

The Doctrine of Justification by Faith

through the Imputation of the Righteousness of Christ
Explained, Confirmed, and Vindicated

John Owen

with an introductory essay by
Carl R. Trueman



Soli Deo Gloria Publications
An imprint of Reformation Heritage Books
Grand Rapids, Michigan

“John Owen on Justification”
Copyright © 2023 Carl R. Trueman

Soli Deo Gloria Publications

An imprint of Reformation Heritage Books
3070 29th St. SE
Grand Rapids, MI 49512
616-977-0889
orders@heritagebooks.org
www.heritagebooks.org

The Doctrine of Justification by Faith is taken
from the 19th century edition originally published by the
Presbyterian Board of Publication in Philadelphia.

Printed in the United States of America
23 24 25 26 27 2/10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

ISBN 979-8-88686-005-4

*For additional Reformed literature, request a free book list from
Reformation Heritage Books at the above regular or e-mail address.*

John Owen on Justification

by
Carl R. Trueman

Introduction¹

The doctrine of justification, famously dubbed by Martin Luther as “the article by which the church stands or falls,” was no less a controversial doctrine in John Owen’s time than it had been at the inception of the Reformation.² It is of course necessary at the outset to acknowledge the fact that Owen’s context for his discussion of justification is a complex one. For a start, the basic significance of the doctrine as one of the key theological distinctives which marked Protestantism off from Roman Catholicism meant that discussion of justification was always going to be profoundly political, both ecclesiastically and in the more general social sense. There were, by Owen’s time, well-established polemical lines of debate between Protestants and

*Carl R. Trueman is professor of biblical and religious studies,
Grove City College.*

¹ This is an abridged version of a longer discussion of the topic in Carl R. Trueman, *John Owen* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007).

² Owen quotes Luther (without giving a specific textual reference) as saying “*amisso articulo Justificationis, simul amissa est tota doctrina Christiana.*” (“When the article of justification is lost, the whole of Christian teaching is lost at the same time”), *The Doctrine of Justification by Faith* (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2006), 77. Standard histories of the doctrine are: Albrecht Ritschl, *The Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation*, trans. H. R. Mackintosh and A. B. Macaulay (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1900); Alister E. McGrath, *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification*, 3rd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

Catholics into which his own exposition of the doctrine needs to be fitted. Second, the wider Western trajectories of doctrinal discussion within which the Reformed Orthodox stood also need to be taken into account: for all of the radical differences between Protestant and Catholic theologians on this issue, particular as these positions received confessional codification at the Council of Trent and then in subsequent Protestant creeds, both Catholics and Protestants conducted their discussions in terms which one might characterize in broad terms as Augustinian, being rooted in the anti-Pelagian writings of the Bishop of Hippo and in the understandings of righteousness, divine and human, and other corollary doctrines which were developed in its aftermath. We need to remember Owen was not just a Reformed, or even Protestant, theologian; we also need to keep in mind that he was an *Augustinian* theologian.³ Third, Owen wrote on justification in the context of an England where specific local difficulties had imposed peculiar requirements on theologians dealing specifically with this doctrine: antinomianism and neonomianism both arose in specific social contexts and were symbiotic in an antagonistic way; Owen needed to bear the Scylla of one and the Charybdis of the other in mind as he penned his great treatise on the topic.⁴

³ I am aware of the problematic nature of this term; I use it to refer to a theologian who stands within the broad, anti-Pelagian tradition of Western theology, and who has a high regard for the authority of Augustine's writings. The problem with the term is not, of course, simply that which typically affects any broad tradition or collection of traditions which take their name from an individual and thus raise complex questions about fidelity, continuity, etc. with the conceptual content of the work of the original writer. For example, theologian Daphne Hampson has raised the significant question of whether the underlying notions of humanity and personhood in Catholicism and Protestantism are not fundamentally different, the former being primarily substantial, the latter more relational. From this, she has argued that Protestantism deviates significantly from Augustine in a manner which has decisive impact on the notion of justification: see her *Christ Contradictions: The Structure of Lutheran and Catholic Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

⁴ Two recent studies on the subject of the context of antinomianism

Owen on Imputation of Active and Passive Righteousness

When Owen comes to write on justification in 1677, then, the debate about justification, specifically with reference to imputation and Christology, was considerably more elaborate than it had been in the sixteenth century. In fact, Owen's commitment to imputation of both Christ's active and passive obedience is evident from the *Savoy Declaration* of 1658 which was essentially a modification of the Westminster Confession of Faith (WCF). Most of the modifications involve the teaching on church polity, but the article on justification is expanded from the WCF to include specific reference to the imputation of both the active and passive righteousness of Christ. Owen, along with Thomas Goodwin, was one of the principal architects of the document, and thus the document can be assumed to reflect his theology and his view of the inadequacy or ambiguity of the original WCF formulation.⁵

Owen's major discussion of justification is *The Doctrine of Justification by Faith, through the Imputation of the Righteousness of Christ; Explained, Confirmed, and Vindicated* (London, 1677), although some of the issues had been touched

worth consulting are David R. Como, *Blown by the Spirit: Puritanism and the Emergence of an Antinomian Underground in Pre-Civil-War England* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004); and Theodore Dwight Bozeman, *The Precisianist Strain: Disciplinary Religion and Antinomian Backlash in Puritanism to 1638* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003).

