Innocency: So it continued after man's Fall, as appears by those remarkable words of God to Cain; If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accept-
ed? and if thou dost not well, Sin lieth at the door. Gen. iv. 7. So it was in God's dealing with the Patriarchs, and the most excellent Persons in the Old Testament, Abraham, Moses, David, Job, &c. But I pass over these, (altho' I suppose they will not be denied to have been of the Elect, and to have had the Benefit of Christ's Righteousness as well as Christians,) and come to the Terms of Salvation, as declared by Christ himself. Let any one seriously peruse the Doctrine which he preached, from the time when he began to preach, and to say, Repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand; (Mat. iv. 17.) and he shall find, the main business of his preaching was, to put men upon performing such Conditions, as were necessary to their Salvation; and for that very Reason: As may be seen in his Sermon on the Mount, in which he begins with promising Blessedness to the humble, merciful, pure in heart, &c. Mat. v. 3, 4. & seq. What do these things mean, if they be not Conditions on our parts necessary in order to Happiness? and that they are considered by God as such? Why doth he say, ver. 20. Except your Righteousness exceed the Righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the Kingdom of Heaven; if such a Righteousness be not a Condition required in order to such entrance? And if it be, no Change of Persons without inward
ward and real Righteousness can be sufficient. Our Saviour doth not speak of what will be eventually in some persons, but of what is required to be done in order to an End. And therefore he concludes his Sermon with saying, Whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doth them, I will liken him to a wise man, who built his House upon a Rock, &c. Mat. vii. 24. Not, he that believes that he is one of those, who is made compleatly righteous by a Change of Persons, without any Change of temper or disposition of mind: He never promises the least degree of happiness to such; but still insists on our own Endeavours, by striving to enter in at the strait Gate; which St. Paul calls, working out our own Salvation with fear and trembling; and St. Peter, giving all diligence to make our Calling and Election sure; for, faith he, if ye do these things, ye shall never fall.

Do not these expressions note the necessity of the performance of Conditions on our side? And therefore all imaginary notions of such a Change of Persons, as hath no regard to any Acts of ours, is wholly repugnant to the main Scope and Design of the Gospel. I meddle not with the dispute about the Moral Law, which must continue to oblige us as long as the Reason of it continues; but the main Argument to me is from the Gospel, as it is delivered by Christ and his Apostles, who
certainly understood the Substance and Design of it far better than Dr. Crisp, or the Reporter doth. What was transacted between the Father and the Son, we know no more than they have revealed to us; and we know they had no Design to impose upon mankind, by laying so much weight upon such Conditions as God had no regard to, and by concealing from them such a Change of Persons as made them compleatly righteous without any Act of theirs. If this were the case, men could never be reconciled to the just Veneration and Esteem we have of the Sacred Penmen of the Scriptures, nor to their Knowledge of the Mysteries of the Gospel, nor to their Fidelity in declaring them for the good of mankind. So that if we find nothing of this Change of Persons in their Writings, and so much as is utterly inconsistent with it, we have all the Reason in the world to reject it. I add,

[3]. That this notion of the Change of Persons is attended with very bad Consequences: Which I do not charge on those who do not see them, or are carried by some higher Principles above them. But we are not to judge of Persons but of Things, and the natural Tendency of Principles. And so the Change of Persons in this Sense hath these very bad Consequences: That it is apt to lessen our Reverence of the Divine Perfections; our just Sense of
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of the Differences of Good and Evil, and of our Obligations to all sorts of Duties; that it tends to the Disparagement of that Free Grace they pretend to exalt; and exposes the Gospel to the Reproach and Contempt of Infidels, and leaves the Minds of those who embrace it, under great Temptations to Presumption.

These things I can only mention, because you desired a short Answer to your Questions, and I have brought it into as narrow a compass as I could. I am,

S I R,

Your Faithful Friend

and Servant,

ED. WIGORN.

Nov. 10, 1697.
Dr. Edwards's Letter

Sect. IV. The Learned Dr. Edwards's Answer to the same Three Questions, in a Letter to Mr. Williams; occasioned by Mr. Lobb's Remarks, wherein he pretends, that the Doctor's Preservative against Socinianism condemns Mr. Williams's Judgment concerning a Change of Persons.

S I R,

I HAVE perused the Passages which you refer to, (viz. Gospel-Truth stated, pag. 41, 44. the places objected among the rest,) besides several other parts of your Books; though I have not as yet had Leisure sufficient to read them over; However I have read enough to know your Opinion, and to understand how you state the Matter in debate between you and your Antinomian Adversaries; and thereby am sufficiently instructed to answer your Queries.

To the First therefore I say, That when speaking of the Sufferings of our Saviour, I assert, as other Divines usually do, a Permutation of Persons; I mean no more than what you affirm; viz. That Christ not only died for the good, but likewise
likewise vice, or loco peccatorum, in the room and place of Sinners. But when we assert an Exchange, or Permutation of Persons, this must always be understood under such restrictions and limitations, as may help us to avoid those two dangerous Errors, which the Antinomians have fallen into. And therefore,

(1.) We must affirm, we mean no more thereby than an obligation to Punishment, which he no otherwise contracted than by his own free and voluntary consent and undertaking, to undergo that Punishment which the Law threatened, and our Sins deserved, viz. Death. But this must by no means be so far misconstrued, as to imagine that thereby the filth and turpitude of our Sins were transferred upon him. For tho' in the former Sense, he is said to be made Sin for us; yet in the latter, he still continued holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from Sinners, and at an eternal distance from them. Neither,

(2.) Must this Permutation be extended so far as to imply a reciprocal Exchange of Persons, viz. of us Sinners, into the room and place of Christ: As if God did look upon us, as doing all that Christ did; and consequently, that we do merit Pardon, atone Justice, compleatly satisfy and fulfill the Law, so that we are actually discharged from Punishment without more ado. No, we continue still under the Sentence
Sentence of the Law, notwithstanding all that Christ did to free us from it, till we perform those Conditions upon which the application of Pardon is suspended. The immediate effect therefore and consequence of the Permutation which we are speaking of, is only this; that Christ by dying in our room, had so far reconciled us to his Father, as that he is willing to pardon and admit us to his favour, provided that we on our parts perform the Conditions of the New Covenant, viz. Repentance and Faith. For tho' Christ by dying for us hath merited our Pardon, yet it still continues so far in his own Power, as that he will not dispose of it, but upon such Terms as have been agreed upon between him and his Father; which indeed are no other than such, as without which we are neither capable of Pardon, nor can God in Honour bestow it upon us. To apply Pardon to a Sinner while he continues in his obstinacy and impenitence, is not only contrary to the Holiness of God, but inconsistent with his Wisdom, and destructive of his Authority and Government. And therefore the Graces before mentioned must be looked upon by us, to be both the necessary Parts of every Christian's Duty, and the indispensible Conditions of his Happiness. [In another Letter,] I intend no more by an Exchange of Persons, than what you have affirmed in your Writings.
As to your Second Query, I judge those Assertions and Acknowledgments frequently made by you in your Books concerning the Sufferings of Christ, and the Satisfaction thereby made to the Justice of God for the Sins of men, do fully acquit you from giving any countenance to the Errors of Socinus in that point. [In another Letter,] You have very rightly, and in an Orthodox manner, stated the Doctrine of Christ's Satisfaction; and it is in perfect agreement with the Doctrine of our own and all the reformed Churches, and therefore fully acquits you from the Imputation of Socinianism.

As to the Third Query, with relation to the Doctrine of Dr. Crisp and others of that Sect, who affirm such a Permutation of Persons between Christ and Sinners, as if to all intents and purposes they were to be looked upon in the room and place of each other; so that Christ is to be accounted the Swearer, Drunkard, Blasphemer on one hand, and the Sinner to be perfectly righteous on the other; I cannot but look upon it to be, not only false, absurd, impossible, but likewise an impious and blasphemous Opinion; as being highly dishonourable to our Saviour, repugnant to the Wisdom and Justice of God, and tends plainly to subvert the whole design of Christianity; which is hereby exposed to the just and unanswerable Reproaches of its
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Sect. its Adversaries, which can never be wiped off, if the Opinion be true.

I would say a great deal more upon this occasion, if it were necessary; but what I have thus briefly suggested, may I suppose be sufficient for your present purpose. And if you think that what I have wrote may be any way serviceable to the common cause of our holy Religion, I give you leave to make what use you think fit of it; and in the mean time remain,

Sir,

Jesu Coll. Oxon. Your assured Servant,
Oct. 28. 97.

Jonathan Edwards,

I had not given this trouble to these Great Men; but that Mr. Lobb makes frequent use of their Testimony against my Judgment, in favour of them whom I oppose. And being no Authors better understand, and more effectually oppose Socinianism, I was sure their Vindication of me would be past exception; and therefore made bold to propose to them, First, Whether they intended more by a Commutation of Persons, than I did affirm in my Books? (which I sent them.) Secondly, Whether I was by the Passages excepted against in my Book (by the First Paper and Mr. Lobb,) chargeable with Socinianism?
to Mr. Williams.

nianism? And, Thirdly, What their Judgment was concerning that Change of Persons which I oppose, and Dr. Crisp and others of that Sect affirm? To these Questions they were pleased to send these Answers, with a Permission to print them.

I THINK, every man will conclude from what they say, that they account our holy Religion is struck at by what Errors I oppose; and that Mr. Lobb doth wrest their Books, when he cites them in Con- futation of what I affirm.

I MIGHT have added another Letter of this Right Reverend Bishop to the same effect; and wherein he proves, that God was not displeased with Christ; And also of the said Reverend Dr. Edwards. But these published abundantly suffice.

S E C T. V.

Some Animadversions on Mr. Lobb's Defence of the Report.
By D. Williams. Note, I call the Author of the Rebuke, Mr. R.

THOUGH I have the Testimony of the Ministers and Elders of all the Dissenting Congregations in Dublin (ex-
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Sect. cept one,) for my Peaceableness and Diligence in the promoting of Union there; yet being industriously branded as the great Divider in this place, it's necessary to represent the Cause of men's mistakes.

To me is ascribed the Rise of our Divisions, because at the request of several Ministers, after other means were unsuccessful, I wrote Gospel-Truth stated; when Dr. Cripp's re-printed Book so obtained as to threaten our Ministry. The Continuance of our Breaches I am charged with, on no better pretence than this; a beaten man makes all that Noise, which proceeds from the furious Blows that fall upon his person. I consented to that Expedient in 1692. wherein all objected against my Book was adjusted; and gave no cause for the Objectors to violate that Agreement.

Mr. Chauncy, Mr. Trayl, Mr. Keach, Mr. Edwards, &c. wrote Volumes against that Book; to all which I replied in a Defence of Six Sheets; thinking that sufficient, and in hopes some Rest might be obtained by silence. Mr. Mather revives the assault with a Charge of Blasphemy and damning Errors: This extorted a short Reply at the end of Man made righteous:

Then by Contrivances I was voted out of the Lecture at Pinners-Hall: Whereupon Dr. Bates, Mr. Howe, Mr. Alfop, and myself, remove to Salters-Hall. About two months after this, my Morals (upon
(upon a search back to my Childhood) are impeached: The united Ministers unanimously adjudged and declared me clear and innocent of all that was laid to my Charge. I forbear Recriminations against many, for which I am furnished.

The same Book comes again upon the Stage with Mr. Lobb's Objections; which I answered in one Sheet. Mr. Lobb rejoineth; but at the Reverend Dr. Bates's request, I laid aside a Book ready for the Press. The Doctor and I fully agree in Sense, notwithstanding he had used some Phrases which Mr. Lobb hoped to divide us by.

They stop not here: As the result of many private meetings with my Adversaries, a Paper is gotten subscribed (when I was at Bath,) by some at least of my Friends, who fully agreed with me in Doctrine. Herein there were several mistakes in matters of Fact, referring to the Subscription to my Book; many insinuated reflections (not designed by all,) against the Doctrine of that Book; with such ambiguities and omissions, as endangered the Truths by me defended; and those Terms proposed to me, which might startle a man they had no power over, and who justly expected better treatment, at least from such whose cause I pleaded. Yet when this Paper was laid aside, and the Third Paper agreed to, I fate still; tho' I knew
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Sect. knew that First Paper (unprinted) was sent through the Nation to my great detriment.

Might not one expect some Quiet, after such various attempts against this Book and its Author? (which I do not ascribe to the Congregational, as a Body; nor had I mentioned most of these things, if I were not charged with all our Divisions.) My hopes are disappointed; Mr. Lobb printeth his Report, wherein the united Ministers for my sake are branded for Socinians, and therein inserts that unhappy Paper. Nay, he soon follows this with his Remarks, to fasten his Charge the deeper upon me. Stops he here? No, in this his Defence I am still pelted, my Doctrine grossly arraigned, and the learned Mr. R. cenfured as a Socinian for defending me. My Book sustains the Clamour, because it denies the Crispian Change of Person: Nay, he hopes it hath some invisible evil thing within its Bowels, which if I do not bring forth, (for no body else can,) I must be one offensive and halting, pag. 88. Nay, as if first in his intention, the last words in his Book are, Whether Mr. Williams be sincere or no, be must now shew it. FINIS. The English of this is, if I be sincere I must shew my self erroneous, that they may have somewhat to justify their past Clamours; for as yet they can prove nothing: And yet, (will you not wonder?) he gives me (pag. 9.) more
more hopes of their Charity and Communion, if I will but write Errors plainly, than they can now allow me when I assert the opposite Truths.

Am not I in a straight? He and others call and provoke me to write; (and they might do it long enough, if the Interest of the Gospel, and such Injuries to my Friend afflsted not their Calls:) Yet if I write, I shall be deem’d the Cause of all our Divisions. But so ’twill be, if I write not; nay, if I be not *felo de se*. I shall therefore adventure, so pressed by Mr. Lobb, to give him some haughty thoughts. I may well call it an adventure, for I foresee, unless he is much changed since he wrote this Defence, he will mis-represent what is written with the greatest caution; and if his Readers shall think him a fair Adversary, he is sure to have the better of any man, as will soon appear.

Mr. Lobb says, pag. 35. "The Phrase "of a Change of Christ’s Person was never invented, till the Gentleman, who engaged my Brother to enter upon this sorrowful undertaking, started it. And to speak the truth, it’s a Phrase only adjusted to express no more, than what the Socinians do constantly grant; for they say, that Christ, tho’ he suffered not the Punishment due to us for sin, yet he endured grievous and dolorous Pains; which is aptly enough expressed, "when
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Sect. "when it is said, there was a Change of V. " Christ's Person for us, for he was, say " these Hereticks, changed from ease to " pain for our good."

Note, (1.) The Phrase, Change of Person, was used by Dr. Crisp, and therefore not invented by me, (whom he meaneth;) it is from him I cited it. (2.) Is it so ill a Phrase, and serves only a Socinian purpose? then Mr. Lobb should not make me a Socinian, only for denying this Phrase. He faith, (and that, when he will speak the truth,) it's adjusted only to express what the Socinians constantly grant; and yet quarrels with me for denying this dangerous expression. (3.) If this bad Phrase, Change of Person, and that good Phrase, Change of Persons, differ so far as Heterodox and Orthodox; did not Mr. Lobb deal unfairly all this while, in telling the world I denied that good Phrase Change of Persons, only because I denied this bad Phrase Change of Person? For I assure you, I no where deny a Change of Persons in the Plural number,(tho' according to his liberty he faith I did, pag. 42.) and I fully assert the sound Sense of it, as the Right Reverend the Bishop of Worcester, and the Reverend Dr. Edwards do witness; and they are men he makes great use of in his Book, as very found in this point. But being more concerned for my Friend, Mr. Rebuker, I shall with this place begin an Account of
Mr. Lobb’s Defence &c. of some of the stabbing Injuries he receives from Mr. Lobb, with an Art thou in health, my Brother?

[1.] Mr. Lobb makes Mr. R. here to say (with the Socinians,) that there was a Change only in the Person of Christ, without an exchange at all with Sinners. Because Mr. R. faith, there was a Change of the Person of Christ, in exchange for the Persons of Sinners, (tho’ not reciprocally, in all respects;) this is plain; for a mere Change from Ease to Pain is only a Change in Christ’s Person. Mr. Lobb faith, pag. 31. “My Brother is in good earnest, “only for a Change of Christ’s Person, “without a Change of Persons between “Christ and us:” When it was thus expressed in the Rebuke, pag. 44. [‘This Phrase, the Change of the Person of Christ, hath truly an honest sound Sense, viz. the Substitution of one Person in the room of another; and a proper Redemption may be obtained by the Punishment of one in the room of another: — If therefore Christ’s dying, by way of Change or Exchange, be all they would have, it’s granted, &c.’] Yet from this very place Mr. Lobb inters, as above.

[2.] Mr. Lobb represents Mr. R. to hold with the Socinians, that Christ suffered only so for our good, as not to suffer truly in our stead. Because Mr. R. affirmed, that
that Christ's suffering properly in our stead was for our good; Mr. Lobb faith, pag. 47. "Whatever my Brother intends, it's manifest, that while he calls the Socinian Sense of Christ's suffering in our stead, knavish; he gives the very Sense of this Phrase, which the Socinians who use it do give; and by it means (if we may judge his meaning by his words,) no more than what Socinus, Crellius, and that Fraternity, do consistently with their denial of Christ's Satisfaction constantly grant." He faith worse in the lines before: (See also pag. 36. and several times elsewhere.) The Place he grounds this upon is, Reb. pag. 35. where it is said, ['The Caviller proceeds; In our place and stead (with some) signify no more, than for our good: Why, it's impossible they should: That which Christ suffered in our stead was for our good; to bear the Punishment of our sins to satisfy Divine Justice, was certainly for our good, &c. Therefore for our good, because in our stead."