⁵ *Savoy* XI.i reads as follows: "Those whom God effectually calleth, he also freely justifieth, not by infusing righteousness into them, but by pardoning their sins, and by accounting and accepting their persons as righteous, nor for any thing wrought in them, or done by them, but for Christ's sake alone; nor by imputing Faith itself, the act of believing, or any other Evangelical obedience to them, as their righteousness, but by imputing Christ's active obedience unto the whole Law, and passive obedience in his death for their whole and sole righteousness, they receiving and resting on him and his righteousness by Faith; which Faith they have not of themselves, it is the gift of God." *A Declaration of the Faith and Order Owned and practiced in the Congregational Churches in England* (London, 1658), 20-21.

on numerous occasions in previous works, most notably those in the exchange with Baxter surrounding the latter's *Aphorisms of Justification*. In *The Doctrine of Justification*, Owen makes the claim in the preliminary chapter that he does not intend to deal with the passive/active distinction at any length.⁶ Nevertheless, he then proceeds in the treatise itself to tackle the issue head on, as it lies very much at the heart of the debates in which he was engaged.

As one would expect, particularly in light of the *Savoy Declaration*, Owen maintains the standard orthodox position of the imputation of both Christ's active and his passive obedience; and he articulates this position through polemical examination of the arguments against this point. As far as his opponents go, he divides them into three groups regarding the role of Christ's active obedience in the work of justification: those who see it as impossible; those who see it as useless; and those who see it as pernicious.⁷ In the first group, he cites Faustus Socinus, *De Jesu Christo Servatore* 3.5, as arguing that Christ's obedience was necessary for his own salvation, and that even his death was an offering on behalf of himself, which God then rewarded with adoption.⁸ This is clearly consistent with Socinian soteriology, rejecting as it does the vicarious nature of Christ's work and insisting instead upon its paradigmatic significance. Thus, Valentinus Smalcius' *Racovian Catechism*, Chapter 8, "Of Christ's Death," makes it clear that the death is purely an example and an encouragement to believers, and that any notion of vicarious sacrifice or satisfaction is "fallacious, erroneous, and very pernicious" a point which has obvious significance for the nature of justification.⁹

It is worth remembering, however, that, although Owen

⁶ Owen, *Doctrine of Justification*, 72-73.

⁷ Owen, *Doctrine of Justification*, 283.

⁸ Owen, *Doctrine of Justification*, 284.

⁹ *The Racovian Catechism* (Amsterdam, 1652), 122-139, esp. 126; cf. the comments of Francis Cheynell, *The Rise, Growth, and Danger of Socinianism* (London, 1643), 24.

chooses to focus on the Socinians in refuting this position, it is not entirely different to that articulated by Johannes Piscator and Thomas Gataker who regarded Christ's positive obedience to the law as being part of his obligation as rational creature, although the teleological significance is clearly very different. Indeed, the connection between Socinianism and those who were "soft" on the imputation of Christ's active obedience was already well-established in the controversial rhetoric of the time, and not entirely without some historical foundation. For example, Piscator's *Profitable Treatise* was, the author tells us, written at the request of his friend, Conrad Vorstius, who wished him to refute Robert Bellarmine on justification. The preface is dated December 18, 1593, some time before Vorstius became Public Enemy No. 1 in the Reformed world; but the connection was surely not insignificant, either theologically or in terms of public association.¹⁰ Further, Anthony Wotton, a leading English proponent of something akin to Piscator's position, was subject to a decades-long campaign accusing him of being a Socinian, a campaign mounted by the vigorously orthodox George Walker. Walker himself was to be a delegate at the Westminster Assembly, and was to target Gataker also as a Socinian.¹¹ We should note, however, that the notion that Christ's obedience to the law was an essential component of

¹⁰ Piscator, *A profitable treatise*, preface.

¹¹ Walker pursued Wotton with an obsessive commitment which can only lead later observers of his campaign to speculate about what personal issues lay beneath the surface. He even kept up the campaign after Wotton's death in 1626. Walker's account of the dispute, which began in 1611, can be found in his *A True Relation of the chiefe passages betweene Mr Anthony Wotton, and Mr George Walker* (London, 1642). Wotton's position can be found in the work which his son published posthumously, *Mr Anthony Wotton's Defence Against Mr George Walker's Charge. Accusing him of Socinian Heresie and Blasphemie* (Cambridge, 1641), itself a response to Walker's *Socinianisme in the Fundamentall point of Justification discovered and confuted* (1641). Wotton's work contained a preface and postscript by Gataker. Gataker himself had to go into print to defend himself against

fitting him to offer his death as a satisfaction on behalf of others had a long pedigree in Western theology and lay very much at the heart of Anselm's rationale for incarnation in *Cur Deus Homo*.

In opposition to this rejection of the imputation of both active and passive righteousness, Owen argues from the integrity of the person and work of the mediator to the necessity for seeing both active and passive righteousness imputed to the believer. Central to this is the typical Orthodox primary emphasis upon the *person* of the mediator, not the *natures* of the mediator:

If the obedience that Christ yielded unto the law were for himself, whereas it was the act of his person, *his whole person*, and the divine nature therein, were 'made under the law;' which cannot be. For although it is acknowledged that, in the ordination of God, his exinanition was to precede his glorious, majestic exaltation, as the Scripture witnesseth, Phil. 2:19; Lk. 24:26; Rom. 14:9; yet absolutely his glory was an immediate consequent of the hypostatical union, Heb. 1:6; Mt. 2:11.¹²

Of course, such an argument is scarcely likely to persuade any

the charge of Socinianism made against him by Walker: *An Answer to Mr. George Walkers Vindication or rather Fresh Accusation* (London, 1642).

¹² Owen, *The Works of John Owen*, vol. 12 (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1965), 256. Cf. the similar argument of George Downname: "But these men should have remembred, that the person, who...did obey the Law, was and is not onely man but God also, and therefore, as his bloud was Gods bloud, so his obedience was the obedience of God, and consequently was performed not of duty, nor for himselfe. For if of duty, then God had been a debtor to the Law: Neither needed the humane nature, being by personall union united to the divine, to obey, or to merit for it selfe; seeing from the first moment of the conception therof, it was personally united to the Deity of the Sonne of God, in whose person it subsisting was, from the beginning of the being therof, most happy, and enjoying the beatificall vision, being at that time, as the Schoolemen speake both *viator et comprehensor*. Neither did the humane nature, which doth not subsist by it selfe, work any thing by it selfe in the work of our redemption, but God manifested in the

Socinian because they would reject the major presupposition, the Chalcedonian definition of Christ's person. Nevertheless, within a Reformed Orthodox framework, the argument is clearly a coherent one, pointing back to the establishment of Christ as mediator under the terms of the covenant of redemption, and assuming both mediation according to both nature and the anhypostatic nature of Christ's humanity. The union of natures in the Incarnation is what qualifies Christ as capable of acting as mediator, and this is because that union is determined by the voluntary covenant of redemption, the doctrinal context for understanding the incarnate Mediator.¹³ Owen accepts the medieval Scotist terminology of *viator* and *possessor* as applied to Christ, to distinguish his earthly sojourn from his later glory, but sees the historical movement contained therein as reflecting the voluntarily established terms of the covenant, and not as indicating any initial deficiency in his qualifications as mediator.¹⁴

The importance of federalism is also clear in several of Owen's other arguments on this issue. For Owen, it is crucial that Christ's appointment as mediator in the covenant of redemption means that all his works are those of voluntary condescension in the ordained economy of salvation, not necessary to his being, and as such their significance and value is

flesh, did in and by it both obey and suffer for us." *A Treatise of Justification* (London, 1634), 29. Cf. the argument of Featley to the Westminster Assembly, *Dippers Dipt*, 196; also James Ussher, *Immanuel, or, The Mystery of the Incarnation of the Son of God* (London, 1653), 11.

¹³ "The Lord Christ was every way meet for the whole work of mediation, by the ineffable union of the human nature with the divine which exalted it in dignity, honour and worth, above any thing, or all things that ensued thereon.... Again that which is an effect of the person of the mediator as constituted such, is not a qualification necessary to its constitution; that is, what he did as mediator, did not concur to the making of him meet so to be." Owen, *Doctrine of Justification*, 289. "[T]he compact between the Father and the Son, as to his undertaking for us...undeniably proves all that he did in the pursuit of them to be done for us, and not for himself." Owen, *Doctrine of Justification*, 290.

¹⁴ Owen, *Doctrine of Justification*, 291.

determined by the covenant which is the defining ground of the work of incarnation.¹⁵ In addition, the position of Christ as federal sponsor means that he always acts in a public, not a private or personal capacity, and that strict comparison with any other individual is not legitimate. His whole life, having its causal ground in the covenant of redemption, is that of the sponsor of the covenant of grace, and thus in its entirety it has a significance which embraces all of the objects of the covenant of grace. The theology of federal headship, rooted in the covenant of redemption between Father and Son, thus repeatedly connects to the debate on justification and allows for conceptual precision in clarifying the status and role of Christ as mediator.¹⁶

In this context, Owen engages both in his treatise on justification and in his commentary on Hebrews in an extended refutation of the notion that Christ's sponsorship, as mentioned in Hebrews 7:22, refers to his sponsorship on behalf of God, whereby the covenant is shown to human beings to be sound. This was the exegesis favoured by Socinians such as Jonas Schlichtingius, Remonstrants, such as Hugo Grotius, and the influential seventeenth-century English commentator, Bishop Henry Hammond, all of whose works are explicitly mentioned by Owen in this context.¹⁷ Owen, standing within

¹⁵ Owen, *Doctrine of Justification*, 288-90.

¹⁶ Owen, *Doctrine of Justification*, 292-93; also *Works* 10, 174-177; *Works* 12, 502-03; cf. David Dickson, *The summe of saving knowledge* (Edinburgh, 1671), Head II; also Patrick Gillespie, *The Ark of the Covenant Opened* (London, 1677). In this context, it is interesting to note that the Savoy Declaration modifies Chapter 8 of the WCF by explicitly using covenantal language to describe the appointment of Christ as mediator by the Father. As the specific conceptual terminology of the covenant of redemption did not start to become commonplace in Reformed theology until the late 1640s, it is not significant that it is absent from the WCF.

¹⁷ Owen, *Doctrine of Justification*, 205-06; *Works* 21, 499-500. Hammond's comment reads as follows: "Christ was Sponsor and Surety [of that covenant] for God, that it should be made good to us on Gods part (on condition we performed that which was required of us) viz. the Covenant confirmed to us by Christ in the Gospel, a better Covenant then the Covenant of

an established and respectable exegetical tradition at this point, argues rather that the sponsorship is on behalf of men and women and directed to God, not on behalf of God and directed to men and women.¹⁸ What this does, of course, is secure the priesthood, and thus the sacrifice, of Christ as something which is offered to God, and which thus refuses to reduce the significance of the incarnation simply to revealing something of God. Again, the roots of Owen's argument in this context lie theologically with his understanding of the covenant of redemption, but, as noted, his exegesis is not exceptional.¹⁹ Further, his understanding of the etymology of the Greek word itself leads him to argue that sponsorship presupposes inadequacy or defect on behalf of the party being represented by the sponsor; and this cannot apply to God but only to the sons and daughters of Adam. Here, his thinking connects with Roman law: Owen translates the Greek as *surety*, as do the Geneva Bible and the Authorized Version, and states that this is the equivalent of *fideiussor*.²⁰ This is a term drawn from Roman law to refer to a guarantor of a debt

the Law, wherein Moses undertook for God to us." *Annotations upon all the Books of the New Testament* (London, 1659), 741.

¹⁸ Owen, *Doctrine of Justification*, 208-21; *Works* 21, 501-12.