Reader, Is not Christ's bearing the Punishment of our sins to satisfy Divine Justice, suffering properly in our stead? And is suffering properly in our stead, and suffering in our stead in the Socinian Sense, (viz. improperly, and not at all,) the same thing? But Mr. R. said, ['It's impossible, in our stead should signify any more, than for
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for our good.] I answer, That it is, considered with respect to our concern-
ment therein, as it is a benefit designed for
us; but not to exclude its being in our
place and stead, which he fully afferts, and
without which we had been ruined for
ever. Is not man's chief end, to be happy
in the enjoyment of God? and doth not
Christ's dying properly in our stead subserve
that end? Mr. Lobb might better say, Mr.
R. denied that Christ's dying in our stead
was for God's glory, to which our good is
subordinate; than that he denied that
Christ died properly in our stead, because
as to our own felicity it did no more than
subserve it. Or was it for our hurt? or
could it be more beneficial to us, than for
our good? for it is only as to our benefit
he applies the words.

[3.] Mr. Lobb represents Mr. R. to
deny (with the Socinians,) that Christ's
Sufferings are a proper Punishment for our
Sins: When Mr. R. doth most expressly
affert, that Christ's Sufferings were the Pu-
nishment of our Sins, for Satisfaction to the
vindicative Justice of God. Thus he is
charged by Mr. Lobb, pag. 48. "Agree-
ably hereto, [the Socinians foisting in a
wretched Sense, and rejecting of Phrases
to make Christ's Sufferings not penal,]
my Brother, as he rejects the Phrases of
Christ's sustaining the Person of Sinners,
&c. and puts an unsound Sense on
G g 2 " Christ's
Jinifnadverfioiis on

Chrift's fuffering in our place and flead;
so that word [answering for them the obligations of the violated Law,] which was in the Firt Paper, to make it evident that we esteemed Chrift’s Sufferings to be a proper Punifhment, is rejected, as what cannot in my Brother’s opinion bear a sound Sense.” This Charge, that Mr. R. denies Chrift’s Sufferings to be Punifhments, he imposeth in very many Pages. Whereas Mr. R. faith, pag. 35. ' Chrift did bear the Punifhment of our fins to fatisfy Divine Justice.' And pag. 48. ' It is freely granted, that Chrift fuffered and died for the Persons of Sinners, and for the Sins of their Persons, and in the room and flead of their Persons; and that he fuffered and died to make Satisfaction to the Justice, to the vindictive Justice of God, &c.'

What pretends Mr. Lobb againft fo full conviction? No other, than that we by the Third Paper rejected this Phrase, obligations of the violated Law. But this is not true; we only waved it, and Mr. R. faith no more. But Mr. Lobb faith, pag. 50. “ The Phrase which we put in its flead, [Chrift came to answer for our violation of the Law of works,] differs as much from their Phrase, [answering for us the obligations of the violated Law of works,] as a Gofpel Truth, and a Socinian Error.” One would think, it is still
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still a true Phrase after his mangling it. Sect. V.
But pray take it as in our Paper: "Christ came into our room and stood to answer " for our violation of the Law of works;" to which add what follows, "And the " Punishment of our sins was inflicted on " Christ, that God might, without injury " to his Justice, pardon and save peni- " tent Believers." Is this a Socinian Er- ror? Or, is a word wanting to make Christ's Sufferings proper Punishments? Nay, what is it for Christ in our stead to answer for our violations? But go yet lower: Is not to answer for our Sins, another thing than Socinians hold? even this is no less, than suffering the Punishment of our sins, if we were for violating the Law, under its obligations to suffer those Punish- ments. But I come to Mr. Lobb's Charge against Mr. R. from the words, cannot bear a sound Sense.

[4.] Because Mr. R. used certain warm words once, and that only against the un- sound Sense of that single Phrase, Commu- tation of Persons, (which yet, he there faith, may be capable of receiving a sound meaning;) Mr. Lobb makes Mr. R. to intend those warm words, against the sound Sense of that Phrase, against that Phrase itself, and a great many other good Phrases which himself makes use of as very safe; yea, against the sound Sense of many o- ther Phrases which Mr. R. pleads for. I

Gg 3
shall fully recite the only place upon which Mr. Lobb grounds his charge; Reb. pag. 30. ['A Change of Persons between Christ and us, which may possibly be capable of receiving a sound meaning, (elsewhere explained,) and yet is more sounding towards a dangerous Sense; the Brethren did unanimously agree to grant as much as the sound Sense could bear, and modestly to wave and pass by the other, which was liable to be interpreted to a Sense and Sound of malignity to the whole of the Gospel.'] You see the other which could not bear a sound Sense, but was liable to a Sound of malignity, is but one thing; for other is not nomen multitudinis, and agrees with the Verb [was] which is in the singular Number. This other, to which these words are appropriated, cannot be the Phrase, Commutation of Persons, for that is not waved, but retained by us in the Third Paper; nor can it be the sound Sense of that Phrase, for that's provided for by Mr. R.; much less can it be all the Phrases and Passages in the First Paper omitted in the Third. It must then be confined to some one thing, expressive of the unsound Sense, which the Cripians put upon the Phrase, Change of Persons; which Mr. R's. following words point at: ['And the Brethren are now more fully persuaded, that they were in the right, by the Reporter's Notions.']
And what's that? Such a Change, as makes Sect. Christ to be destitute of a Righteousness entitling to eternal Life, and to become Sin as we are Sin; (Report, pag. 5, 7.) that is, filthy Sinners.

Yet upon this foresaid Passage of Mr. R. Mr. Lobb says, pag. 14. "This Passage of my Reverend Brother doth make it manifest, that the Paragraphs, Terms, and Phrases, which were in the First Paper, and were waved and passed by in the composure of the Third, are looked upon by my Brother, as what could not bear a sound Sense, but were liable to be interpreted to a Sense and Sound of malignity to the whole of the Gospel: That is to say, the Phrase of Christ's putting on the Person of Sinners, of his answering for us the obligations of the violated Law of works, the Term Surety, and the Assertion of the necessity of a Commutation of Persons, cannot bear a sound Sense, but are liable, &c. This is the Sense of my Reverend Brother."

And so these words, cannot bear a sound Sense, &c. are trumped up I believe forty times with these by tale, from pag. 48, to 65. Nay, in this last, pag. 65. he faith, "According to what my Brother declares, it must be supposed, that this Passage in the First Paper, [viz. Regeneration, Repentance towards God, Faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, and a holy Conversation, are
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Sec. "are by God's word manifestly necessary
V. "to the Salvation of a Sinner;] cannot
"bear a sound Sense, but is liable to be in-
"terpreted to a Sense and Sound of malig-
"nity." Must not Mr. R. tho' thus loudly warned, find it impossible to guard him-
selt against this man?

[5.] Mr. R. pag. 17. faith, ["These
Phrases, terms, or expressions, of a
Change of Persons between Christ and us,
and his taking on him the Person of Sin-
ers, are unknown to our Confessions, and
not to be found in the Body of Confes-
sions."] Mr. Lobb exposeth him by ci-
ting a Confession, that useth some Phrases
Mr. R. makes use of, and others which
he never denied; but mentions no Confes-
sion that hath the Phrases Mr. R. said,
could not be found. Upon this poor
work he toils from pag. 71, to 80. I
must stay a little on what occurs pag. 73,
and ask,

(1.) When Mr. R. denied only, that
these Phrases (not the found Sense) were
in the Confessions; why should Mr. Lobb
make him deny, that the Confessions gave
any countenance to the found Sense of those
Phrases?

(2.) When Mr. Lobb declares he had
been silent, if he had not found these Phra-
ses in some Confessions, and ridicules Mr. R.
for denying they were in them; why
did not he shew these Phrases, or one
of them, in some or other Confession? Sect. V.

(3.) If these Phrases, as to the Letters and Syllables, (which M. R. called for,) are wherever the sound Sense of them is to be found, (which is what Mr. Lobb pretends, or fondly argues;) why doth he deny, that the very Phrases of Christ taking on him the Person of Sinners, &c. are in the Third Paper, and say they are rejected by us, seeing the sound Sense of those very Phrases is there?

(4.) Mr. Lobb faith, "The Phrases of a Change of Persons, of Christ's sustaining our Person, of his being substituted into our room, and his suffering in our place and stead, are so nearly allied, that they live and die together; grant one, and all necessarily come in with it; &c." They must then be of the same adequate Sense with each other, or the Confession could not assert Christ's sustaining our Person, by its saying, Christ died in our stead: But if the Sense be adequate, then Mr. R. denies the right Sense of none of these Phrases; for he afferts, Christ died properly in our place and stead, and that he was substituted in our room. Whence it will be no better by Mr. Lobb's own confession, than that he makes all this Noise to shew his Copia verborum: He will have the mentioning of each of the various words of the same signification, to be Terms of Communion, and the omission of any one
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Sect. as great a bar to it, as if the very Sense of all those words were denied; ay, and that when the full just Sense of any of those words is granted.

For my part, after all his big words, from pag. 58, to 65, about Logical Terms, or mere human Forms of Speech, (tho' I believe, they who drew up the Third Paper never dreamt of such designs, as he with somewhat too like malice fastens on them,) I would think him a turbulent, uncharitable Schismatick, who would divide from others, merely because they scrupled this or that human form of words, so they held and plainly expressed the Scriptural Truth designed by those words, yea, tho' they expressed it by Terms less proper. How much more culpable is it then, to raise such Storms, only for our omitting a Phraze, because less intelligible to the People, more capable of being abused by the Etymology and Acceptation thereof among the Vulgar, and known to be grossly abused by the Crispian from that occasion? May not Mr. Lobb commence as just a War, if people should omit his fine Phraze, Zeal for Populacy, and yet be willing to use their plain Phraze, Zeal for Popularity?

But to conclude this head: I deny, that his Change of Persons, or Christ's suffering in our Person, either in the Crispian Sense, or his own, as stated in the Report, pag. 5. are included in, or to be proved from,
from, the Confessions. To pretend the literal Phrases, from such words, as Christ died in our stead, and was substituted in our room, is fordid; and the Confessors meaning in those words, is contrary to the Crispian and the Reporter's Sense: And therefore Mr. Lobb's Phrases are not at all proved from the Confessions; unless a thing be proved, where the Phrase is unmentioned, and the Sense opposed.

[6.] Mr. Lobb, that he might bring his English Reader to judge Mr. R. a baffled man, leaves out a considerable word in his translating a part of the Scotch Confession; which he thus renders, pag. 81. "It became the Redeemer to be true God and true Man, because he was to suffer the Punishments due for our sins, and to appear [quasi in personal nostrâ coram judicio Patris, pro nostrâ transgressione & inobedientiâ pati,] in our Person before the Judgment-Seat of the Father, to suffer for our Transgressions and Disobedience." Thus Mr. Lobb Englisheth the Latin words, and boasts, "Here you see the Church of Scotland useth this very Phrase, &c." But left his admirers should applaud his conquest to an indecency, it's fit they know, there's a word [quasi,] which Mr. Lobb did not think for his purpose to English. He ought to have said thus; "and to appear [as it were] in our Person;" that is, Christ appeared not
not properly in our Person; but that Phrafe is too hard, tho’ there be somewhat towards it, in some certain respect; as Calvin in this case useth quodammodo. But Mr. Lobb, by leaving out quasi, performs what he undertook, pag. 73. "Perhaps it may appear, [that is, to the English-man,] that the Phrafe most exposed by him will be found literally in one or other Confession.” These words cited are all, by which he makes it to appear; and quasi answers to perhaps. Nay, had the diminutive quasi been out, he is not sure it had served his turn.

But considering the wonted Freedom of the man, I wonder he left not out this quasi. For I could give many Instances, where the very next words omitted by him, would have defeated his purpose by what he citeth. But, to prevent a snare, I’ll prefer that in his Letter to Dr. Bates, pag. 17. where he faith, "Many hold Christ and us to be one Person in Law: And, that it may be said, that we suffered in Christ, is the import of that assertion which faith, that Christ suffered as our Surety; and is allowed by Mr. Baxter:” Just against this, Mr. Lobb cites in the Margin, "It is not so aptly said, he satisfied, as that he suffered ed in the Person of Sinners: Mr. Baxter, Cath. Theol. part. ii. pag. 79.” (It should be, pag. 76, 77.) Amazed I took Mr.
Mr. Baxter's Book, and found the very next words were; 'Note, That it is not any other man's Person that Christ suffered in, but his own; and we mean, that he took upon him the Person of a Sinner himself, in as much as he consented to suffer for sin: And so personating here, is not becoming any other man's person in a Law-sense, so as that other legally suffered what he did; but it is only his own Person's becoming a Sufferer in the stead of Sinners for their sins.' And two or three lines before, Mr. Baxter tells us, 'To say, that Christ satisfied in our Person, and we by him, is false, and subverts the Gospel.'

Or why did not Mr. Lobb split the word quasi, and leave out the last syllable si; then qua being oft reduplicative, had better fitted. Thus he served me, when in Man made Righteous, pag. 122. I had said, "Therefore Christ HEREIN is what the Civilians call an Expromissor; he is obliged alone, tho' he acts for another." Mr. Lobb in his Letter to Dr. Bates, pag. 12, 13. to expose me as unlearned, and himself skilful, recites several properties of an Expromissor, and will have me to mean that all these did belong to Christ; and then infer what pleased himself; whereas I had by the entire word Herein, limited it to one property of an Ex promissor, viz. He is obliged alone, tho' he acts for another,
Animadversions on Mr. Lobb, (viz. in Redemption-work.) Mr. Lobb seeing the word Herein would mar his project, he fairly splits the word, leaving out In, and makes it (a local) HERE; and so found Scope for his purpose.

These few Instances of many, may convince, how unfit Mr. Lobb is to report other men's words; tho' his Talent seems confined to the collecting and publishing what Authors write: It were well for his Readers, he did it with more of true Judgment, and less of Trick; for thereby his Quotations would more edify, and require less care and pains to become sure the Authors are not mis-represented.

[7.] Men will scarce judge it decent or prudent in Mr. Lobb, (if in his Friend,) to publish by that Letter to himself, a Reflection on the Rebuker for his Loyalty to the present Government, as inconsistent with a few Rhetorical expressions, in addressing the late King James, (to whom his obligations were somewhat peculiar.) But whereby doth his meaning appear so insincere at that time? Or what is done by him since, so contradictory to what he said, as to render him an Exemplar of Insincerity now? No other, than swearing allegiance to King William, signing the Association, and carrying it as becomes a Loyal Subject in his Prayers, Sermons, and peaceable behaviour and advices? What Fetters are some in, if once addressing
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fing the late King by a few big words, must eternally proclaim a man an Hypocrite, unless he be now a Non-juror, Non-ass ociator, Plotter, and Director of other Ministers (in imitation of himself) to pray for the King, as either of the two Kings may be intended, if they must at all seem to pray for King William. I hope, few will be gull'd into such a Character, from the fancied obligations of former Addresses, (tho' some of them were highly inconsiderate,) nor any discouraged from a persevering Loyalty by the forecited aspersion. This would admit enlargement, which provocations might improve. But I retain a Respect sufficient to forbid it; nor had I inserted the least hint at such things, except as a warning against the like Instances, when his first-rate man is to execute his fiery threats, and his very learned Person already roused (alike obnoxious) stretcheth forth his Claws. Let men take their way, but the common Interest will not long be sacrificed, ere some (now imposed on) will find out the Instruments and Designs of our Breaches. I hope, the Reverend Rebuker will pardon my Interposal, and that I acquainted him not therewith. His abilities for a Reply I acknowledge such, that if these short hints serve for a Foil to that he is preparing, and in the interim abate the ill Impressions of Mr. Lobb's attempt, I shall account these few
few hours well employed; which otherwise had been more feelingly spent in reflecting those base Reflections, that I am his Leader, Master, Principal, and what else became scarce any man, besides Mr. Lobb their Author.

Mr. Lobb owneth, pag. 8. "I granted, that besides the effects made ours, the very Righteousness of Christ is imputed to Believers;" but adds, "I mean nothing by this Grant;" because I use a Simile to illustrate the manner, in Man made Righteous, pag. 89. 'If one give me my Liberty, which he voluntarily purchased for me at a dear rate, he medially gives me what he paid for my Ransom, tho' immediately I receive my Liberty and a Right thereto.'

Answ. Had he cited the Apodosis, which is in the next words, he had spoiled his suggestion. I shall contract what I there enlarge on. I make Pardon and Adoption to be benefits, or effects following upon the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness. And the Righteousness of Christ I distinguish into, (1.) His performance of the conditions of the Covenant of Redemption; and (2.) His Right (or jus adjudicatum) by the Covenant of Redemption, to our Pardon and Adoption, for his performance of the Conditions adjusted in that Covenant. The former I said, is mediating imputed. The latter I said, is immediately
mediate imputed; it's reckoned to us when believers, because it was acquired expressly for believers. \textit{John iii. 16. Isa. liii. 10, 11. The judicial Imputation of this Right of Christ intervening, the Righteousness of Christ (as a performance of the conditions) is imputed as our Plea for that Pardon; it being the procuring cause of that Right of Christ, which is immediately imputed to us. And this Right I also distinguish, from that which the Gospel-promise made to believers doth invest them in: For the former Right results immediately to Christ from the Covenant of Redemption, and is subjectively in him, tho' imputed to us: Whereas the Promise, [he that believes shall be forgiven, or saved,] not only supposeth the former transactions, and is the Instrument by which God imputeth Christ's Righteousness to the believer; but it also, as a conditional promise, giveth believers a Right to forgiveness, whereof they are the immediate Subjects. Here Mr. Lobb may see the vanity of his Objection: It is not Pardon, or such possessed effects, that intermediate between Christ's Righteousness and us, nor only the Right given by the Gospel's conditional grant: No, it's \textit{Christ's own Right}, and that imputed to us by God himself, and that immediately to us. And pray, is God's imputing to us Christ's performance of the conditions, so far as to be
be our plea and foundation of claim, no
Imputation of his Righteousness at all, be-
cause the Imputation of Christ's acquired
Right intervenes? Nothing is left out, but
God's legal accounting us to have performed
all that, by which Christ merited and made
Atonement. Yet without this proud as-
sumption, nothing will please Mr. Lobb.