¹⁹ See especially Owen, *Doctrine of Justification*, 215-16; *Works* 21, 505. Cf. William Gouge, *A Learned and Very Useful Commentary on the Whole Epistle to the Hebrewes* (London, 1655), 193-94; David Dickson, *An Exposition of all St Pauls Epistles*, 196; Edward Leigh, *A Systeme or Body of Divinity* (London, 1657), 575. See also the definition in Thomas Wilson, *A Christian Dictionary* (London, 1647), n.p.: "Surety) One that undertaketh for the debt of another man. Prov. 6.1...2. Christ, who undertooke to answer the debt of our sins to Gods justice, by his obedience to death. Heb. 7.22." While this particular point is not a matter of comment in either the *Dutch Annotations* or the various editions of the *Westminster Annotations*, Giovanni Diodati does do so, and offers something of a mediating position, whereby Christ is surety for the elect in satisfying God's wrath, and for God by assuring believers of the Father's favor through the Spirit: *Pious and Learned Annotations upon the Whole Bible* (London, 1648), 375 (New Testament).

²⁰ Owen, *Doctrine of Justification*, 208, 211.

or obligation who acts voluntarily and on behalf of the one in debt.²¹ In all of this, particularly in his use of the language of *sponsor* (the term used in the Vulgate) and *fideiussor*, he stands within typical Reformed Orthodox treatments of Christology in the context of the covenant of redemption.²²

The final argument Owen offers in this refutation of the Socinian claims concerning the impossibility of imputation of active obedience relates to the meaning of the term *under law*, which he reads his opponents as meaning “obliged to obey God by virtue of the relationship that necessarily exists between the Creator and all rational creatures.” Owen accepts that this is indeed the case, but then pushes the argument forward into the eschatological realm: Christ’s human nature, as a creature, will be obliged to God as creator even in the eschaton, a point he supports with reference to the communication of properties which will never involve the direct communication of self-existent deity to Christ’s humanity; but, argues Owen, to claim that this involves the heavenly Christ being *under law* in the Pauline sense of *obliged to fulfill it on his own account* is clearly absurd in such a context. Further, the notion of the law as specially imposed by God with a view to reward also points to the absurdity of seeing Christ as *under law* for his own sake: again, the hypostatic union itself was quite sufficient to make Christ’s human nature worthy of eternal life for itself. Here we see the obvious doctrinal intersection of the covenant of works and that of redemption in the context of Christology and mediation.²³

Indeed, as Owen elaborates upon the saving efficacy of Christ’s mediation, he is very clear that the terms of Christ’s penal work on the cross are set by the Creator-creature frame-

²¹ E.g., Justinian, *Institutes* III.xx.

²² See the entries under *fideiussio* and *sponsio* in Richard A. Muller, *A Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1985).

²³ Owen, *Doctrine of Justification*, 293-94.

work as covenantally established in Genesis 1-3. Working against the background of Reformed exegesis of Romans 5, with its parallel of Adam and Christ, Owen argues in *Of the Death of Christ*, his 1650 response to Baxter's *Aphorisms*, that the penalty which Christ underwent as federal sponsor on behalf of the elect was death; and in so doing, he connects Galatians 3:13, Romans 8:3, and Genesis 2:17.²⁴ Thus, as representative human being, Christ must both fulfill the law positively on behalf of humanity because of Adam's abject failure so to do, and he must undergo punishment of death because of Adam's breaking of the original covenant. It is not Christ's ontology as the Divine-human person which requires this, but his covenantal status as representative which demands it.

The presence of these three types of argument (from hypostatic union; from condescension; and from federal headship) at least in a very brief form in earlier works by John Downname and David Featley suggests that, by the time he writes in the 1670s, Owen is working within an established framework of standard Orthodox responses to criticisms of the mainstream position.²⁵ As is typical of Owen, however, this lack of originality in the basic trajectories of argument does not prevent him from engaging in significant theological elaboration, of a kind which lays bare the sophisticated underlying structure of the Reformed Orthodox theology to which he is committed, particularly as it finds its ground in the doctrine of the Trinity, specifically the covenant of redemption and its determinative impact upon both the history and the order of salvation. Having highlighted this, it is now necessary to turn to one of the implications which his opponents saw in the connection he drew between atonement and justifi-

²⁴ Owen, *Works* 10, 448.

²⁵ See Daniel Featley, *Dippers Dipt*, 5th ed. (London, 1647), the appendix of which contains Featley's speeches on the issue of twofold imputation to the early sessions of the Westminster Assembly; see esp. 196-197; also George Downname, *A Treatise of Justification* (London, 1634).

fication: the problems of eternal justification, with its connotations of antinomianism.²⁶

Owen and Eternal Justification

The primary criticism of Owen on atonement and justification came from Richard Baxter, for whom the issues of antinomianism and its perceived conceptual foundation, eternal justification, were more than just theological games. His experience in the Civil War as an army chaplain left a lasting impression on him: the impact and influence of radical sectarianism and its frequent connection to what Baxter regarded as moral anarchy left Baxter with a lasting fear of anything which might disrupt the smooth-running of the godly commonwealth, be it antinomianism or pedantic doctrinal militancy.²⁷

It should be noted at the outset that the Protestant doctrine of justification by imputation was always going to be vulnerable to criticisms of tending towards eternal justification.

²⁶ It is worth mentioning one final argument used by Owen's contemporaries to deny the imputation of Christ's double righteousness to the believer is a more straightforwardly exegetical one, and this again serves to bring out the importance of federalism to Owen's own theological position. Gataker is a good example of this: in his *Antidote*, he argues that Scripture never associates the life of Christ with the works of redemption, remission, and justification; rather, the textual evidence points squarely towards the suffering and death of Christ as being the grounds for this: see *An Antidote against Error*, 5, 28-31. Featley himself responded to such arguments as proposed by Daniel Tilenus and Piscator in his second speech on Article 11 to the Westminster Assembly: *Dippers Dipt*, 196-97. By Owen's day, then, the standard response to this was to argue that references in the New Testament to the blood of Christ etc. are to be taken synecdochically, and that they simply subsume both active and passive obedience under the one term; it is thus hardly surprising that we should find Owen making this conventional case: Owen, *Doctrine of Justification*, 304.

²⁷ See Carl R. Trueman, "Richard Baxter on Christian Unity: A Chapter in the Enlightening of English Reformed Orthodoxy," *Westminster Theological Journal* 61 (1999), 53-71; on the question of Baxter and the church in general, of particular note is the work of Paul H-C Lim, *In Pursuit of Purity, Unity, and Liberty: Richard Baxter's Puritan Ecclesiology in Its Seventeenth-Century Context* (Leiden: Brill, 2004).

Late medieval theologians had used the distinction between God's absolute power and his ordained power, along with that between congruent and condign merit, to break the necessary connection between the logical priority of actual righteousness in a real sense, and God's declaration that a particular person was justified. Thus, in placing the declaration in God's will, not the intrinsic qualities of the one justified, it is arguable that the necessary connection not only between ontological factors and justification but also between chronological factors and justification had been decisively abolished. Given that Protestantism actually intensified this medieval emphasis, it is not surprising that some Reformed theologians, including Owen, should find themselves under suspicion of holding to eternal justification.

The name perhaps most associated with sophisticated expressions of the doctrine of eternal justification in Owen's day was that of Tobias Crisp. Indeed, the republication of his works in 1690 was to bring the elderly Baxter out of retirement on the grounds that he needed to refute the dangerous tenets of "Crispianism."²⁸ In the 1640s, however, the posthumous publication of his sermons occasioned vigorous opposition not simply from the likes of Baxter, but also from orthodox figures such as Samuel Rutherford, who, in the wake of the debates at the Westminster Assembly, saw Crisp's work as part and parcel of a dangerously antinomian trajectory in English Puritan thought which was also connected to the sinister calls for that most un-Presbyterian tenet, liberty of conscience in religious matters.²⁹ Others, such as Stephen Geree and John Benrigge were also quick to respond, concerned that Crisp's teaching on eternal justification subverted the need for the moral imperatives of Christian sanctification.³⁰

²⁸ Crisp's works were published posthumously, in three volumes, in the 1640s.

²⁹ Samuel Rutherford, *A Survey of the Spirituall Antichrist* (London, 1648).

³⁰ Stephen Geree, *The Doctrine of the Antinomians by Evidence of Gods Truth plainly Confuted* (London, 1644); John Benrigge, *Christ Above All Exalted as in Justification so in Sanctification* (London, 1645).

In fact, an examination of Crisp's writings reveal that his position on the timing of justification was somewhat more sophisticated than the bald characterization implied by the term "eternal justification." First, it is important (particularly for our subsequent discussion of Owen and Baxter) to note the covenantal/Christological context of Crisp's understanding of justification. For Crisp, the covenant of grace is, in a threefold sense, to be identified with Christ: fundamentally, in the sense that he is the one who establishes the covenant with God the Father (Crisp here anticipated the development of the covenant of redemption; materially, as he both represents God to the people and the people to God; and equivalently, in the sense that once the believer has Christ as an earnest of salvation, then he or she has the equivalent of the whole covenant, even though there will be progress in the Christian life.³¹ This latter point is particularly significant as it points towards the problems inherent in dismissing Crisp as antinomian *tout court*: if there is progress in the Christian life, then there is need for nuance in understanding how time and eternity are connected. It does, however, point to the strong Christological federal representation which underlies Crisp's scheme and which thus parallels that of Owen. As the covenant is objectively fulfilled in Christ, what significance can history have?

Crisp is very clear that justification does precede faith. In this context, faith serves to manifest that which is already true, i.e., one believes that one is already justified and this act of belief makes manifest that which was before hidden. This is rooted in the objectivity of Christ's work in the covenant of grace.³² Yet, even as he is emphatic in teaching that reconciliation was effected in Christ and thus completed on Calvary, Crisp sets God's eternal justifying love, the atonement, and the life of individual elect, in the context of a basic distinction between God in eternity, conceived of in Boethian terms of

³¹ Tobias Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted* (London, 1643), 171-77.

³² Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, 168, 198-99.

simultaneous access to all points in time, and the sequential nature of time as experienced by creatures. Thus, from all eternity God knows who are his, and he knows that Christ has made satisfaction for them; yet, given the fact that human beings experience life sequentially, it can be really said that, considered in themselves, men and women do actions that are at enmity with God.³³ The solution, therefore, lies in the logical problems generated by language which reflects human experience of time rather than the divine relationship to time in eternity. It is arguable that the solution is unsatisfactory, but it highlights the complexity of argument with which the Reformed Orthodox addressed such issues and once again indicates the need to avoid simplistic categorical arguments which seek to reduce Reformed Orthodoxy to systems of logical deduction from single axioms. Further, anticipating a point which connects directly to the problem which Baxter sees in Owen's theology of justification because of the latter's understanding of atonement, Crisp makes it clear that his view assumes the identity of Christ's punishment with that which elect sinners deserve.³⁴

It is this point on which Baxter focuses in the appendix to *Aphorismes of Justification*: presupposing the force of the Socinian critique of Reformed atonement theory, and the usefulness of the Grotian response, Baxter claims that if Christ has paid the actual price for our sins, as Owen argues in his 1647 work, *The Death of Death*, then this payment is not refusable by God; nor is it possible that there be a chronological delay between payment and dissolution of the personal debt, since it is either paid or not paid; thus, the elect are justified in Christ, and faith must fulfill a mere epistemological function whereby the members of the elect come to acknowledge that which they are already, namely, justified. In other

³³ Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, 393-97; cf. 328-30.