Being so often pressed to it by Mr. Humfrey and Mr. Lobb, I will endeavour
their satisfaction. If Christ had acquired
by his Death a power indefinitely to for-
give sins, without a Compact determining
(either by name or qualification) the per-
fons that should be pardoned in the virtue
of his Death, or only purchased the Gos-
pel-Covenant, as conditionally offering Par-
don; I should agree with Mr. Humfrey:
But it being otherwise, I differ from him.
And I add, that as the posseffed effects are
not properly imputed, so I will not confine
the support of my Faith ultimately, and
only, to the Gospel conditional promise,
tho' that's infallible; when God hath
made the Compact between the Father and
our Mediator to be my Security, and
Christ's performance of the conditions of
that Compact to be my Plea with God;
among which conditions was what answers
the Law of works, which I have tran-
gressed: Altho' I own, I must try my
Interest by Christ's Gospel-Law, as what
describeth the person who is entitled to
Pardon.
Mr. Lobb's Defence &c.

Pardon, and enjoíthen us to be such, with a promise of that Interest. In short, a Believer having for his Security and Plea, the Gospel-promise, the Covenant of Redemption, and the value of Christ's Death, I'll retain each; and therefore still say, Besides the effects possessed by me, the Righteousness of Christ is imputed to me, as above accounted for.

On the other hand, Could I think, it was by the Covenant of works, that Christ was constituted our Surety, so that his obligations to suffer the Punishment of our sins, did immediately result from that Law: And that we Sinners were Principals in Redemption-work, and Christ such a Surety as to be a joint Party with us in that work of Redemption: And that the Law of works required the Divine Nature, to give a value to what it accounted to be Righteousness: And lastly, that this Law promiseth Pardon to Sinners, for the sake of a Mediator's sufferings: I should then agree with Mr. Lobb, that we satisfied for our sin, died and obeyed in Christ's Person, and he and we paid the idem. Nay, I should be a full Crispian, and say, I was justified at the time of Christ's Death; I had nothing to do to become a partaker of the effects of that Death; I was as righteous as Christ: And so should deny any proper forgiveness; nay, and own, that Christ was really a Sinner; for I am sure,
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Sect. V.

the Law could immediately oblige no other to die.

But I must disagree with Mr. Lobb and them, because I am well persuaded, that God never proposed the work of Redemption to condemned Sinners, but to Christ our Mediator: Also, that to the Redemption of Sinners, God in Justice requiring for the honour of his violated Law, that a perfect obedience, and the suffering of what was equivalent to its threatened Punishment, should in the Human Nature be submitted to by the Redeemer; our blessed Mediator obliged himself to yield that obedience, and to bear those Punishments, upon condition that such Sinners should be forgiven in his Right, who should comply with the Gospel-terms agreed upon between the Father and him; and pursuant hereto, our Mediator did in our Nature perfectly obey and suffer the Punishment of our sins, whereby he had a Right to a believer's Pardon, and believers do obtain it in the way above described: And lastly, I am sure the Law of works never promiseth Pardon to Sinners for the sake of Christ's sufferings; the Payment of the full Idem was impossible, (tho' there was a supra-equivalent;) and the Law accounteth that Righteousness perfect, which an innocent holy Creature renders, tho' he have not the Divine Nature to give that value to his obedience, without
without which very thing we had been entirely lost.

Here Mr. Lobb may find a Surety, viz. an obliged Mediator: And under the Law, viz. as an Article taken into the Covenant of Redemption, whereby Christ was obliged: And in our stead, viz. we were condemned to suffer, and we are by and for his sufferings to be saved. Nay, he may find the sound meaning of his other Phrases, as Change of Persons, yea, Christ's suffering in the Person of Sinners; that is, Christ our obliged Mediator suffers in our stead what we were to suffer; yet it was, that we might be delivered for it, but not legally reputed our selves to suffer. And yet here's place left for Pardon, a Gospel-Law, Terms of Application, &c.

That none may mistake, note, (1.) I instance Pardon, &c. for brevity sake, but exclude no saving benefits; and I distinguish saving benefits, which are used as motives to duty in the Gospel, from the duties which are conditions of those benefits. And therefore, (2.) I speak not of Christ's peculiar purchasing Grace for the Elect, effectually to perform those Conditions, whereby, together with the Decree, their eventual Salvation is secured. This is my Judgment; but I ought not to confound this with that adjustment of things, whereby the Gospel-Offer of Salvation to all men, and the Gospel-Rule of conferring...
Animadversions on Sect. its benefits, and of our final Judgment, are provided for.

Mr. Lobb oft objects a Contradiction, if I affirm a Change of Persons, and yet say, I deny there is a Change of Person.

Answ. Besides Answers already given, I say, without any design'd Affront, it's no greater, than Answer not a Fool according to his Folly, yet Answer a Fool according to his Folly.

By thus gratifying Mr. Lobb's imperious humour, I am the freer to tell him, (1.) I am sorry, that he so boldly averreth many gro's mistakes in matters of Fact. Thus, pag. 35. I invented the Phrase, Change of Person; whereas I cite and use it as Dr. Crisp's Phrase.—Pag. 29, 43. I deny a Change of Persons; whereas I never denied it; what I denied was Dr. Crisp's Change of Person, and I fully asserted the Sense of the other.—Pag. 22. I appealed to the learned Witius; but this I never did. — Pag. 7. That only Mr. Toland wrote much in praise of my Book; whereas he being then in Holland, (and not the man he since appears,) desired them who gave an account of published Books, to give their Judgment of my Book, and the great Praisers are theirs; and others have since commended it above its worth.—Pag. 63. That I was the Contriver of the Third Paper; whereas others had drawn it up before I saw it. — His vile Reflections on Mr.
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Mr. R. with respect to this, and his Nine Subscribers of the First Paper, pag. 70. makes an account of that Matter necessary.

The united Ministers appointed Dr. Bates, Mr. Hammond, Mr. Slater, Mr. Hill, with Mr. Howe and myself, to compose an Expedient, &c. Two of the Brethren drew it up, (which is this Third Paper,) and brought it to the rest of us met together: After some alterations we did all agree to it, and brought it as our agreed Act to the meeting at St. Helens. There, among the rest, Mr. Stretton, Mr. Quick, and Mr. Evans agreed to it. Mr. Alsop, Mr. Burgess, and Mr. Shower, not being present any of the times when it was read in the meeting; it was brought to the view of Mr. Alsop, who approved of it: I am very sure also, it was shewn to Mr. Burgess, (his Informer,) who appeared to agree to it; and Mr. Shower did to more than one express his approbation of it. So that Mr. Lobb hath all the Nine Subscribers to my Book enumerated.—Mr. Lobb somewhere faith, All the Phrases of the First Paper, not in the Third, were rejected by my means: And yet several of them are in my own Paper, called the Second; which I am glad was printed ere I read his Defence.—He faith, The Third Paper denies a Commutation of Persons; pag. 14. when both Phrase and Sense are in it.—Other Instances are not wanting. It's false, that
Sect. the generality of the Pastors do not approve my Book; though they were asked only to subscribe the state of Truths and Errors.

(2.) The Cause he undertakes is miserably defended against the Rebupe. He appears to give, pag. 13. a Scheme of his project, viz. the Points left out of the Third Paper which offended the Brethren: But where's his Proof, that the united Ministers were obliged to retain so many Phrases of the First Paper, as they did? If they had used none, but what the Church of England and the Assembly of Divines Confession included, the Heads of Union were observed by them, and violated by such as exacted more. Where makes he it good, that the united Ministers rejected all the Phrases of the First Paper which they omitted; especially when it was never read nor proposed to them? Or that the omission of those Phrases warrants the breach of Union? Such matters ought not to pass unargued, without which none can tell what honest cause the Report pretends to, unless the traducing men found in the Faith, to cover the turbulency of the Erroneous, should be so accounted. As these are waved, so he trifles on what he pretends to insist on. — Mr. R. demands the difference between a Commutation of Persons between Christ and Sinners, and Christ's dying properly in the Sinners stead.
Mr. Lobb grants they are same; and yet Sect. poureth out a Flood of impertinent words against the Rebuker, as if they widely differed.—Mr. Lobb makes Christ's suffering the Punishment of our sins to the Satisfaction of Justice, the thing which distinguisheth the Orthodox from the Socinians: And yet he represents Mr. R. as a Socinian, who oft asserteth, Christ suffered the Punishment of our sins to the Satisfaction of Justice, even vindictive Justice.—Mr. R. chargeth his account of Change of Persons, Rep. pag. 5. with little less than Blasphemy: He bears that with the profoundest silence.—Mr. R. blames him, that he gave not a full Report of our Difference, and from its Rise: To this he faith, He pretended not to give a Narrative of the whole: And yet, Rep. pag. 4. he faith, The Difference hitherto hath been about the Satisfaction of Christ; and in his Remarks, he oft leads his Reader to judge we never had any other Controversy.—Indeed his present State of the Difference was such a Piece of Art, as he thought it so much pity to spoil it by a fuller account, that their violation of the Agreement of Doctrines, 1692. he answers only with a groan.---Their refusal of the Paper, 1694. because a disowning of sundry Antinomian Errors was added; he excuseth no better than by an abrupt Dismiss, after a Suggestion, that nothing had been added.
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Sect. added but that about Repentance, which is not true: And yet this being in the Assembly's words, he impeacheth the Refusers as insincere, in subscribing this in the Assembly's Confession, and yet refusing it in that Paper.----To the horrid Passages out of his Brethren's Books, collected to justify a demand of satisfaction, and a fit Antidote when he formed their Creeds; with him 'tis enough to say, they were not sent to Pinners-Hall; as if it matter'd not, that he knew, they were in their Books, and before the united Ministers.----What faith he to Mr. R's citations out of my Book, fully afferting Christ's Satisfaction? ne quidem, but caluminates still.-----Where states he a fair Question with the Rebuker? Instead of that he pursues a Logomachy, and cites Authors to prove what Mr. R. pleads for, and to confute what his Party reckons he defends, yea, what himself oft-times afferts. Phrases he tires, when the Sense is so disregarded, that I would thank him to shew one Error of Mr. R. (unless by gross wresting of his words,) he once remarketh; or one Doctrinal Truth he pretends to prove, which Mr. R. hath not expressly own'd.----Upon the whole, the Cause of the Rebuke is still unhurt, otherwise than as its Author is pelted with his smoothest Brother's rotten Eggs; such as, not having a grain of Sense, heretical, false, delirious, changeling, and what not? But as
as for the Cause of the Report, the Defendant has wisely got that into a Wood, in hopes his Party shall not find it is dead by the Rebuker's wounds.

(3.) I will foretell from what I already hear and see, how several sorts are likely to judge, and stand affected to his Performance.—His Disciples may say, All we have learned is even this: A Change of Persons, and Christ's suffering in our Person, if explained to a sound Sense, are no more than Christ's suffering properly in our stead: And yet Christ's suffering properly in our stead, is not so much a Change of Persons, or suffering in our Person, but that we must call them Socinians, who hold Christ suffered in our stead, if they will omit any of our Master's Phrases, altho' they own the Sense of all.

—The sagacious Crispians (if any such,) will say, He hath betrayed our Cause; yea, himself condemns it, and anon espouseth it: But one good turn is done; he hath toiled hard to spoil what is a real Confutation of it.—The factious Bigots may glory, Whatever becomes of Truth, yet it's worth our Contribution, that he has spoiled all hopes of that ill thing, Union, and Peace too; and has put the united Ministers to groan, We are abused, and as far as this Pacificator can influence, our Breaches shall still be wider.—They whom he
he remarked, saying, The Difsenters differ about they know not what, will loudly boast, We now see with a witness, that even the only man of close study, yea, that no man can guess what it is about.—They who used to truft to Quotations from Authors, must grow suspected, and resolve always to examine.—Hard Students (some such there are besides Mr. Lobb,) will dread a Common-place-Book of Phrases, left they should divert them from their more important Sense, and confound themselves to the distracting of the Church, and the torment of all Mankind.——It's well if some of his reproached Preachers fay not, We study Things more than Words; and yet Words, more than to speak false English, that we may strut in bombastick Phrases; and both to better purpofe than our assuming Dictator, who brands us with Ignorance, and a Zeal for Populacy; whilst his Gain by our more common acceptance, qualifies him for a fort of clofer Study; but in time we may become more politic.——But which more affects me, plain serious Christians with grief will cry, We know not what to think, if the way to Heaven be thus perplexed, and the Articles of our Faith fo intricate as these heaps of obscure Phrases represent them.—The Profane are tempted to scoff at Religion, as a wordy Noise; and our Enemies well pleased, to see us destroy each other by dividing, and this
this for what exposeth as much to Con-
tempt as Ruin.—How much should we V.
pray for godly Sincerity in our appeals to
God, and Serviceableness to a common
good in our pretended pleadings for Truth!
and not still amuse men, as Mr. Lobb
hath done by a Book, the Substance where-
of is no more than a Misrepresentation of
the Rebuker's Words, that the Reader may
believe him an Heretick in grain, when
the plain Sense of his Expression seems oft
contended for by Mr. Lobb. Nor can peo-
ple propose a benefit by multiplied Quo-
tations of a Phrase, when the Authors,
who use it, design by that Phrase no more
than Mr. R. grants; and his Exception is
not against their Sense of that Phrase, but
against imposing it as a Term of Union,
after the Crispian's and Mr. Lobb had so per-
verted it.
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OF
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For clearing

Sundry TRUTHS objected against, &c.

Printed in the Year 1698.

The Interest of the opinions and persons of Antinomians in this City did amazingly appear, in a violent opposition to this Book, and persecution of its Author, by a great Party among the Independents and Anabaptists. To such as will not read what they are bid to rail at, I wish a more impartial Judgment than to act thus blindly, lest they be found to resist the Truths of Christ, and that for purposes too carnal to be approved by upright men, when their Eyes are open. But my present concern is with such of the pretended Confuters of this Book, as deserve any regard. Several of them plainly avow Crispianism in its vilest Doctrines: Others divert the Controversy to occasional expressions, upon which the cause I manage had no dependance; but these agree with the residue of their Associates, to mis-represent my Principles, and with clouded confusion to state their own. Tho' the disingenuity of my Antagonists would be sufficiently manifest, upon the Reader's perusal of the places they cite out of my Book;
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Book; yet that I may not give Satan any advantage against the Cause of Christ, wherein I am engaged, I shall propose the considerable Objections offered against this Book, and shew, where on my part the difference is not, and wherein it truly consists, between me and the Objectors; if their exceptions are sincerely made.

SECT. I.

A Reply to the Objections in a Paper signed by several Brethren.

SECT. I shall chiefly insist on a Paper, signed in the year 1692. by Mr. Griffith, Mr. Cole, Mr. Mather, Mr. Chauncy, Mr. Trayl, and Mr. Richard Taylor; and in part printed in Neonomianism unmasked, part iii. pag. 96. Wherein they except against the following places in Gospel-Truth stated, under these Seven Objections.

Obj. I. *We find Truth and Error not rightly stated in several particulars; Chap. ii, v, vii, viii, xii, xvi, xviii, xix. and in other places.*

Answ. The meaning of this Objection (as further explained by one of the principal of these Brethren,) is, That what I state as TRUTH in the beginning of each of
of these Chapters, they esteem to be an Sect. ERROR; and what I call an ERROR, they think to be a TRUTH. The Reader cannot be just to himself, or me, if he peruse not what I call Truth and Error; and then let him excuse the Objectors from favouring the very dregs of Antinomianism, especially if he know what those other places be, which they thought less fit to mention.

Obj. II. **Under a colour of opposing some old Antinomian Errors, (which we from our hearts abhor,) he falls in with them in their main Principle of vacating the Sanction of the moral Law.** Pref. pag. ix, x. Book, pag. 142, 147.

**Answ. (1.)** It were their interest, that they could (without a breach among themselves) agree to name one Antinomian Error they abhor; when this Book states so many, their Advocates plead for each, and they have so often been called thereto in vain. Not to mention, how their Pulpits entertain, and they patronize, such as Mr. Davies, Mr. Jacob, &c.

(2.) As for their own opinion concerning the Law, it comes in effect to worse than the Error they object against. They are for the Law given to Adam (and no other) to be in force; but behold the manner! viz. The Law delivered to Adam as a Covenant of works, promising life upon
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Sec. no lower conditions than perfect obedience, and threatening death for the least sin, is still the only Law or Covenant, that appoints to Sinners the conditions of obtaining Salvation. But if we object, that by this notion all men must be unavoidably damned: They answer, Every elect person hath already fulfilled Adam's Law or Covenant in Christ; that is, the Elect have in Christ endured the curse to the satisfaction of Justice, and perfectly obeyed its precepts too; and therefore they are justified before God by Adam's Law: Nor doth the Gospel require Faith or Repentance, as any condition of Pardon or Life, nor denounce any threatening for the want of them, or for any other sin.

This being their notion of the Law, who sees, what more influence it can have upon Practice, than if its Sanction (if not Precept too,) were vacated? For the Curse can be of no use to deter such from sin, who have already endured it, and are guilty of unbelief if they any more fear it, or any other threatening for sin. Nor yet can imperfect Obedience avail for any benefit, when no Promise is made thereto: Nay, the Elect having perfectly obeyed in Christ, are therefore entitled by Adam's Law to its entire reward: But as for others, they have no conditions proposed to them, for escaping the Curse, or obtaining the Blessing. And thus they make the Law to be passed.
to Gospel-Truth &c.

passed into a Sentence, (viz. a mere justifying Sentence upon all the Elect, and an irrevocably damning Sentence upon all the Non-elect;) which is far worse, than what they exclaim against as an Error in others; who use that phrase, to shew that the Reward is not attainable by the Obedience of them who have once sinned; while yet they assert a remedial Law with Threats and Promises, affecting the fears and hopes of men as they obey Christ, yea, and the Law-curse to abide on unbelievers: Whereas by this notion all such Guards are wanting. I shall now state this point as it concerneth me.

The Difference is not, (1.) Whether the preceptive part of the moral Law be a rule of manners, and every violation thereof a sin? (2.) Nor whether all who believe not, are still under the Curse of the Law? (3.) Nor whether we are still condemnable by the Law for the defects of our Obedience, except the Gospel did provide a Pardon? (4.) Nor whether the Obedience of Christ, for which we are justified, must be at least adequate to the moral Law? All these I affirm, G. Truth, pag. 165, 64, 142, 117, 17, 46. Pref. pag. ix. (See also Def. of G. Truth, pag. 300.) And therefore it is a false Charge, that I hold the Sanction of the moral Law is vacated: I never said it. It is true indeed, I said, The Sanction is so removed,
Sect. as not to hinder our Relief by the Gospel; pag. 147. which if it were not, our Case were as desperate as the Devils. I affirmed also, It is a false notion of Free Grace, that when the Curse of the Law is removed, (as it is from Believers,) God cannot express any displeasure against them when most provoked; pag. 264. The plain meaning whereof is, That tho' believers are delivered from the damming Curse of the Law, yet there be many penal Afflictions threatened in the Gospel for such sins as believers may fall into. I also said, The Gospel hath another Sanction to the preceptive part of the Law, as taken into the Gospel; Pref. pag. ix, x. which must be true, if the Redeemer enjoin those Precepts, and the Gospel have a Sanction. But tho' I say in this respect there is a Change, yet this hinders not, but that those Precepts, considered as still in the moral Law, are under the same Law-Sanction as they were at first.

The Difference is, (1.) Whether by the Curse of the Law the sins of the Elect are imputed to them to condemnation, in foro justitiae, while they are unbelievers? This they deny, and I affirm. (2.) Is perfect Obedience to the moral Law the lowest condition of Salvation proposed by Christ to sinners? This they affirm, and I deny. (3.) Are Infidelity, Impenitency, and reigning Wickedness, as much the accepted
accepted conditions of Gospel-Pardon and Sect. Salvation, as unfeigned Faith, true Repentance, and sincere Obedience, tho' each be imperfect? This they affirm, and I deny. Of which more hereafter.

Obj. III. To supply the room of the moral Law vacated by him, he turns the Gospel into a new Law, in keeping of which we shall be justified for the sake of Christ's Righteousness; pag. 49, 138, 152, 229. making qualifications and acts of ours a disposing subordinate Righteousness, whereby we become capable of being justified by Christ's Righteousness. Pag. 60, 61, 69, 76, 108, 112, 114, 124, 142, 155, 159.

Answ. Read the places, and thou wilt be convinced, these men will have the Object on whom the justifying Act of God terminates, to be an impenitent Infidel; whereby we shall be justified as much by works as by faith, that is, by neither. Abraham would not be the pattern of a sinner's Justification, for he believed that he might be justified. Nor could faith in any sense be imputed for righteousness; for it would not be Christ believed on who justified, but Christ not believed on. All which are contrary to the very scope of Rom. iv. as well as to the inferred conclusion, ver. 23, 24.

The Difference is not, (1.) Whether the Gospel be a new Law in the Socinian, Popish,
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Sect. Popish, or Arminian sense? This I deny.

I. See it stated, Defence of G. Truth, pag. 346, 347. (2.) Nor whether faith, or any other grace, or act of ours, is any atonement for sin, satisfaction to Justice, meriting qualification, or any part of that righteousness for which we are justified at God our Creator's Bar? This I deny in places innumerable; yea, in those object- ed, pag. 112, 114, 124. (3.) Nor whether the Gospel be a Law more new than is implied in the first promise to fallen Adam, proposed to Cain, and obeyed by Abel, to the differencing him from his unbelieving brother? This I deny. (4.) Nor whether the Gospel be a Law that allows sin, when it accepts such graces as are true, tho' short of perfection, to be the conditions of our personal interest in the benefits purchased by Christ? This I deny. (5.) Nor whether the Gospel be a Law, the promises whereof entitle the performers of its conditions to the benefits as of debt? This I deny, pag. 64, 67.

The Difference is, (1.) Is the Gospel a Law in this sense? viz. that God in Christ thereby commandeth Sinners to repent of sin, and receive Christ by a true operative faith; promising that thereupon, they shall be united to him, justified by his righteousness, pardoned and adopted; and that persevering in faith and true holiness, they shall be finally saved; also threatening, that
that if any shall die impenitent, unbelieving, ungodly rejecters of his grace, they
shall perish without relief, and endure worse punishments than if these offers had
not been made to them. (2.) Hath the Gospel a Sanction? that is, Doth Christ
therein inforce his commands of faith, repentance, and perseverance, by the fore-
said promises and threatenings, as motives to our obedience? Both these I affirm; and
they deny, saying the Gospel in the largest sense is an absolute promise without pre-
cepts or conditions, and a Gospel-threat is a Bull. See this Law and Sanction prov-
ed, pag. 145, to 159. and Def. of G. Truth, pag. 348, & seq. (3.) Do the
Gospel-promises of benefits to certain graces, and its threats, that those benefits shall be
withheld, and the contrary evils inflicted for the neglect of such graces, render those
graces the condition of our personal title to those benefits? This they deny, and I af-
firm. (4.) Are impenitent Infidels while such, incapable by the Gospel-constitution,
to be justified by Christ's righteousness? This they deny, and I affirm. (5.) Do the
promises of the Gospel infallibly entitle by gift, the performers of their respec-
tive conditions, to the benefits promised thereupon? This they deny, and I affirm.
(6.) Seeing the Gospel promiseth pardon and life to all such as believe, (to be en-
joyed in the virtue of Christ's obedience,)
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Sect. is faith imputed for righteousness, as far as it is the performed condition upon which the Gospel-promise gives pardon and life to him that believeth, in opposition to him who believeth not? This I affirm, and they deny: Of which more hereafter,

MIGHT not Peace be more in prospect, if we could distinguish, [1.] Between a Command exacting and directing duty, and a Promise determining some degree of that duty to be the Condition of a benefit? This would convince us, that the Gospel is not a Law that allows sin. [2.] Between benefits considered as to be merited by us, and applying to us those benefits as merited and procured by Christ. [3.] Between God's adjusting a right to, and distributing benefits by governing Justice towards man without a Mediator; and by governing Grace giving a right and distributing benefits to sinners, for our Mediator's sake; by whom Satisfaction was made to governing Justice, and those benefits purchased.

Obj. IV. He denies the Covenant of Grace to be made with Christ as the Second Adam, and in him with all the Elect as his seed; pag. 59. and that the Covenant is pleadable by us, as it was made with Christ. Pref. pag. x.

Answ. Consult the places, and you'll find, all the cause for this is, that I distinguish
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[Reference to image content]

finguishe the Covenant of Redemption, Sect.
wherein Justice fixed the terms of the im-
petration of benefits, which Christ alone
was engaged to perform; and the Gospel-
Covenant, (which for distinction sake I
called the Covenant of Grace,) the terms
of which we are to perform, tho' in the
strength of Christ it is that we do that.

The Difference is not, (1.) If you call
the Covenant of Redemption by the name of
the Covenant of Grace, whether it was made
with Christ? This I affirm in the objected
place. (2.) Nor whether Christ engaging
in the Covenant of Redemption, may be
called the Second Adam so far, as that
what he engaged was for the Salvation of
all that shall believe; and that no man
can be saved, but in the virtue of his righ-
teousness; and he hath undertaken, that
the Elect shall believe and be saved? This
I oft affirm, pag. 44, 63. (3.) Nor whe-
ther all men may encourage themselves in
prayer, by what was promised to Christ,
and by the absolute promises of Grace?
This I affirm. (4.) Nor whether the Gos-
pel-Covenant gives Christ's Seed, that is,
believers, a right to plead Christ's perform-
ance of the terms of the Covenant of Re-
demption, as their Security of enjoying
what was promised to Christ for his Seed,
and is in the Gospel-Covenant promised to
themselves? All I this affirm.

The Difference is, (1.) Ought we to
distinguish
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 Sect. I.

distinguish between the Covenant of Redemption, which adjusteth the terms of Satisfaction, and Impetration of Salvation for us, (which Christ alone was to perform,) and the Gospel-Covenant, which appoints the way and conditions of applying to us that impetrated Salvation? This they deny, and I affirm. 

(2.) Was the Covenant of Redemption made with all the Elect? that is, Did the Elect covenant with God, that they should make their Souls an Offering for Sin, or that Christ should make his Soul an Offering for Sin? This they affirm, and I deny. 

(3.) Were the Elect, while unbelievers, properly the seed of Christ? This they affirm, and I deny; because Christ was to raise a seed by making them believers, and the Elect were given him so to raise. 

(4.) Can any unbeliever plead with God, that he hath a personal right to the promise of the first grace, and that God were unfaithful to him if he give it not? This they affirm, and I deny; tho' I grant, Christ can plead it, and the giving it is an act of faithfulness to him. 

(5.) Is the Gospel-Covenant made personally with fallen man? that is, proposed to all men where the Gospel comes, and ratified absolutely to believers for their interest in its benefits? This they deny, and I affirm. 

(6.) Is the Gospel-Covenant, which offers salvation to sinners on the terms of faith and repentance, made between the Father
Father as one party, and between Christ and us in him as the other party? Or is it made between God in Christ as one party, and us as the other party? The former they affirm, and I deny; because so it could not be the Testament of Christ, which it plainly is: The latter they deny, and I affirm; because the true question will be, Is Christ to believe and repent for us? and is his doing so the condition of our obtaining the pardon, which the Gospel promises, and which he procured by his obedience? Nor can I forbear to wonder that men think, if thou Sinner wilt believe, and if thou Christ wilt enable Sinners to believe, should be the same condition; whereas enabling is Christ's act, but believing is our act; and this our Act is the Gospel condition.

Obj. V. He teacheth, that the Righteousness of Christ is imputed only as to effects, with the purchase of a conditional grant, viz. this proposition, He that believeth shall be saved. Pag. 43, 57.

Answ. My words are, pag. 44. “Besides these effects being made ours, the very righteousness of Christ [it self] is imputed to true believers;” and pag. 43. “Christ merited for all the Elect, that they should in his time and way be certainly partakers of its saving effects;” and did not only purchase a conditional grant,
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Sect. "grant, viz. this proposition, He that believeth shall be saved." Do not they induce men to think, that I said, we are partakers only of the effects of Christ's death; but that his righteousness itself is not imputed to us? Also that I denied, that Christ merited for all the Elect, that they should believe and be saved? Which are so contrary to my words, that it should induce all honest men to deprecate the power of a faction.

The Difference is not, (1.) Whether Christ's righteousness itself be imputed to believers, as well as that the effects of it are possessed by them? This I oft affirm. (2.) Nor whether Christ hath merited, that all the Elect shall certainly believe and be saved? This I affirm.

The Difference is, (1.) As to the Covenant-Grant, Whether the Gospel-offer and promised Grant to fallen sinners, viz. that if they will believe they shall be saved, be merited by Christ? This they deny, and I affirm; because God might, as consistently with his Justice and the honour of his Government, save believing sinners without a respect to Christ's merits; as offer and promise Salvation to sinners, if they will believe, without a respect to the Death of Christ, as what vindicated his Justice and Government in treating thus with sinners, whom his own Law condemneth; nay rather, because his saving of believers
believers after such a grant, is an act of faithfulness to them, that being the execution of the Gospel-grant, to which he is self-engaged by his word. (2.) Whether the death of Christ is legally esteemed to be endured by us, and his obedience to be performed by us? Or whether they are imputed to believers, as their pleadable security for their pardon and title to eternal life in the right of Christ? The former they affirm, and I deny: The latter I affirm, and they deny; because it allows them not to say, that they are adjudged by God legally to have made Satisfaction to Justice; as they must be, if they endured those Sufferings in Christ, which were accepted for Satisfaction; unless they'll say, that Christ's Sufferings were not so accepted for Satisfaction. Nor will it permit them to conceive, they are as righteous as Christ, which they must be, if they are adjudged to have perfectly obeyed the Law in him: Nay they must be as holy as Christ too, unless they can be justified without habitual holiness by a Law that requireth habitual holiness to perfection. Not to insist how inconsistent their notion is with forgiveness of sin; unless that man be capable of pardon, whom God judgeth to have suffered the penalty, to have perfectly obeyed, and to be habitually holy, according to the full demands of the Law. To do, suffer, and be
be all this *in Christ*, and yet be pardoned for the sake of what he suffered, was, and did, I cannot reconcile; unless I could find, that we are not pardoned for the sake of what he did and suffered, or that he did and suffered somewhat for our pardon which we are not judged to do and suffer *in him*.

I have largely treated of the matter of this Objection, in *Man made righteous*, pag. 87, to 94, and in the *Answer to the Report*, pag. 452, to 455, as a reply to the Reverend Mr. Humfrey and Mr. Lobb. Yet I will offer a few thoughts on this point.

[1.] Mr. Humfrey ordereth his conceptions, as if there were no Covenant of Redemption, or Law of Mediation; and thence denies the Imputation of Christ's righteousness it self to us: For *in se*, amounts to no more, in opposition to me. Mr. Lobb, with these Brethren, speak in the other extrem, as if there were no Gospel-Covenant, or Law, but only a Covenant of Redemption; and this leads them to deny a Gospel-righteousness. Whereas a due regard to both these Covenants, renders the imputed righteousness of Christ, and a Gospel-righteousness, very consistent; the former, as securing us Sinners against the Challenge of Justice at the Creator's Bar; the latter, at the Redeemer's Bar, against the Charge of rejecting Gospel-Grace. Without the first, no Sinner, tho' a believer, could be saved: And if there be no such thing as a Gospel-righteousness,
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teousness, all invited Sinners must have an equal interest in the Salvation offered, as well as in the Offer of it, unless Christ will not judge them, or judge with respect of persons: Of which hereafter.

[2.] I ask no more as to a Covenant of Redemption, than such a transaction between the Father and his Son our Mediator, whereby it’s agreed, that if the Mediator should make his Soul an offering for sin, he should by his knowledge justify many, and that whoever believed on him should not perish, but have everlasting life.

[3.] Here is a Promise made to Christ, of the Justification and Salvation of all Believers; the only condition of which promise is the death of Christ, supposing his obedience adequate to the Law. The faith of men is no condition of this promise, but a description of the Sinners whose Salvation is promised to Christ in reward of his death: (The Elect’s being made believers is secured by another article :) And to Christ it is a reward of debt, because the condition when admitted was proportioned by the claim of Justice.

[4.] Upon Christ’s performance of this condition, viz. dying, this promise entitles him to this reward, viz. that all believing men, tho’ fallen, shall be justified and saved: Which, considered as pursuant to this agreement, must be in the sole right of Christ, whose reward it is, and who alone
[5.] The Justification here promised being the Justification of a believing Sinner, and to be in Christ's right, it cannot be a constituting or declaring him, one that hath never sinned, or that hath satisfied for his Sin: For this is neither true, nor possible; nor will the Law as to its violated precept admit the first, tho' it hath nothing to object against the Lawgiver's admitting a Satisfaction equivalent to its penal Sanction, and thereupon his pardoning the believing Sinner. Nor yet is this Justification to be taken in so low a sense, as to be only a Pardon as an act of mere Sovereignty, which secures that the criminal shall not be punished, but cannot be called Justification. But it imports, that the believing Sinner shall be pardoned upon Christ's Satisfaction, and be declared by God not punishable according to the curse of the Law; because the Lawgiver, as above the Law, yet securing the ends and honour of it, hath ordained, agreed, and promised, that Christ's Death should be admitted to satisfy for all the believing Sinner's offences; and that he should be pardoned upon that, but yet in his right who made that Satisfaction. To be rendered and declared thus unpunishable, is Justification. And note, the matter in issue before a Judge when a man is accused as a Criminal, is this, Is he punishable, or is he
be not punishable? A Charge of faults takes no place as to a penal Sentence, if that Sentence lieth not against him for those faults; and where it lies not against him, the man is justly absolved from Condemnation. It's this Satisfaction of Christ by his death, upon which God declares the curse of the Law cannot oblige the believer; tho' it is not by the Law God passes that Sentence, but by his promise: The Law cannot condemn him, because the Lawgiver hath admitted a Satisfaction; but it is not the Law that justifieth him, because it declares no Sinner's absolution upon another's Satisfaction. See Rom. viii. 33, 34. 

Τὸ εὐαγγέλιον; who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's Elect? what man or Devil shall object their Crimes, as obliging them to punishment? It is God, the supreme Lawgiver and Judge, that justifieth; he admitted a Satisfaction, and acquits them upon it: Τὸ ἐξοκατακμήνων; who is he that condemneth? that is, Is there any who urgeth the Sentence of the Law, the heinousness of their Crimes, or the insufficiency of the Satisfaction, in bar to his justifying them? He answers, It is Christ that died. Here's death for death; the death of the Lord of Glory, instead of the Sinner's death; and therefore God is not unjust, nor the Law injured, tho' the Sinner is pronounced un-punishable.

The like might be said, as to Adoption.
Sect. to Glory upon the merits of Christ; but I want room to insist on this branch of Justification.