³⁴ Crisp, *Christ Alone Exalted*, 398-401.

words, justification by faith is justification in the forum of the conscience, not in the forum of God himself.³⁵

Baxter is particularly upset with the implications of a passage in Owen's work which he sees as clearly reducing faith to acknowledgment of prior justification and thus of laying the groundwork for a radical antinomianism.³⁶ While he gives no precise reference, the passage in Owen to which he appears to be objecting occurs in Book III of *The Death of Death*. Here, Owen declares that Christ, by his death, did, "*ipso facto*, deliver us from the curse, by being made a curse for us." He then proceeds to explain why this did not mean that all the elect were not immediately justified from that moment by drawing an analogy with a prisoner detained in a foreign country: though he has a right to liberty from the moment the ransom is paid, yet he does not enjoy possession of that liberty until such time as the news of his delivery is brought to him.³⁷ The analogy is weak and unfortunate because it really does play to the notion that faith is a merely epistemological tool whereby those of the elect come to realization that they are what they always, in fact, have been; and the only movement from wrath to grace in history is in the forum of the individual conscience. This point is not lost on Baxter, who hits Owen hard at this point.³⁸

³⁵ Baxter, *Aphorismes of Justification*, Appendix, 146-59. Owen responded to *Aphorismes of Justification* in *Of the Death of Christ* (London, 1650), though Baxter, never one to allow others to have the last word, kept up the polemic in *Richard Baxter's Confession of his Faith* (London, 1655). Owen, himself no slouch in the matter of controversy, then responded to this work in the appendix to his long treatise on Socinianism, *Vindiciae Evangelicae* (London, 1655), entitled *Of the Death of Christ, and of Justification*.

³⁶ Baxter, *Aphorismes of Justification*, appendix, 155-57.

³⁷ Owen, *Works* 10, 268.

³⁸ "1. Whether a man may fitly be said actually, and *ipso facto*, to be delivered and discharged, who is not at all delivered, but onely hath right to deliverance, I doubt. 2. Knowledge and possession of a deliverance, are farre different things: A man may have possession and no knowledge in

Of course, Owen's analogy, and indeed, the language which he uses, do tend when taken in isolation to lend themselves to the kind of reading (and criticism) offered by Baxter; and it would seem that, under such pungent polemical pressure, Owen is forced to elaborate his position in the two later treatises which give a much clearer grounding and articulation of his point that the rather unfortunate prisoner passage of 1647. At the heart of his mature argument is the covenantal structure of salvation. In this context, he argues, it is crucial to understand that God's desire to save is prior to the establishment of the covenant of redemption between Father and Son, and thus to any consideration of Christ's satisfaction. Thus, he precludes at the outset any crude notion that Christ's death in any way changes the Father's mind or somehow buys his favor in a crude, commercial sense.³⁹ The power of this argument is reinforced when Owen draws attention to the fact that Christ's death, considered in abstraction from its covenantal context, has no meaning or significance as a payment because, considered as such, it is no payment.⁴⁰ If, however, the death is considered as a covenantal action, then it does have meaning as a payment; but the force of this is to focus attention on the will of God as the determining factor in

some cases; or if he have both, yet the procuring of knowledge is a small matter, in comparison of possession. 3. Our knowledge therefore doth not give us possession; so that the similitude failes; for it is the Creditors knowledge and satisfaction that is requisite to deliverance. And our creditour was not in a farre and strange countrey, but knew immediately and could either have made us quickly know, or turned us free before we had knowne the cause. 4. Nor can it easily be understood, how God can so long deny us the possession of Heaven, if wee had such absolute actual Right (as he speaketh) so long ago." Baxter, *Aphorismes of Justification*, appendix, 156-57.

³⁹ Owen, *Works* 10, 455-56. This point is simply a clarification of Owen's position as laid out at length in Book I of *The Death of Death*.

⁴⁰ "The suffering of Christ may be considered...[a]bsolutely, as in itself, abstracting from the consideration of any covenant or compact thereabout; and so it cannot be said to be a refusible payment; not because not refusible, but because no payment." Owen, *Works* 10, 458.

the economy of salvation. The positive relationship of Owen's theology to the more voluntarist/Scotist trajectories of late medieval thought is here evident and allows him to argue that the economy of salvation, of which Christ's sacrifice is a part, is to be understood as an act of God's sovereign will and not to be subjected to the narrow canons of particular human logic.⁴¹

It might be argued, of course, that Owen's shift on divine justice in the early 1650s would render this argument somewhat weaker, given that he adopts a position whereby atonement is necessary if God is to forgive sin.⁴² Yet this is not the case: the question of necessity of atonement *vis à vis* God's attributes and his intention to save is a determining factor in the nature of the atonement, covenantally considered, but in itself exerts no decisive influence on the overall structure and disbursement of covenant blessings. As the death of Christ purchases all benefits for the elect, including faith (which is, in a sense, a condition of the covenant of grace), so even after 1653 Owen sees that the atonement needs to be understood within the broad contours of the covenant and of the order of salvation; and he regards faith as given at a point in time determined by the will of the Father, with the voluntarist accent still strongly evident. This tracks to the second covenantal strand of Owen's thinking on justification which defuses the issue of eternal justification: if the covenant of redemption establishes the nature of Christ's death as satis-

⁴¹ In discussing the distinction between the death of Christ considered abstractly and covenantally, Owen concludes: "This distinction is not accommodate to this difficulty [of the non-refusability of payment]; the sole reason thereof being what was held out before, of the interest of God's sovereign right to the bestowing of purposed, purchased, promised blessings, as to times and seasons, according to the free counsel of his own will." Owen, *Works* 10, 458.