[6.] When Sinners do believe, they come under this Promise to Christ, and God judicially declares them the described persons, in whom that promise to him is to be performed; accounting his death their security for their possessing that promised Justification and Salvation, to which he is entitled as part of his reward for enduring death: Moreover, he acknowledgeth Christ's death, and his right thereupon, to be the very consideration, upon which he acquitteth these believers as not punishable with destructive punishments; and that no other satisfaction or merit is demandable from them; they being the persons, who by the Covenant of Redemption were to be acquitted for what he did and suffered. It's true, the Gospel enumerates the effects of Christ's death which believers are to receive in his right, and it promiseth the same to themselves personally; but the Gospel-promise to them supposeth this Covenant of Redemption with Christ, as what accounteth for the grounds upon which such Gospel-promises could be made to fallen Sinners, and stateth their original security for possessing them now that they are believers.

[7.] This Application of Christ's death to believers as their security, his judicial accounting
counting them the Persons in whom the Sect. Promife made to Christ is to be performed, and God's giving them Pardon and eternal Life, as the merited reward of his death and obedience, gives just ground for us to say, the Righteousness of Christ is imputed to believers. They do not only enjoy Pardon, Adoption, and such other effects of Christ's death; but his Righteousness itself is imputed to them, relatively to that Pardon, &c. Nor is less important in our Prayers, that God would pardon and save us for the sake of Christ's death and agonies; and sprinkle his Blood upon us, and the like.

To make the utmost sense of such expressions, to refer to his purchase of the Gospel-Covenant; were to confine his merits to the procuring of the Gospel-Offer, and to disown the benefits granted by that Covenant, to be the rewards merited by Christ according to the Covenant of Redemption, which gave him a right to our enjoyment of them. Surely God gives us Pardon and Salvation for Christ's sake, as well as he promiseth them for his sake; especially when they are supposed to be purchased by him, before they are promised to us on Gospel-terms: Neither should our Faith neglect to rest on Christ's death as the price of Pardon, with the promise made to him that our Pardon should be the reward of his death, as well as it ought to rely on the
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 Sect. the Gospel-promise made to us. But to add no more, How can Mr. Humfrey deny the Righteousness of Christ itself to be imputed to us as our pleasurable security, unless he'll deny that Christ's Righteousness is the meriting cause of our Pardon and eternal Life? Seeing any one that enjoys a benefit as merited for him by another's Act, hath that meriting Act imputed to him as his pleasurable security, for his possessing that merited benefit in the right of him who performed that Action; this Action of him who merited is accounted to this other person, in bar to Challenges against his enjoying what was procured by it, tho' he be not accounted the person who performed that Action.

Having asserted an imputed Righteousness, as far as the Scriptures warrant, as the safety and peace of a Christian require, and as can consist with the general offer of Salvation, and with Christ's proceeding with men as that offer is accepted or refused; I shall annex some hints concerning Gospel-Righteousness, in conformity to the Gospel-Law as a Rule of Judgment.

1. The Transactions in the Covenant of Redemption left room, and made way, for Christ's gracious and sapiential Government of fallen men, as rational Creatures, (under restored influences,) and for his judging us as Objects of offered mercy. His perfect Righteousness precluded not a rectoral
rectoral way of his applying it, with the effects thereof: His right to the believers Pardon and Glory, is consistent with a Rule of giving them a personal right there- to; wherein his acquired Authority and Government over man shall be acknowledged, the Operations of the Holy Ghost honoured, and his purchased benefits used as motives, to make us such as were by the Covenant of Redemption to be pardoned and glorified in his right, viz. Believers.

2. Our blessed Redemer, by the Gospel, declares what he had suffered and acquired, and therewith proclaims an Offer of his purchased benefits to fallen Men, (not Devils,) commanding their acceptance thereof; with a promise of investing them therein upon their compliance, and threatening their final refusal with the want of these offered blessings, and becoming more miserable. That this is the Will of Christ, is past doubt: And it must be the Gospel-constitution; for it cannot be God's Language by the Law or Covenant given to innocent Adam, which faith nothing of it, nor could say any thing of it consistently with it self. That this Will of Christ, thus commanding, promising, and threatening, is the Gospel Law, I have elsewhere proved: And a very fit Instrument of Government it is, over fallen Man under offers of mercy; because here's a Rule set for invited Sinners,
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Sect. Sinners, to be judged by Christ, and to try
themselves, and they are excited to holy
diligence, by what affects men's warranted
hopes and fears.

3. Without the Gospel-Law, as an
Instrument of Government over fallen
Man, Christ could not without respect of
persons judge invited Sinners, as accepters
or refusers of his tendered benefits; nor
could Men upon Self-examination judge
of their present State, whether still con-
demned, or saved from wrath. Not to
mention, how Despair or Presumption must
abate men's diligence, when no promise is
made to any Graces, or Duty, short of that
sinless Perfection, which was become im-
possible to fallen men. For,

(1.) Without a Gospel-Law, how
could Christ judge invited Sinners, as ac-
cepters or refusers of his offered Pardon? An
offer hath been made to many who shall
then be condemned, as well as to the saved;
and to prevent a respect of persons among
these, the Accepters of this Pardon must
have more title to Salvation than the Non-
accepters. Say not, Christ condemns them
by Adam's Law, as Sinners: For Pardon
was offered to them, when they were Sin-
ners condemned by that Law; and the ac-
cepters are by the same Law as justly con-
demnable as themselves, but that the offer-
ed Pardon is given to those accepters, which
is denied to these who did not accept of it;

yea,
yea, God faith, it's denied to them because of their Non-acceptance.

If you object, Christ died for the accepters of Salvation, and therefore he then solemnly adjudgeth them to life: but he died not for those whom he then condemns. I answer, This would make the matter in issue at the Judgment-bar to be, Whom did Christ die for, and for whom did he not die? and not, Who accepted or refused his offered Salvation? A strange notion of any judicial proceeding at that day; and contrary to every description the Scriptures give of the last Judgment. See 2 Thes. i. 7, &c. and Mat. xxv. 21, &c. But I ask, If Christ died not at all for any then condemned, how came Salvation, which is the effect of Christ's death, to be offered to them? If you say, It was not offered to them, tho' living under the external Call of the Gospel; it's a giving the lye to the plainest Scriptures: Mat. xxii. 3, 9. Acts xiii. 38. And can you tell, how they are said to neglect Salvation, and to put it from them; Acts xiii. to be condemned, because they believed not; John iii. 46. yea, and to be more sorely punished for refusing Salvation? And again,

(2.) No man without this Gospel-Law could be assured, whether he be at present in a State of Salvation or Condemnation. By Adam's Law, the best will see himself condemnable as imperfect. And if there be no promise of Salvation to Faith, the believer
Sect. I. 

iever must say, "I may be condemned, tho' I know I have true Faith:" And if Salvation be not by the promise confined to the believer, and the unbeliever excluded by the threatening, the unbeliever may say, "I may (as I am) be delivered from wrath, tho' I am sure I have not Faith." By which it's plain, Assurance is impossible; offers of life to any besides them who will be eventually saved, and even a final Judgment, must be denied, if there be not a Gospel-Law. 

4. This Acceptance of the offered Salvation, being the performed condition of the Gospel-Law, is fitly called a Gospel-righteousness, and is so at the Redeemer's bar. Faith (as the Apostle faith) is imputed for righteousness; and its Sincerity is instanced in sincere obedience, which is called righteousness generally in the Word of God, even when it is short of perfect obedience.

Should it be said, Acceptance is naturally necessary, to make any offered benefit to become ours. I answer, That if this were true, (which it is not,) yet that doth not here exclude the instituted place and use of it as a condition, especially when it is a moral Acceptance. The offer is made, to incline us to this Acceptance; and final non-acceptance is not only a threatened bar to our obtaining the offered Salvation, but a Cause of greater punishment: Yea, and every sort of Acceptance will not serve,
but it must be according to what's appoint-
ed by Christ in his conditional offer. I ask,
Will a proud contemptuous Acceptance,
from a mind resolved to abuse the blood of
Christ as an encouragement to rebellion,
avail a sinner to Salvation? And yet men
may be content to enjoy, and be persuad-
ed they have Christ for pardon and glory,
in this very manner.

A. AGAIN, if it be argued, This Acceptance,
the extended to the Rule the promise limiteth
its offer by, is not sinless obedience, nor per-
fect; and therefore is not any righteousness.
I answer, (1.) That this prejudiceth not;
for it is not to merit any thing, nor to be
a satisfaction to Justice, or atonement for
sin, but only to be a condition of applying
to us by gift, what Christ merited by his
perfect righteousness, and supports by his
right. And, (2.) If it were sinless obedience,
it would be inconsistent with our Salva-
tion's being by the merits of a Redeemer;
and it is in the virtue of his righteousness
that Faith is an accepted condition; and
being a condition, it is a righteousness as
to judicial proceedings, by that Law which
appointeth that condition.

AND if it be still said, This is too low a
thing, to be accepted by Christ as a condition.
I answer, (1.) It is what he is pleased
to appoint; and not unfitly: For
it is his own gift; it's a great instance of
Divine power, considering the depraved
state
state of fallen man; and this, which in his address to men he fixeth to be a condition, is what in the Covenant of Redemption did describe such Sinners as should be saved in his right. Further, This will reach the end of his acquired Government over fallen man; it's the seed and principle of Perfection; and thereby we are justified by the Spirit of God, and indebted to him as well as to the Father and the Son for our Salvation. But, (2.) Seeing that Christ addresseth himself to Sinners by general Offers of pardon and final glory, and judgeth them as these Offers are entertained, it follows, That as there must be some discriminating condition, or all the invited should be saved; so that condition must be either sinless Perfection, (by which all would be condemned as refusers;) or sincere Acceptance, as the Offer determineth, viz. the Faith of a penitent heart, in due time working by Love, and producing sincere Obedience, (which is what I insist on;) or it must be impenitent Infidelity; and then the Offer must run thus, "Oh fallen Sinners, If you will despise my Grace, reject my Scepter, abuse my Blood, and refuse to turn to God by me, and nevertheless conclude I am yours, you shall be pardoned and saved by my merits." Now would this become Christ's mouth, or tend to recover fallen man, better than this following Offer, viz. "Oh Sinner,
"Sinner, repent of thy sins, and credit, receive, and rely on me as thy Prophet, Priest, and King, and thou shalt be pardoned, and eternally glorified, for the sake of my merits."

When some men say, *We must come to Christ as Sinners*, in opposition to such who contend for this last Offer, they must intend the Gospel-offer to be upon the terms of Impenitency and Infidelity. For if they meant by coming to Christ, a true Gospel-acceptance of Christ, then no man can be said to come to Christ as an impenitent unbelieving Sinner, tho' a Sinner; for his coming is his penitent believing. And if they mean by as Sinners, that we must accept of and rely on Christ for Pardon as guilty Sinners, and for Sanctification as impure Sinners, and that we bring nothing with us to Christ that meriteth or makes amends, they abuse us in saying we disagree with them. But yet we abhor their notions, who intend by coming to Christ as Sinners, that the impenitent Infidel may persuade himself that Christ is his; and that we shall obtain Pardon no more upon Repentance and Faith, than if we be impenitent Infidels; which is a disbelief of the Gospel, and giving Christ the Lye. But further,

5. **Justification** being a forensic act, that upon which the Law a man is tried by doth acquit him from its threatened
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Sect. ned penalty, and entitle him to its promised benefits, is so far a justifying righteousness by that Law. The case is not altered, by the Law being a Law of Grace: For upon a man's reading, he is to be acquitted by the Law that allows benefit of Clergy, tho' he be condemnable by that Law which makes Felony capital; and there the Issue is not, Is he a Felon? but did he read, or no? and consequently, is he to die, or no? Laws concerning Testamentary Gifts do found a Claim upon the conditions appointed by the Testator, tho' never so undeserving in themselves. By these the trial is not, What proportion the condition beareth to the value of the Legacy? But is that condition performed, which the Testator appointed? And thus,

6. The cause depending as to the Redeemer's Bar, and to be tried by the Gospel-Law, is this; Is this man a true believer and accepter of the Pardon and Salvation offered by Christ? and consequently, one whom the Promise entitles by gift to Pardon and Salvation in Christ's right, and to Christ's Obedience for the securing of it? Or is he an unbeliever and rejecter of Salvation? and consequently, notwithstanding Gospel-offers, abides under the Sentence of the Law of works, and is condemned by the Gospel to forer punishments, as well as excluded from the offered Salvation? In order to the judicial deciding this matter,
the hearts and ways of men give evidence, and the Judge that knoweth all things doth justify one as a believer, and condemn another as an unbeliever. The Gospel did not denounce Death against, but promised Pardon and Life to all true believers; and therefore Christ judging by this Gospel proceeds upon the truth of their Faith, notwithstanding their consistent Imperfections, and that it is not a Righteousness that would justify them by the Sanction of Adam's Law. That legal perfect Righteousness, this Gospel-Law enjoineth not as a condition, but supposeth it performed by Christ, before he made this offer. And therefore Faith is not a Righteousness subordinate to Christ's Righteousness, in such a sense; as if Christ's Righteousness were not of itself a sufficient justifying Righteousness to satisfy Justice, merit Glory, and secure a believer's possession of eternal Life; But the sense is, that the Gospel-Law which appoints Faith to be a condition, is a Law subordinate to the Law of mediation; so that upon performance of this condition, the Sinner dependently on Christ's right, becomes personally entitled to Christ's righteousness, as his security for enjoying those saving effects which it purchased for him according to the Law of mediation, and which are promised to himself by the Gospel-Law. And therefore the Righteousness of Faith, is so far from contributing any
any thing to Christ’s merits or satisfaction to Justice, that it is it self accepted and secured at God’s bar by the Righteousness of Christ, which alone, and fully, answered the ends of Adam’s Law. And hence,

7. The Promises of the Gospel-Law have such a respect to what Christ did and suffered pursuant to the Law of mediation, to procure the Pardon and Salvation which the Gospel promiseth to believers, that they all lead us to acknowledge and rely on his Righteousness, as what procured the promised Pardon and Salvation, and what is imputed to us to secure us against the Challenge of Justice, and the Law, to which our defects, guilt, and forfeitures would otherwise subject us, notwithstanding our Faith. But still,

8. Justification by the Righteousness of Christ, and Justification by the Righteousness of Faith, are in the Gospel so connected, mutually connoted, and inseparable in their Subject, that they are expressed as if but one only Act; and yet, they are very distinguishable.

There is no Justification of our persons by Christ’s Righteousness without Faith; for by the Covenant of Redemption, it was promised to Christ for none but such as should believe, and for all such; and by the Constitution of the Gospel it is promised to all believers, and Faith made a condition of our personal interest in Christ’s
Christ's Righteousness for Justification unto life. It follows then, that all who are justified by Christ's Righteousness, are also reckoned and adjudged to be believers, and so far justified by the Righteousness of Faith. Again, it follows, from the Nature of the thing, and the Covenant of Redemption, with the reference of the Gospel-promises to that; that there could be no Justification by Faith unto Salvation before God, without the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness, and Justification thereby. For the Righteousness of Faith is not that Righteousness, which God hath accepted for satisfaction to his Justice, or to merit that right to impunity and life, which the Gospel promiseth: No, that is only Christ's Righteousness, and without that, there had not been a Pardon and Life to be promised to Sinners by the Gospel. Hence it is plain, that no man justified by the Righteousness of Faith, could be justified unto Salvation before God, but as he is justified by Christ's Righteousness, as what pleads with God for him.

But tho' they be thus conned and joined, yet Justification by Christ's Righteousness is very distinguishable from Justification by the Righteousness of Faith. In that, there's a judicial regard to the Honour of the original Law, and the Demands of Justice: In this, there is a judicial regard to the Law, by which Christ...
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Sect. dispenceth his purchased Salvation to Sinners. In *that*, Christ is our Advocate; in *this*, our Judge. In *that*, the Reward promised to Christ as a debt is distributed, and we are justified in *his* right: In *this*, the Benefits are of gift to us, and we are justified freely, though in a way of governing Grace. In *that*, men are considered only as described by Faith, they being incapable of performing the condition of the Law of mediation, and so Faith can be no part of our justifying Righteousness there: In *this*, we are the performers of the condition, and are adjudged such. In *that*, we are defended against the Challenge of Divine Justice, and Adam’s Law, and warranted in our enjoying the great things the Gospel promiseth to believers, tho’ imperfect: In *this*, we are acquitted from the guilt of final rejection of the Gospel-offers, and declared heirs of its promises, by free adoption.

The Difference is so great, that what’s equivalent to a twofold Justification of a believer, is implied, where but one is expressed; *viz.* Justification *by the Blood of Christ*, as that where his alone Righteousness is proceeded on as a Righteousness; and Justification *by Faith*, where Faith hath the place of a Righteousness as a performed condition; tho’ the other is noted as the Merit, for which there is upon believing, a Justification unto life. And thus
thus Christ's Righteousness doth as it were justify our Justification by Faith, as it vindi- cates God's Justice, honours the Law, and supports our Pardon and Gospel-Title.

By this account there is a Harmony be- tween the Covenant of Redemption, and the Gospel-Covenant. By that, there is provided the Righteousness of Christ without us, in which the pardoned believer stands safe at the Bar of a just Creator, where Christ's atonement, satisfaction, and merit, plead for his acquittal, and right to Glory, as no way injurious to Justice: And by this, the Righteousness is adjusted, that at the Redeemer's Bar distinguish- eth the Sinner who shall be acquitted upon Christ's satisfaction, from the Sinner whom he will not have to be acquitted thereby. And thus,

9. This Gospel-righteousness is no way dishonourable to Christ's righteousness; for it is no way a Rival with it, seeing it is not to merit, or to satisfy Justice, or make amends for Sin, which are Christ's pecu- liars: Nay, it is what was not suitable to Christ to perform in his own Person, because he it is who requires it as Lawgiver, from those who are brought into his own Kingdom as Mediator, to discriminate them from such as will be judicially denied the Salvation he offered them, and as what serves the purposes of his Mediatorial Kingdom:
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Sect. I. Kingdom: And to deny it, is to deny the Mediator any Kingdom, except one merely Physical; unless to be Rebels, or Subjects, is the same under his administration.

Obj. VI. He asserts, that forgiving, adopting, glorifying, and conveying of every promised Benefit, are judicial Acts of God, as Rector, in a way of distribution of Rewards. Pref. pag. xi. xii. Book, pag. 142, 148.

Answ. I deny it of the first Grace, and express it only concerning Promises made to Graces. And I deny the Benefits to be a reward of debt, but affirm them to be given in a way of reward, but that of Grace. Pag. 68, 137.

The Difference is, Whether Christ gives his saving Benefits as a Ruler, encouraging men to perform any duty, to which he moves them by his promise of those Benefits? This I affirm with Dr. Twif; and they deny, as if they never read of Rewards in the Gospel, and thought Christ no Governor or Judge. But the last Head spares further Labour.

Obj. VII. He perverts and wrests many eminent portions of Scripture; in particular, Phil. iii. 8, 9. pag. 220. Isa. lxiv. 6. pag. 219. Jer. xxxi. 33. and Heb. viii. 10. pag. 74, 75.

Answ. See the places, and you'll find, that
that on Phil. iii. 8, 9. I do assert, that Christ's imputed righteousness is intended there; tho' I add, that Gospel-righteousness is intended also, as the effect of it, and could not there be opposed to it. And I find, so did St. Augustin of old, and of late the Reverend Mr. Cradock, and others. Calvin gives the same sense of Isa. lxiv. 6. as I do. But I find none can confute my exposition of any of these texts: And no human Authority shall sway me, against the plain meaning of the Holy Ghost.

Thus I have answered all these Reverend Brethren's exceptions, which have led me to enlarge on what I never designed to trouble the world with. For my business lay against justification without Faith; God's seeing no Sin in Believers; Sin could do them no hurt, nor Duty do them any good; Believers should not mourn for Sin; and the like impious assertions of Dr. Crisp. What in their printed (and more in their written) Paper would expose them, I meddle not with: If I can undeceive them, or others misled by them, in their accusations of this Book, I am content to bear their censures as rash, and pass by other things as weak. Mr. Chauncy repeats these Objections in a seeming Answer to this Book; but is so unhappy as to misrepresent my Judgment in most particulars, which you may see in Sect. 1. of my Defence of Gospel-Truth.
Postscript

Sect. Truth. And he so much agrees in all other things with Dr. Crifp, that my State of the difference between Dr. Crifp and me will save further labour in stating it with Mr. Chauncy.

As for Mr. Crifp, I leave him to get an understanding of what he affirms, before I dare waste any precious time to expose his Impertinencies, his Self-contradictions, and scandalous Falshoods. There be others of his degree in intellectuals, who dare be Authors in this controversy, because their Weakness will secure them from any Answer.

Sect. II.

A Reply to Mr. Lobb's Objections.

Sect. Long after two Editions of this Book, Mr. Lobb so acquitted it in print, as to adventure to tell the world, there was no difference between Mr. Chauncy and me. Yet when he thought it seasonable for his other purposes, he also turns an Objector; but waveth the former exceptions, (except the first and seventh,) that his design of dividing the united Presbyterians might the better succeed: And he addeth these following Objections, which I shall now but briefly insist on, because
because I have by me an Answer to his Sect. Appeal, the publication whereof is delayed by the long and to be lamented Sickness of that ornament of our nation, the Bishop of Worcester.

Obj. I. The Father was not displeased with Christ. Gospel-Truth, pag. 34.

Answ. The Difference is not, Whether Christ endured the effects of God's wrath against sin; and that God testified his threatened indignation against sin, in the awful Sufferings of Christ in soul and body? This I affirm in that very place.

The Difference is, Whether God was displeased with Christ, (as disprincency is opposed to complacental Love,) and this because of the filthines of sin upon him? This I deny; and Mr. Lobb affirms, and consequently, that Christ was hated and abhorred by the Father, and that for the filthines of sin upon him; for these last words I joined with displeased, tho' he leaves them out after his usual manner.

Obj. II. All Communications of comfort [or strength] from the Divine Nature, could not be interrupted while the Union remained. Pag: 37.

Answ. The Difference is not, Whether the Divine Nature suspended for a while the delightful Communications of itself, as to the degrees it was accustomed to emit
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Sect. to the Human Nature of Christ? This I even there affirm.

The Difference is, Whether such degrees of comfort were suspended, as were necessary to support the holy trust, hope, and strength of Christ, and to secure his patience, and peace of conscience as to his own Innocency, and to prevent despair? This I deny, and Mr. Lobb affirms.

Obj. III. There is not a Change of Person between Christ and the Elect, nor between him and believers. Pag. 41, 45.

Answ. The Difference is not, (1.) Whether Christ died properly in our stead? This I still affirm, pag. 41, 43, 47, 48. Nor, (2.) Whether what our Divines mean by a Commutation of Persons, be true in opposition to the Socinians? viz. That whereas Sinners were obnoxious to suffer the Punishments due to their sins, the Lord Jesus became our mediating Surety, and as such, our Punishments were judicially transferred on him; which for our Redemption, according to his engagement, he endured in our room and stead, to the Satisfaction of Justice, that we might be justified when we believe? This I constantly affirm, pag. 8, 10, 11, 15, 43, 270. Nor did I deny any part of this, by any argument I urged against that Change of Person, which I denied. See pag. 45. Letter to Mr. Humphrey, pag. 293.
Mr. Lobb made use of the Writings of the Right Reverend the Bishop of Worcester, and the Reverend Dr. Edwards, against me in this point: But they were pleased to vindicate me fully in their Letters to me, which I published in the Answer to the Report, pag. 411, 424. The united Ministers also did the same, and among them such Subscribers to this Book, as before that had signed what is called the First Paper. [Mr. Burgess, I am contented to except, tho' he agreed to the Third Paper.] See Answer to the Report, pag. 339, 374, 377, 379, 383.

The Difference is, Whether there be such a Change of Person between Christ and the Elect or Believers, as makes Christ to be as sinful as them, and them to be as righteous as Christ? This is the Change of Person, which in opposition to Dr. Crisp I denied, and Mr. Lobb must affirm; or he objects in this and the last point, for worse ends than to detect an Error. See more in the next Head, where I shall handle what refers to both these Objections together.

Obj. IV. It is Blasphemy to debase Christ among Transgressors. Pag. 46.

Answ. My words are, "It is Blasphemy to debase him among their number, who
Sect. " who were Enemies, without strength, II. " and Sinners, for whom he was the dy-

"ing Sacrifice." And these words are brought only to prove, that Christ was not as sinful as we; which you see cannot pass with Mr. Lobb, because he is for no lower Change of Persons, than what will make Christ to be a Sinner. But this being the hinge of the Controversy the politick Mr. Lobb hath started to revive our divisions, I shall set the Difference in a plain light.

The Difference is not, (1.) Whether Christ did bear the punishment of our sins? Nor, (2.) Whether he did bear the guilt of our sins? that is, was by his own consent obliged to bear the punishment due to us for sin? Nor, (3.) Whether Christ was esteemed by men a Transgresser, and crucified between two thieves? Nor, (4.) Whether Christ was made under the Law, and (considered as a man,) was obliged to obey its precepts, and was for his obedience entitled to its reward? Nor, (5.) Whether the penal Sanction of the violated Law against us Sinners, and the Justice of God, and the Honour of Divine Government, made it requisite, that if Sinners should be pardoned for the sake of a satisfying Mediator, Death threatened by the Law for sin, should be inflicted on that Mediator? Nor, (6.) Whether Christ in the Covenant of Redemption obliged himself
himself to obey the Law, and to suffer Death for our sins; and this, to satisfy Justice, to honour the Law by answering its ends, to make Atonement for Iniquity, to procure Peace, to be a proper Ransom for sinners, to merit eternal Life, to purchase the Gospel-grant, to express God's Hatred against sin, and to be a warning against all Disobedience, as what nothing below his Blood could expiate? Nor, (7.) Whether the Father consented to this his undertaking, and approved of what he engaged, to be the Condition of our redemption and reconciliation; substituting him to suffer in Sinners stead, with a Promise to him, of Pardon and eternal Life for all that should believe on him, and of a certain Number who should believe and for ever glorify him? Nor, (8.) Whether Christ being thus by his own and the Father's consent a mediating Surety, did die in our stead, that we might not die but live; and the Father justly inflicted Death on Christ, thus obliged to endure it as the punishment of our sin, on him as the propitiatory Sacrifice; and that Christ so far sustained the Person of Sinners, and was dealt with as if he had been a Sinner? Nor, (9.) Whether God did esteem Christ and Sinners to be so far one Legal Person when he died; as a sinless Person that freely and without their Concurrence engageth to redeem Sinners by dying in their
their stead, and they in whose stead he dieth, are one; and that in this sense he was our Representative? Nor, (10.) Whether God accounted and adjudged Christ's Sufferings to be in Sinners stead, and thereby their Crimes to be expiated; so that God can demand no other Atonement from any who believe on Christ; and that his Sufferings are as effectual, to put away Sin, as if (and infinitely more than if) the Filth of Sin had been transacted on him, and to save believing Sinners, as if God had legally esteemed them to have suffered, and Christ to be a Sinner? Nor, (11.) Whether our Sins were the meritorious cause of Christ's Death, and not only the final cause? that is, Christ did not only die to incline and encourage us to repent of our Sins, that upon our Repentance we might be pardoned: But our committed Sins, (still ours, not his, further than to expiate them,) being meritorious of our Death, and he obliging himself to redeem us by a Satisfaction, and by his Death to propitiate God, who was so injured and so provoked by our Sins, that without Blood there should be no Remission; it follows, That tho' Christ deserved not to die for our Sins as a Criminal, yet our Sins which deserved our Death, did deserve the Death of him who would save us from dying, by making reparation for our Sins thereby; and Christ making that repara-
reparation by dying for our Sins to save us, Sect. our Sins may properly be called the meritorious cause of his Death, as a Saviour of us Sinners, tho' not as a Sinner himself. All these I do affirm, and nothing can be found in my Books contrary thereto. See pag. 8, 10, 11, 17, 41, 114, 235, 270. Defence of Gospel-Truth, Pref. pag. 294, 295, 296. And Man made righteous, pag. 12, 18,—22, 50, 68, 105, 109, 128.

The real Difference is, [1.] Whether Christ was a Sinner in God's esteem, and a Transgressor at his bar? This Mr. Lobb oft affirms; and says, "He was not only " treated as if he were a Criminal, but was " a Criminal in foro poli." See his Appeal, pag. 56, &c. This I deny; because he must be really a Sinner, or God could not esteem him such, for he accounts of things as indeed they are: But he could not be a Sinner, unless he committed the Sin, or were culpably accessory to the perpetration of it, or were seminally and representatively in such as sinned, as we were in Adam. But to say, Christ was a Sinner in any of these respects, is downright Blasphemy: Yea, were it only that he was a Sinner, upon the account of being represented by us when we sinned; for thereby he must have suffered for his own Sins, unless you'll deny original Sin to be our Sin: Neither could he suffer as a Sinner, for any besides his own Progenitors, if he were a Sinner only
[2.] Whether Christ and we were so one legal Person, as that we are legally accounted to have obeyed the Law, and to have suffered what Christ endured? This Mr. Lobb affirms, and I deny. For if we suffered what he suffered, as one legal Person with him, then we suffered as much as was fit to make Satisfaction to Justice for our sins; nay, we suffered all that was accepted by God for Satisfaction: And consequently, unless you'll say, that Christ's Sufferings were not fit nor accepted for Satisfaction, we suffering the same things, and as one Person, have as well satisfied in Christ, as we suffered in him; which is a proud and vile assumption, making Christ to wash us from sin in our own legal Blood, if his legal Blood doth wash us; and sets us up to claim Life of debt, if Christ had such a claim; and implies, that Christ was pardoned, or we have no need of Pardon. More might be said, against our obeying the Law in Christ; but I pass by that.

[3.] Whether Christ and we were one joint federating Party in the Covenant of works, either before it was violated, or after it was violated? that is, Was that Covenant thus constituted before the Fall, "If thou innocent Adam, or Christ thy Surety, shall keep the Law, thou shalt live;"
live; but if thou break the Law, thou Sect.
or thy Surety shall die?" Or after the Fall was it thus; "If thou fallen Adam,
or Christ thy Surety, shall endure the Curse, and hereafter keep the Law,
thou shalt live; if not, thou shalt abide "under the Curse?" Mr. Lobb affirms it in the last sense. I deny it in both senses, because God's Word faith nothing of it, but much inconsistent therewith; and it tends to destroy the Gospel and all true Religion. But I pass by the former sense, and except briefly against the latter. If Christ and we were one joint federating Party in that Covenant after it was violated, then Adam's Covenant, after it was violated, was not the same Covenant as God made with Adam before the Fall: Which might be proved by such reasons; Christ is inserted a Party in it, and all the Non-elect excluded as no Parties; and Adam ceased to be a representative of mankind, but is made to be a representative of the Elect, as some say, or of Believers, as Mr. Lobb faith: Hereby also Faith in a Mediator, is made a condition of, and by the Covenant of works, &c. Nay, it would follow, that Adam after he sinned, and was condemned by the Covenant of works, had terms of Life offered to him by that very same Covenant which he was condemned by: Which, with a hundred more differencing things, would raise a Blush
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Sect. a Blush in a modest person to assert, that it was in Adam's violated Covenant of works, that Christ was a joint Party with us. If Mr. Lobb should say, That God by this violated Covenant proposed, and agreed to these terms of Life, (viz. Christ's obedience to the Law, and suffering its curse,) only to and with Christ for Adam, and not to or with Adam: I answer, This would make it to be the Covenant of Redemption, which one might think would set it still further from being Adam's Covenant of works, or the same Bond, as they call it.

[4.] Whether Christ became a Surety, by coming under the Law, as the Instrument and adequate Rule of his engagement? This I deny, and Mr. Lobb affirms. Or did Christ come under the Law, because he was constituted a Surety by the Covenant of Redemption, as the Instrument and adequate Rule of his engagements, wherein his coming under the Law was one Article? This Mr. Lobb denies, and I affirm; because the Law could put no value on the Dignity of his Person, nor adjust his Reward; it prescribed not what was sufficient to be meritorious and satisfactory for Sinners, and yet insisted on some things inconsistent with Christ's condition, as God-Man, &c.

[5.] Whether was Christ as a strict pecuniary Surety with us? that is, Was Christ jointly
jointly obliged with us in one Bond to pay, whereby we should be legally accounted to pay if he paid? And as to the demand of the Creditor, (viz. God,) are we as well as Christ, immediately, and by that very Bond including us as one legal Person, to be discharged, unless Christ be undischarged? This Mr. Lobb affirms, and I deny. Or was Christ as a mediating Surety, self-obliged to make Satisfaction for us Criminals? that is, Did Christ as Mediator oblige himself by a Bond of his own, to make Satisfaction and merit benefits for Criminals; reserving a liberty to suspend our personal Right to his acquired pardon and benefits, upon other Terms than the Bond we were in included? This Mr. Lobb denies, and I affirm. And I see not how any, who affirm the former, and deny this latter, can argue against Antinomianism, or preach otherwise to a mixt Assembly, than thus, "You that are Elect, are already justified by the Law of works; no Sin you commit can make you unrighteous, nor is Faith itself needful to put you into a safe accepted State; and if you would know this, be persuaded of it: But you Non-elect have no offers of Salvation, and Christ is not able to save you, because he was not bound with you in the Covenant of works." Nor is it easily accounted for, how so many can infer, that because Christ is once called a Surety of a better
better Covenant, which promiseth Pardon (Heb. vii. 22.) therefore he is with us a Surety of the Covenant of works, which pronounceth the Curse: Ay, and hereby model their Scheme of Christianity, against the plain Scope of the Bible, and all the Sermons of Christ and his Apostles, which propose benefits on the same terms of Duty to all alike.

[6.] Whether the meaning of Christ's sustaining the Person of Sinners is, that Christ was an adjudged Sinner in foro poli, at the bar of God? This Mr. Lobb affirms, and I deny. Or is it, that Christ still reputed the innocent sinless Mediator, mediating for Sinners, suffered in their stead for their Salvation, what they were obliged to suffer, and they otherwise should have endured? This Mr. Lobb denies, and I affirm: For had he not been reputed sinless at God's bar, his Sufferings had not availed us: Nor could God esteem him a Sinner. But of this elsewhere.

[7.] Whether by Christ's dying in the Sinner's stead is meant, that Christ in the Sinner's room, became the Sinner; and being legally the Sinner, he as such died for Believers, and they in him? This Mr. Lobb affirms, and I deny. Or is it, that whereas we who were Sinners were liable and obliged to die, Christ the just Mediator came into our room as liable and obliged to die, and suffered death to make satisfaction
faction for our sins, and ransom us from death? This Mr. Lobb denies, and I affirm: And I can easily prove it to be the sense of that Phrase in our Confessions of Faith; nor do most of our orthodox Authors intend more by it, notwithstanding the lax Expressions of some in opposition to the Socinians; and tho' some Socinians use this Phrase, yet it is in a very contrary sense to what is here given.