⁴² See Owen's *A Dissertation on Divine Justice* (London, 1653) in *Works* 10; also Carl R. Trueman, "John Owen's *Dissertation on Divine Justice*: An Exercise in Christocentric Scholasticism," *Calvin Theological Journal* 33 (1998): 87-103.

faction, then the covenant of grace, made by God the Father with Christ on behalf of the elect, embodies within itself not only the election of individuals to salvation, but also the times, circumstances, and means by which the elect will come to enjoy salvation and all its benefits.⁴³

In fact, Owen regards Baxter's claims that his (Owen's) theology requires that the elect be justified from the moment of Christ's death as resting upon a misconception of the union of the elect with Christ.⁴⁴ What Owen does claim is that the union of Christ with the elect in his atonement is not a real union in the sense of some form of actual, direct participation, again with the whole context of covenant and covenantal terms being crucial. The imputation of sin to Christ is thus not strictly parallel to the imputation of Christ's righteousness to sinners because it is not simply Incarnation, absolutely considered, which is the foundation of the salvific scheme, but the covenant which lies behind the Incarnation and which gives the Incarnation meaning for salvation. Thus, imputation of sin to Christ and imputation of righteousness to the elect both need to be set against the background of covenant terms; and the covenant terms are such that union with Christ by faith is necessary in order for the imputation of righteousness to take place.⁴⁵

Conclusion

John Owen's treatment of justification is a classic example of

⁴³ "This is that I say, *Christ hath purchased all good things for us*; these things are actually to be conferred upon us in the *time and order* by God's sovereign will determined and disposed. This order, as revealed in the gospel, is, that we believe and be justified, etc." Owen, *Works* 12, 608. Cf. *Doctrine of Justification*, 243-45.

⁴⁴ Owen, *Works* 12, 606.

⁴⁵ "God has appointed that there shall be an immediate foundation of the imputation of the satisfaction and righteousness of Christ unto us, whereon we may be said to have done and suffered in him, what he did and suffered,

Reformed Orthodoxy at its best: rooted in the ongoing Anti-Pelagian trajectory of Western theology and operating within the established Protestant consensus, Owen yet demonstrates the ways in which that consensus was itself under strain, exegetically, theologically, and socially, in the seventeenth century, and how it was necessary for doctrinal formulation of the doctrine to undergo careful elaboration in order to respond to such. In particular, his defense of the imputation of Christ's active and passive righteousness and his vigorous rejection of Baxter's accusations that his theology was antinomian and demanded a doctrine of eternal justification, points towards the covenantal/Christological heart of his theology. As such, he is an example of how federal theology could be deployed to set the Protestant confessional consensus on a much firmer conceptual foundation than was the case in the early Reformation; and also how Reformed Orthodoxy's theological structure is highly elaborate and irreducible to soundbites about dogmatizing; rather, Owen's treatment exhibits the typical Reformed attention to the exegesis, doctrinal synthesis, and church consensus, and is one more piece of evidence as to how and why the Reformed faith became more elaborate in its argumentation during the course of the seventeenth century.

in our stead, by that grant, donation, and imputation of it to us; or that we may be interested in it, that it may be made ours, which is all we contend for. And this is our actual coalesce into one mystical person with him by faith." Owen, *Doctrine of Justification*, 244-45; cf. *Doctrine of Justification*, 396; also *Works* 12, 606-07.

**The Doctrine of
Justification by Faith**

through the Imputation of the Righteousness of Christ
Explained, Confirmed, and Vindicated

CONTENTS.

PREFACE,	5
ADVERTISEMENT,	10
GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS previously necessary to the Explanation of the Doctrine of Justification,	11
CHAPTER I.—Justifying Faith, the causes, object, and nature of it declared,	81
CHAPTER II.—The Nature of Justifying Faith,	105
CHAPTER III.—The Use of Faith in Justification; its especial object further cleared,	121
CHAPTER IV.—Of Justification, the Notion, and Signification of the word in the Scripture,	139
CHAPTER V.—The Distinction of a first and second Justification examined. The Continuation of Justification, whereon it depends,	155
CHAPTER VI.—Evangelical Personal Righteousness, the Nature and Use of it. Final Judgment, and its respect to Justification,	172
CHAPTER VII.—Imputation, and the Nature of it; with the Imputation of the Righteousness of Christ in particular,	183
CHAPTER VIII.—Imputation of the Sins of the Church to Christ. Grounds of it. The Nature of his Suretyship. Causes of the New Covenant. Christ and the Church one Mystical Person. Consequences thereof,	198

CHAPTER IX.—The Formal Cause of Justification; or, the Righteousness on account of which believers are justified before God. Objections answered,	231
CHAPTER X.—Arguments for Justification by the imputation of the Righteousness of Christ. The first Argument from the nature and use of our own Personal Righteousness,	251
CHAPTER XI.—The Nature of the Obedience that God requires of us. The Eternal Obligation of the Law thereto,	270
CHAPTER XII.—The Imputation of the Obedience of Christ to the Law, declared and vindicated,	282
CHAPTER XIII.—The Nature of Justification proved from the difference of the Covenants,	303
CHAPTER XIV.—The Exclusion of all sorts of Works from an interest in Justification. What intended by the Law, and the works of it, in the Epistles of Paul,	311
CHAPTER XV.—Faith alone,	326
CHAPTER XVI.—The Truth pleaded, further confirmed by Testimonies of Scripture, Jer. xxiii. 6,	330
CHAPTER XVII.—Testimonies out of the Evangelists, considered,	335
CHAPTER XVIII.—The Nature of Justification as declared in the Epistles of Paul, especially that to the Romans, chap. iii.	343
CHAPTER XIX.—Objections against the Doctrine of Justification, by the Imputation of the Righteousness of Christ. Personal holiness and obedience not obstructed, but furthered by it,	416
CHAPTER XX.—The Doctrine of the Apostle James, concerning Faith and Works. Its agreement with that of Paul,	430

P R E F A C E .