[8.] Was Christ obliged immediately by the penal Sanction of Adam's Law to die? that is, Did the Father as Judge pass Sentence upon Christ, addressing himself to him according to the Curse of the Law, in this manner? “Thou Christ hast sinned, therefore thou Christ a Sinner shalt die.” This Mr. Lobb affirms, and I deny. For the Sanction of that Law supposeth one a Sinner before it lies against him, and doth not make him a Sinner; the Curse of the Law can immediately oblige none to Punishment, that it finds not to be a Transgressor; and a man is denominated a Transgressor from the Precept violated, and not from the penal Sanction, as Mr. Lobb fondly imagineth; whereas the Sanction determineth only, in what manner the offender is punishable.—Or was Christ immediately obliged to die, by his own Sponsor, and the Right God had thereby over him; but mediately, by the penal Sanction of Adam's Law? that is, Is not the Sentence
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Sect. II. 

Whereas thou Christ, the Mediator, hast with my consent declared thy willingness to expiate sin, and ransom Sinners justly condemned by the Curse of my Law to die; and whereas my vindictive Justice, the honour of my Law and Government required, that I the Reñor should exact Satisfaction to be given, and Reparation made, for the crimes of these Sinners, by thy Death, if I agreed to thy redeeming and saving them; and thou hast obliged thy self to die in their stead to redeem them; therefore thou the just Mediator, my beloved Son, shalt die this shameful accursed Death, and this Cup must not pass from thee." This Mr. Lobb denieth, and I affirm. For tho' I conceive the Justice of proceeding thus with him, who was sui Juris, and had freely consented; yet I see not how the Curse could immediately oblige him to die, who was no Criminal; nor how our sins could be imputed to Christ otherwise, than as what he had promised as Mediator to be an expiatory Sacrifice for, which could not make him a Sinner, nor be more (but less) effectual, if God had esteemed him a Sinner: Nor did God ever require, nor Christ promise, that he would become a Sinner, or be esteemed one at God's bar; nor is there any Aét of the Father, or his own, to found such an Imputation of sin, as shall give
give him the repute of a Sinner in divine esteem. Indeed God, as above the original Law, did according to the Law of Mediation, lay upon him the Iniquities of us all, yea made them to meet on him; that not one of them should be unsatisfied for, by the propitiatory Sacrifice of him, who consented to be dealt with as if a Sinner, to save such as were so. But the Moral Law of itself laid nothing to his Charge, to render him a filthy or guilty Sinner; and therefore its Curse did not immediately oblige him; nor could it, unless you'll say, he personally violated it in its preceptive part, or sinned in us as we fell in Adam. God declared us Transgressors, in the Necessity of his Death to save us; but proclaimed him obedient to his command in dying, and loved him; yea, crowned him with Glory and Honour for it; which were a strange procedure towards one who was a Transgressor, and as such, condemned to die by the immediate obligation of the Curse.

[9.] Did Christ suffer the idem, that is, all the same for Kind, which the Law threatening against Sinners included? This Mr. Lobb affirms, and I deny, as inconsistent with the nature of Satisfaction, which is not a Solution of all the same in Kind. Or did Christ suffer some of the same things in Kind, and a full Equivalent to what he did not suffer in Kind? This Mr. Lobb
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Sect. Lobb denies, and I affirm. I grant, that

II. Christ endured bodily Death, inward Terrors, and many other things of the same sort, as we were to suffer. But (to name no more) I deny, that he endured a Spiritual Death. Did he lose the Image of God, and was he spiritually dead in sin, by being deprived of the Holy Spirit? or was the Return of that Spirit, as to sanctifying operations, penally denied him at any time? Yet Mr. Lobb will grant this to be included in the Curse of the Law; and the threatened Death in that Curse is commonly divided into Temporal, Spiritual, and Eternal, as three Species thereof. If he objects, It was impossible, Christ should die a Spiritual Death: I answer, If it be true, (as he faith,) that Justice required the whole idem to be suffered in Kind, tho' not in circumstances, and that without it Justice could not be satisfied; it follows then, that Christ was not fit to be a Redeemer, because he was not capable to bear all for Kind which the Curse included; and by his assertion, Christ is not a complete Redeemer, because he was not under a Spiritual Death, through the absence of the Holy Spirit. And hence, Justice is still unsatisfied; with several such Consequences, which might be justly urged in this case against him; but are strangely argued by him, to prove Christ a Sinner, (for that's his scope,) though he leaves us
in the dark how he became such, and Sect. chimes some frightful words backward and forward, which conclude nothing like his being such. But in lieu of both, he makes our Christian Cause indefensible against the Socinians, that he may brand us with Socianism among the ignorant. For,

(1.) By his Scheme we must yield up Christ's Priestly Office, and the doctrine of his Satisfaction, unless we can prove, that Christ was a Transgressor by being one political or legal Person with apostate Sinners, and those Sinners one legal Person with Christ the Sufferer; a Point, I think, by himself too much exposed. For if from that Union he justly infers, that we suffered in Christ, how will it be avoided that Christ also sinned in us? (for the Union is mutual:) And Christ the Sinner must be pardoned notwithstanding his Satisfaction, or we be above the need of Pardon through our suffering that in him, which was accepted for Satisfaction. If you'll say, the Satisfaction was refusible; I answer, It was refusible from Christ, antecedently to the Compact; and not refusible from us in him, after that Compact.

(2.) By his Sentence they are all Socinians, who allow not Christ to be a Sinner, tho' they acknowledge, as I do, That there was a Change of Persons between Christ and us, as to our punishments, tho' not otherwise as to our sins, than to bear M m 4 them,
them, as he was a well-pleasing Sacrifice, but not as a hateful Sinner: That Christ died properly in our stead, tho' he was not a Sinner in our stead; and that Christ's Sufferings, as to the end of God's inflicting them, and of his enduring them, were proper punishments, tho' vicarious; that is, they were not instead of punishments, but real punishments; yet were endured by our self-obliged Mediator, instead of the Sinners who did deserve them: That he died to satisfy vindictive Justice; yet that was provoked, not by him the Redeemer, but by us Sinners, whom he engaged to redeem: And that our Sins were the meritorious cause of his death, as what must be expiated by the death of him who would release Sinners from death in a way of Satisfaction, and who engaged to do so by his dying in their stead; yet they were our sins, and not his sins, which deserved death; and but for the necessity of death to satisfy Justice, and Christ's Resolution and Engagement to save Sinners even by his own dying to make Satisfaction, he no more deserved to die for our sins, than our sins deserved he should so resolve and engage to save us by dying in our stead.

These Concessions, and many more of this kind, ought as well to restrain Mr. Lobb's unjust outcries against me, as they compelled him, for want of matter in my Books, to muster up a few expressions of Mr.
Mr. Baxter's, which he perverts to a quite contrary sense than they were designed by that excellent and upright Author. His argument from them against me, deserves rather Pity than an Answer: For hopeth he to induce any man to think, That every obnoxious expression of Mr. Baxter must declare my sense, who never used such expressions, but those so very different, that unbounded Craft, excited by inveterate malice, as well as vigorously designed projects, cannot wrest them to obnoxiousness? Nevertheless I shall (if that easy Labour be not prevented by others,) plainly evidence Mr. Lobb to be very ignorant what Socinianism is, or extremely injurious to Mr. Baxter, in charging him therewith; whereas his very objected expressions are intended only to distinguish (over accurately) between a Sponfors suffering for the sins of others, and the delinquent's suffering for his own sins; and being allowed for this, Mr. Baxter fully afferts the orthodox Doctrine of Christ's Satisfaction against the Socinians. But what can Mr. Lobb scruple, to give a wound to that reverend Name? who represents him saying, "Our Sins were only "a mere occasion of Christ's death after his "Sponsion," because before that Sponsion they could be no other than so.
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S E C T. III.

A Vindication from some Aspersions, with a brief Summary of my Principles.

Sect. III. HAVING answered the exceptions against the matter of this Book, it's at last become necessary, I should clear my self from the Aspersions published in some late nameless Pamphlets. It's known to very many, how easy it were to wipe off all those Reproaches. But I fear, the doing it as effectually as I am capable, should give so much a greater wound to Religion than my Reputation would countervail, that I heartily pray, I may never be forced to expose so many persons, and to discover such methods, as that would necessitate me to. Resolved therefore to prefer a publick good, and to proceed to no higher degrees than as I'm compelled; I shall content my self with this short Vindication, even as to what they say of that affair, which I referred to the united Ministers about three Years and nine Months since.

If I had met with any person accusing me of Whoredom, Cheating, or any Crime that could bear an Action at Common Law; I had
I had not desired the united Ministers to put themselves to the trouble of receiving and judging of whatever could be objected against my Conversation: Nor did I fear an enquiry into my Life, when I agreed to have several of the Committee to report matter of Fact to the Body of Ministers, from whom Justice was the utmost I could expect, seeing it was not very long after the Breach at Pinners-Hall. The Persons appointed were Dr. Annesley, Mr. Griffith, Mr. Hammond, Mr. Barker, Mr. Bragg, Mr. Mayo, Mr. Howe, Mr. Alsop, Mr. Stretton, and Mr. William Taylor. [Dr. Bates was also named, but could not meet with them except about twice; yet he soon saw enough for my Vindication.] Mr. Lobb met still with them, at the desire of some of the Committee. They heard all pretensions; yea, spent two Meetings to hear, if I could be proved guilty of having spoken any one Untruth: And after about Eight Weeks spent in this affair, the Minutes of their Report, written by Mr. W. Taylor, were by them ordered to be given in by him to the united Ministers. In which Report it is declared, that all the forenamed Persons being present, (except Dr. Bates,) they were agreed, concerning each of the things attempted to be made good against me, that there was no Proof, that I was guilty of any one of them. Only at the end of the Report a Note is added, as a Minute of April
Sect. April 8. (being the morning before the Report was delivered, and three of the above-named not present,) which seems to insinuate somewhat towards two Faults, after they had cleared me as to all other mentioned instances. Their insinuation is in these words, "As to the practice of having his Side chafed by the hands of a Woman, by which Offence hath been occasioned; it is such an indecent Act as the Seventh Commandment warns against, for which he hath expressed his sorrow: And whereas it was charged on Mr. Williams, that he had denied his arresting Mr. Wheeler, which denial he professeth he remembers not, it was testified against him by Mr. Kuffin and his Wife;" Of both which you'll presently see the Brethren's account.

I have Reason to adore the Providence of God, which fully detected the groundlessness of such Testimonies as pretend only mere silly Suspicion, and that contradicted all the bearsays by the Testimony of their first pretended Authors. I'll give one instance: Mr. Kuffin told the Ministers, "that his Wife told him, her Maid told her, that my Maid told her, that upon her telling me somewhat of him, I asked her a foolish Question concerning him." But my Maid, instead of affirming it, took a solemn Oath before a Master in Chancery, that I never asked her that, or any such Question, &c. which
which Oath was produced: What followed Sect. that Question, I pass by. And how amazing was it, that God so over-ruled all their Witnesses, as that not one of them could so much as pretend, that ever they themselves heard from me one indecent word, or knew by me one obscene gesture or action; except Mrs. Martin the Nurse, (called Lathewood when in Ireland,) the Ministers ensuing Character of whom was proved by the Attestations and Oaths of Fifteen Persons of good reputation and unsuspected piety: (Yet Wheeler was as fully proved, even more faulty then her.)

The united Ministers met together, to the number of near Sixty, April 8, 1695, upon general notice given them, that the Report would be delivered in that Day for their Determination; and after much discourse and enquiries, they gave their Judgment by this Vote, and dissolved the Committee.

That it is the unanimous Opinion of the united Ministers, upon the Report brought in from the Committee, and the further Account of those of the Committee present, that Mr. Williams is entirely clear and innocent of all that was laid to his Charge.

This Vote was entered in their Book, and repeated and agreed to three several meetings successively; and all of the Committee who were present on any of these Days, consented; viz. Dr. Annesley, Mr. Barker,
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Barker, Mr. Hammond, Mr. Alsop, Mr. Mayo, Mr. Stretton, and Mr. William Taylor. This was the issue of that affair, after a search for several months had been made into my conversation, to my very childhood: And I hoped, that the wisdom of such, who will be my adversaries tho' I wish well to them, would keep them silent, when I was contented to be so for religion's sake.

But about two years and a half after this, the united Ministers saw occasion to order a Committee to draw up (among other things) a justification of their vote; which they did at large, and in two or three full meetings it was unanimously agreed to, and delivered to be safe kept, and signed by the Moderator: And then their present Committee was appointed to prepare an abbreviation of it, which when approved of by the Body, a copy was directed to be sent to a worthy person, in answer to his scruples concerning the said vote, as well as about other matters, which related to the body of the united Ministers.

Out of these papers, I shall cite a few passages, in answer to what is mentioned by Mr. Crisp, in one of the said late pamphlets. The words of the Ministers are as follow.

"You are the first, (and that after two "Years and a half,) that objected any "thing against our clearing Mr. Williams, "&c."
As to what you say, of Mr. Will-Sect. liams being rebuked, you may know, that the Brother who spake to him, (which was only about chafing his Side,) when he came afterwards to understand the Circumstances of it, declared in our meeting, as he had done formerly to the foresaid Committee, (viz. that which made the Report,) that Mr. Williams's having his Side so chafed, was so far from being a breach of the Seventh Commandment, that it would have been a breach of the Sixth Commandment, not to have done it. And when it's said, Mr. Williams was sorry for it, we found, it was only from his saying that he was sorry that wicked Persons had made that wicked use of it; but he still had justified it as lawful, &c. And we found, that as to Mrs. Martin the Nurse, her Testimony was disproved, as far as the nature of the thing would bear; and that such malice, contradictions, lyes and flanders were proved against her, that her Testimony deserved no regard; or, to use Mr. Mayo's words, Her Testimony was not sufficient to hang a Cat upon: And other Testimonies to her Allegations, there were none. Upon Enquiry we found, that what was said (in the Report) of chafing his Side, as being warned against in the Seventh Commandment, was procured to be put in by
by Mr. Lobb, when the Report, as finished, had been read to Mr. Williams, and the Committee was risen, and in a hurry going away. And we find, that the utmost any of the Committee had pretended, for calling it an indecent act, was, that Mr. Williams had, as they said, (and others denied,) owned, that some time when his diseased Side had been chafed by a woman, and by a man, it was to the upper part of the Hip, where the Groin comes furthest up. And enquiring as to his arresting Mr. Wheeler, we found, he must have been distracted if he had denied it four days after he had done it, because the City did ring thereof; the thing was upon record, and likely to come to a Trial; nor was any turn pretended to be served by his denial of it." This is a small part of the foresaid Papers.

I too much pity the present Case between the forementioned Mr. Kuffin and his Wife, to reply to what the Author of the foresaid Pamphlet faith concerning him; and I dare not improve such things for my defence. Neither deals the Author fairly in his intimation, as if what he calls Mr. Al sop's Reproof to me was before the breach at Pinners-Hall, (begun in August, and finished November 7. 1694.) For neither he, nor I, heard of the foresaid Aspersions till several Weeks after that; tho'
to Gospel-Truth &c.

tho' presently upon it, and the setting up Sect. of Salters-Hall Lecture, a Minister said to some in a way of advice, We must blacken Mr. Williams; and Reproaches were scattered in December. To add no more, Mr. Barker, (now in Heaven,) Mr. Hammond, Mr. Alsop, and several others of that Committee have attested under their hands, That such gross lyes and flanders were proved against Mrs. Martin, that her Testimony was of no value; and that they intended not by any words in the Report, to charge me with any Lasciviousness or Lying.

Other things, I hope, I shall never be forced to produce; yea, I am sorry that I am compelled to say even thus much, tho' it be with that care of all men's Reputation, and only to wipe off a Blot from my profession, and to remove impediments to my usefulness, those few Days my God shall please to add to my frail Life. To him I render Glory, that I hope, I truly forgive my greatest Adversaries, and with them long Lives, filled with service and comfort; and to them and us a better Spirit, and more Regard to the Interest of Christ, than to manage our debates, as if all Charity, Truth, and Prudence were lost among us.

There is another Prejudice against this Book to be removed; viz. what some talk.
A Postscript

Sect. talk about the Names annexed to the Ap-
III. probation. In answer to this, I think it suf-
sufficient to transcribe the following lines out of the Answer to the Report, agreed to by the united Ministers, pag. 379, 380. where they say, "Whatever the Reporter faith of the Scope, or Of-
"fensiveness of that Book of Mr. Wil-
"liams, called Gospel-Truth stated; those
"Brethren whom he calls of biggest Name, 
"who subscribed the First Paper, have 
"declared, They intended not by that 
"Paper to censure the passages against 
"which the Dissenters objected; but were 
"so far from condemning any passage 
"therein, that they subscribed the First 
"Paper, because they were sure, that 
"upon enquiry it would appear, there 
"was nothing in that Book of Mr. Wil-
"liams contrary to the Sense of that First 
"Paper: And they still, as well as for-
"merly, declare it is an useful Book, and 
"that it is the cause of Truth it pleads;
"and have given it under their hands, 
"that the State of Truth and Error is 
"not at all enlarged or changed, since they 
"first subscribed; nor did they mean fo 
"in the First Paper, but only, that there 
"were in the Book, besides the State of 
"Truth and Error, several Explications 
"and Arguments added thereunto. Nor 
"indeed, could the State of Truth and 
"Error be enlarged and changed, because
(as it is attested by several, even of those Sect.
Sixteen, who were the first that subscribed to the first Edition, the Book, as far as it contained the State of Truth and Error, was printed before they subscribed the Attestation. Nor do we know of any of the Subscribers of that Attestation, who do disallow the said Book; nor any, whose Names are fixed thereto without their consent.

Having cited the Brethren's words, I shall add, I am well assured, that Reverend Brother who was oft talked of, as having said he had not read this Book, hath since read it, and greatly approveth thereof.

I think it not inconvenient here to give a short Summary of my decried Principles, for the sake of such as will govern their Censures by reading little more than other mens false account thereof: And yet left any might suspect they were more unfound, when such violent outcries were made against them, I shall transcribe a Paper, which I sent by Mr. Edmund Harrison to a general meeting of the Subscribers to the Lecture at Pinners-Hall, which he read publickly to them before the unhappy Breach in the said Lecture; a faithful account whereof, with other matters of Fact, would greatly disadvantage them for whose sake the History of the Union was lately written. But a Concern for our common
A Postscript

Sect. common interest and quiet, allows me only to say, I was industrious to prevent that Breach, and willing to *condescend* to any thing, except sinning against my conscience, by a voluntary recess after God had placed me in that Lecture by a decisive *Lot*, which I durst not disregard; and by giving way to what would be interpreted the publick Triumph of *Antinomian Errors* over the Truths preached in that place, not only by me, but by Dr. Bates, Mr. Howe, Mr. Alspop, yea, and Mr. Mead, whose Ministry is now exclaimed against by many of the same impetuous men, as *Legal, Arminian, &c.* Nor can men forget, that the main point Mr. Cole opposed, was the *necessity of Repentance* to the forgiveness of sin, which Dr. Bates had asserted in a practical discourse; after which, that Reverend man (now in the glorious regions of light and love,) excited by more designing persons, could scarce in any Sermon for a long time forbear breaking out against us.

The Paper is as follows.

"*NOTWITHSTANDING* any hardships I have endured, the misrepresentation of my Principles, my Innocency as to having ever designed by any writing to expose the Congregational party, or all their Ministers as such, which I solemnly disown: And that I well know, I never used any *Reflections* in the
the only three Controversial discourses, which I was so exceedingly forced to preach at Pinners-Hall: Nevertheless, to prevent Sin, Scandal, and great danger to the Dissenters, which may follow a Breach; I am willing to join with Mr. Cole, in subscribing the following Declaration, and Doctrinal Articles; and shall bless God, if it may prove an expedient. Tho' there may be some lesser differences between us, yet we account these following Principles, a ground of agreement notwithstanding any past debates; and of encouragement to each other's Ministry; being sorry for any misapprehensions of each other's Doctrine, and any indecent reflections on either the Ministry or person of one another, whether in Discourse, Sermons, or Print; resolving for the future to avoid all irritating disputes in our Sermons. And we heartily desire our respective Friends, to lay aside those prejudices, heats, distances, and reproaches, which so dishonour our Religion, hinder Edification, tend to our common Hurt, gratify our Enemies, grieve the Spirit of God, as well as all serious Christians, and much obstruct the usefulness of our Ministry. Lastly, As we shall truly endeavour to keep the unity of the Spirit.
A Postscript

Sect. III. "rit in the bond of Peace, so we shall pray for each other, and bless God, if he shall please to disappoint Satan's design by, and hopes from, the afflicting Contentions, which have so long continued in this place.

"The Doctrinal Principles follow, which I affirm as my Judgment in all my Books, and am ready to subscribe with Mr. Cole. (1.) God has eternally elected a certain definite number of men, whom he will infallibly save by Christ, in that way prescribed by the Gospel. (2.) These very Elect are not personally justified, until they receive Christ, and yield up themselves to him; but they remain condemned, whilst unconverted to Christ. (3.) By the Ministry of the Gospel, there's a serious offer of Pardon and Glory upon the terms of the Gospel, to all that hear it; and God thereby requires them to comply with the said terms. (4.) Ministers ought to use these, and other Gospel-benefits, as motives; assuring men, that if they believe, they shall be justified; if they turn to God, they shall live; if they repent, their sins shall be blotted out; and whilst they neglect these duties, they can't have a personal interest in these respective benefits. (5.) It is by the Power of the Spirit of Christ freely exerted, and not by the Power of free-will.
will, that the Gospel becomes effectual sect.

for the conversion of any Soul to the Obedience of Faith. (6.) When a man believes, yet is not that very Faith, and much less any other work; the matter of that Righteousness for which a Sinner is justified; that is, entitled to Pardon, to Acceptance as righteous, and to eternal Glory, before God: And it is the imputed Righteousness of Christ a-

alone, for which the Gospel gives the Be-

liever a Right to these and all saving blessings, who in this respect is justified by Christ's Righteousness alone. By both this and the 5th head it appears, that all boasting is excluded, and we are saved by free Grace. (7.) It is Faith alone, that receives the Lord Jesus and his Righteousness; and the subject of this Faith is a convinced penitent Soul: Hence we are justified by Faith alone, and yet the impenitent are not forgiven. (8.) God has freely promised, that all whom he predestinated to Salvation, shall not only savingly believe, but that he by his Power will preserve them from a total or a final Apostacy. (9.) Yet the Believer whilst he lives in this world, is to pass the time of his sojourning here with fear, because his warfare is not ac-

complished; and that it is true, if he draw back, God will take no pleasure in him; which, with the like cautions, God
A Postscript

"God blesseth as means to the Saints perseverance; and these by Ministers should be so urged. (10.) The Law of Innocency, or the Moral Law, is so in force still; as that every Precept thereof constitutes Duty even to the Believer; every Breach thereof is a Sin deserving death; and this Law binds death by its curse on every unbeliever: And the Righteousness for or by which we are justified before God, is a Righteousness (at least) adequate to that Law, which is Christ's alone Righteousness; and this is so imputed to the Believer, as that God deals judicially with him according thereto. (11.) Yet such is the Grace of the Gospel, that it promiseth in and by Christ a freedom from the Curse, forgiveness of Sin, and eternal Life to every sincere Believer; which Promise God will certainly perform, notwithstanding the threaten ing of the Law."

This is a faithful account of my Principles: And tho' the Proposal including them, was ineffectual to divert those who were resolved to publish an end to the Union by breaking that Lecture; yet I will declare, that as I never reflected on Mr. Cole, or any other, in that Pulpit, so I am sorry for that expression, of his mysterious Nonsense, which is in my Preface to Man made Righteous. Nor had I been so sharp, but that just before my writing that Preface
to Gospel-Truth &c.

Preface he had preached in a publick Fast, Sect.
“that the Subscribers to my Book were III.
“Enemies of all Righteousness, and Chil-
“dren of the Devil, &c.” And yet I
wish, I had omitted that passage, and re-
strained an angry return to that provoca-
tion; as by the Grace of God I have been
enabled to do, under many greater of-
fences.

S E C T. IV.

A Reply to some other Objec-
tions.

THERE is somewhat deserves a Sect.
Reply in an Anonymous Book; the IV.
Author, I suppose Mr. Lobb, or a small Instrument of his; the Title, A Confuta-
tion of some of Mr. Williams’s Errors,
by Mr. Allop, in a Letter to Mr. Bur-
gess.

It is not worth while to blame the published Title; tho’ Mr. Allop wrote no such Letter, knew not of it, yea, abhor-
ed it: Nor to detect the Story of Mr. Sylvester; who declares, “Mr. Baxter “told him, that the managers of Pin-
ners-Hall Lecture desired him, that I “might always preach in that Lecture “when he was disabled:” And I am sure, I never requested it of Mr. Baxter or
Sect. or any other, and the foresaid managers

IV. desired it of me: Yea, Mr. Baxter, and

some of them pressed me to be the stated
Lecturer during his Life, which I refused; tho' after his death my Election was op-
posed as far as possible by many of them, because of that part of my Sermon which
is in the Appendix at the end of Gospel-

Truth. The only pretence I know for
this Author's Story, is, that being one E-
vening with Mr. Baxter, who fearing he
should be unable to preach next day at
Pinners-Hall, I desired him to resolve to
do it, and if he found himself in the morn-
ing too weak, I would supply his place for
that turn.

But I shall briefly consider an Ob-
jection or two, against my Books, the rest
being answered already.

Obj. 1. The threatening of the Law was
Eternal Death, as Eternal: Eternity was
an ingredient in the misery of every Sinner.
Man made Righteous, pag. 16.

Ansiv. If this be an Error, why do our
Divines make Eternal Death one Species of
the Death threatened by the Law? But
I have further Reasons to fear, that some
prime Authors of this Charge believe Ori-
gen's Notion, and of late deny the E-
ternal duration of the Torments of the
damned.

Obj.
Obj. 2. That Legal Preaching which is a Crime, is to preach the Law as a Covenant of works. Every Threatning used by God to Conversion, is a Gospel-Threatning. Gospel-Truth, pag. 243, 145.

Answ. 1. I have been branded as a Legal Preacher, and yet it seems, I am not Legal Preacher enough: But peruse the places; and see pag. 245. where I explain his first Clause, and say, "The blameable Legal Preaching is to preach duties or holiness, as if men must perfectly believe and obey, or they shall avoidably perish; and to denounce wrath and hell, as miseries, from which there is no relief by Christ." And my words, in pag. 145. (which his second Clause cites,) are, "Most of the promises and threatnings in the Bible, that refer to the state of Souls, are evangelical promises and threats; they are not the Sanctions of the Law of Innocence, but of Gospel-grace:" Which words (so falsely quoted by him,) are an Argument to prove, that there be Gospel-Threatnings.

Answ. 2. By denying that the Covenant of works ought to be preached, I could not mean, that it should not be explained; or that all men should not be informed, that they were condemned thereby: For my affirming, that the Elect remain
A Postscript

Sect. main in a condemned State before God till they believe, is what offends them; as also my saying, that this is a fit Argument to incline men to obey the Gospel; (which makes it a Gospel-Argument in our Preaching.) But I grant, that I affirm and these men deny, that our offers to Sinners are enforced by Gospel-Threatnings, viz. that they shall remain condemned, and be more sorely punished, if they will not repent and believe; and these are urged to persuade their acceptance of it. Whereas they say, Turn ye, turn ye, why will ye die, is the Triumph of the Law over dead Sinners: And they are for no threatenings or precepts, but those of the Law of works, which they thus accommodate: If you sin, you shall die, that is, you or your Surety: If you obey, you shall live, that is, you or your Surety. And thus with them the Gospel Preaching is, Your Surety hath died, and obeyed, and all this you have done already in him: and if you believe this, you shall know that it was so: But you incur no danger by not believing, but that it will not be evident to your own Conscience, that you have thus suffered and obeyed in Christ. And so you have their Legal, and their Gospel Preaching.

Obj. 3. What is the Covenant of Grace? In Answer be faith, By Covenant of Grace, I mean the way that God hath ordained,
to apply to Sinners that Salvation which is prepared by Christ, and which he will enable the Elect to comply with. Gospel-Truth, pag. 59, 60. And telling us, This is my description of the Covenant of Grace, he blames my want of accuracy in Logick, being I mention neither the Genus of the thing defined, nor the specific difference, or what is proper to a Covenant of Grace.

Anfw. 1. It seems, a definition and description is the same with him: But with his leave, if you see pag. 59, 60. you will find, that between my Question and this Answer, I speak at large, that it is not the Covenant of Redemption. In the next words, I describe the Conditions of the Covenant of Grace; from thence to pag. 62. And then I shew the specific difference between the Covenant of Works, and that of Grace, pag. 63, 64. and at the end of these Preliminaries, I give a description of the Covenant of Grace. But what he calls my description, is only designed to give the difference between the Covenant of Redemption, and what I call the Covenant of Grace, viz. the ordained way of Application of saving benefits, as opposed to the way of their Impetration.

Anfw. 2. I write to explain Truth to ordinary Readers; and had I been concerned for the praise of Skill in Logick, Dr. Bates had not kept back my Answer to Mr. Lobb's Letter; wherein I shew the falseness
A Postscript

Sect. falleness of his two vulgar Axioms about disjunctive Propositions, and prove, (1.) Partes propositionis disjunctivae non sunt semper oppositae, sed aliquando solummodo diversae, & equidem subordinate; & quamquam aliquando sit ridiculum loqui disjunctive cum possumus copulative, at non semper ridiculum. (2.) Ad veritatem affirmatae disjunctivae propositionis non esse est, ut unica tantum pars sit vera; potest enim affirmata esse vera ex ambabus, pluribus, omnibus, partibus veris. Vid. Eccl. xi. 6. Col. ii. 16.

Ansiv. 3. I'll here inform another, that as no umbrae did insert a word in Gospel-Truth, so its Learning is not less, for wanting Latin Quotations, when the words of the Assembly, and of Independents, were likelier to be regarded by the Crispians; nor for omitting Physical terms in the Doctrine of Justification, which is a forensic act, where the meriting consideration for which the judicial Sentence passeth, is as a material Cause.

Our Catechism puts it so; Justification is an act of God's free Grace, wherein he pardoneth all our Sins, and accepteth us as righteous in his sight, only for the Righteousness of Christ, imputed to us, and received by Faith alone. Here the Form of God's justifying act is, his pardoning our Sins, and accepting us as righteous; the meriting Cause is, the only Righteousness of Christ imputed:
imputed: Which expressly answers to this Sect. Question, For the sake of what, as the merituous Cause, are Pardon and Acceptance adjudged to us by that justifying act? The word [imputed] not only shews, that unless Christ's Righteousness were imputed, God could not pardon and accept us for it; but also assigns the Reason, why God for it justifies us and not others, and now and not before; tho' it hath a meriting value to justify others, and us before this time: The next words tell us, to whom, and when, these benefits are adjudged; viz. to such as have this Righteousness imputed to them, and when it is received by Faith. We see, that Righteousness even imputed, is with the Assembly, only the merituous Cause for which God forgives, and accepts us; suitably to Rom. iii. 24. We are justified thro' the Redemption that is in Christ; that is, for the sake of Christ's redeeming Blood, as the meriting price, unless men deny Redemption by price. And they cannot mean, that imputing Christ's Righteousness is the Form of God's justifying act, (nor consequently, of our passive Justification,) unless pardoning our Sins be formally the Imputation of the Righteousness, for the sake of which when imputed he pardoneth; which true Sense, and the formal notion of Forgiveness, contradicet; no, nor will Acceptance as righteous admit it. Yea, with them an imputing act is supposed, to this
A Postscript

Sect. this justifying act here defined; of which elsewhere.

But if they be supposed to intend, with the French Church in the Synod of Rochel, That the whole obedience of Christ both in his Life and Death, is imputed to us for the full Remission of our sins and acceptance unto eternal Life; it is what our Author weakly decries, as an Imputation only as to effects. For if he mean by quoad formam, that Christ's Righteousness itself, and not the effects, is imputed, I grant it; for it is itself imputed, relatively to that pardon and acceptance, and is our pleadsable Security; itself is so, and is imputed to be so: Nor is it less than ridiculous, that I must deny it, because it is effectual for our pardon and acceptance; unless he deny, that pardon and acceptance can be the effects of that Righteousness of Christ which is imputed. But he must mean by the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness, that God reputes and judicially pronounceth us to have performed that Righteousness; that is, that we obeyed the Law, and died, which was accepted for Satisfaction for our sins, and merited Life; which I have spoken to, and the Assembly never could intend.

And if it be objected, that they say, God accepteth us as righteous in his sight, for the Righteousness of Christ imputed to us: I answer, God adjudgeth us when believers,
believers, to be dealt with as righteous persons, being we are pardoned upon IV.
Christ's satisfaction and intitled to happiness in his right, whose obedience and satisfaction are judicially accounted our pleadable Security for both. But though we are to be thus dealt with for the sake of Christ's obedience; they cannot intend, that God accounts us to have obeyed in Christ: For that is contradicted in his pardoning our sins, unless we can in the same sentence be legally adjudged to need a Pardon as Sinners, and yet be legally accounted no Sinners as having always obeyed. Nay, if we obeyed in Christ, because the Law faith, If thou or thy Surety obey, thou shalt live, we could not, for our own sins, be obliged to punishment by its threatening; no, though Christ had not died; and so Pardon and Satisfaction are needless: For this Law was so fulfilled, that the Reward became due by our obeying in Christ, notwithstanding our own sin; unless we need Satisfaction and Pardon when we are entitled to the Reward; which is impossible, both by the nature of that Reward, for a right to Life hinders a liableness to die; and by the merit of it, unless perfect obedience consist with disobedience. And do not say, We sinned, but Christ obeyed: For if our obeying in him makes the Reward due to us, our not obeying ourselves did not forfeit it, nor
Answ. 4. I pity the weakness of these men, who, when their noise is about \textit{Justification}, tell the world, we are therein \textit{Amyraldians}; whereas \textit{Amyraldus} was so exactly \textit{Calvinistical} in this point, that the last Synod of \textit{Charenton} appointed him to defend the \textit{Protestant Doctrine of Justification} against \textit{Milletiere}: (Yea, \textit{Arminius} was professedly so too:) But his offending notions respected the Divine Will, Decrees, subjective Grace, and the extent of Christ's Death: Though the last was not condemned by the \textit{French Church}, and is owned by \textit{Davenant, Usser, &c.}: Nay, see Mr. \textit{Lobb} in his \textit{Glory of free Grace}, pag. 66, 67. proving, \textit{That the Salvation of every man is become possible, by Christ's satisfying Divine Justice by his Death.}

I shall conclude with this Apology, for continuing the Name of Mr. \textit{Fergujon} before this Book. When he was pleased to give his Name to the Second Edition, he appeared to be an \textit{Ecclesiastic}, (though not in \textit{Socks and Buskins};) and though he now think it fit to lay aside \textit{that Character}, yet I remove not his Name; hoping his present intimacy with Mr. \textit{Lobb}, his zeal for \textit{Independency}, and warmth against \textit{Presbyterian Discipline}, may reconcile the most offended to a Book, as far as he approves of it.
In the bowels of Christ I humbly beseech all Contenders, to secure the aptitude of the Ministry to promote practical Religion, and so to manage our Debates, as that we may reflect with inward peace, if the Calamities of our French Brethren should become our Lot.

The END of the Fourth Volume.