I SHALL not need to detain the reader with an account of the nature and moment of that doctrine which is the entire subject of the ensuing discourse. For, although sundry persons, even among ourselves, have various apprehensions concerning it, yet that the knowledge of the truth therein is of the highest importance to the souls of men, is on all hands agreed to. Nor indeed is it possible that any man who knows himself to be a sinner, and therefore obnoxious thereon to the judgment of God, should not desire to have some knowledge of it, as that alone whereby the way of delivery from the evil state and condition wherein he finds himself is revealed. There are, I confess, multitudes in the world, who, although they cannot avoid some general convictions of sin, as also of the consequences of it, yet do fortify their minds against a practical admission of such conclusions, as in a just consideration of things do necessarily and unavoidably ensue thereon. Such persons wilfully deluding themselves with vain hopes and imaginations, do never once seriously inquire by what way or means they may obtain peace with God and acceptance before him, which, in comparison of the present enjoyment of the pleasures of sin, they value not at all. And it is in vain to recommend the doctrine of justification to them, who neither desire nor endeavour to be justified. But where any persons are really made sensible of their apostasy from God, of the evil of their natures and lives, with the dreadful consequences that attend thereon in the wrath of God, and eternal punishment due to sin, they cannot well judge themselves more concerned in any thing, than in the knowledge of that divine way whereby they may be delivered from this condition. And the minds of such persons stand in no need of arguments to satisfy them in the importance of this doctrine; their own concernment in it, is sufficient to that purpose. And I shall assure them, that in the handling of it from first to last, I have had no other design, but only to inquire diligently into the divine revelation of that way, and those means, with the causes of them, whereby the conscience of a distressed sinner may attain assured peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ. I lay more weight on the steady direction of one soul in this inquiry, than in disappointing the objections of twenty wrangling or fiery disputers. The question therefore to this purpose being stated, as the reader will find in the beginning of our discourse, although it were necessary to spend some time in the

explication of the doctrine itself, and the terms wherein it is usually taught, yet the main weight of the whole lies in the interpretation of Scripture testimonies, with the application of them to the experience of them who believe, and the state of them who seek after salvation by Jesus Christ. There are therefore some few things that I would desire the reader to take notice of, that he may receive benefit by the ensuing discourse; at least, if it be not his own fault, be freed from prejudices against it, or a vain opposition to it.

1. Although there are at present various contests about the doctrine of justification, and many books published in the way of controversy about it; yet this discourse was written with no design to contend with, or contradict any of what sort or opinion soever. Some few passages which seem of that tendency, are indeed occasionally inserted. But they are such as every candid reader will judge to have been necessary. I have ascribed no opinion to any particular person, much less wrested the words of any, reflected on their persons, censured their abilities, taken advantages of presumed prejudices against them, represented their opinions in the deformed reflections of strained consequences, fancied intended notions which their words do not express, nor, candidly interpreted, give any countenance to, or endeavoured the vain pleasure of seeming success, in opposition to them, which with the like effects of weakness of mind and disorder of affections, are the animating principles of many late controversial writings. To declare and vindicate the truth to the instruction and edification of such as love it in sincerity, to extricate their minds from those difficulties in this particular instance, which some endeavour to cast on all gospel mysteries, to direct the consciences of them that inquire after abiding peace with God, and to establish the minds of them that do believe, are the things I have aimed at. And an endeavour to this end, considering all circumstances, that station which God has been pleased graciously to give me in the church, has made necessary to me.

2. I have written nothing but what I believe to be true, and useful to the promotion of gospel obedience. The reader may not here expect an extraction of other men's notions, or a collection and improvement of their arguments, either by artificial reasonings, or ornament of style and language, but a naked inquiry into the nature of the things treated on, as revealed in the Scripture, and as evidencing themselves in their power and efficacy on the minds of them that do believe. It is the practical direction of the consciences of men in their application to God by Jesus Christ, for deliverance from the curse due to the apostate state, and peace with him, with the influence of the way thereof upon universal gospel obedience, that is alone to be designed in the handling of this doctrine. And therefore to him that would treat of it in a due manner, it is required that he weigh every thing he asserts in his own mind and experience, and not dare to propose that to others which he does not abide by himself, in the most intimate recesses of his mind, under his

nearest approaches to God, in his surprisals with dangers, in deep afflictions, in his preparations for death, and most humble contemplations of the infinite distance between God and him.

Other notions and disputations about the doctrine of justification not seasoned with these ingredients, however seasoned to the palate of some by skill and language, are insipid and useless, immediately degenerating into an unprofitable strife of words.

3. I know that the doctrine here pleaded for, is charged by many with an unfriendly aspect towards the necessity of personal holiness, good works, and all gospel obedience in general, yea utterly to take it away. So it was at the first clear revelation of it by the Apostle Paul, as he frequently declares. But it is sufficiently evinced by him to be the chief principle of, and motive to all that obedience which is accepted with God through Jesus Christ, as we shall manifest afterwards. However it is acknowledged that the objective grace of the gospel in the doctrine of it, is liable to abuse, where there is nothing of the subjective grace of it in the hearts of men; and the ways of its influence upon the life of God, are uncouth to the reasonings of carnal minds. So was it charged by the Papists at the first reformation, and continues yet so to be. Yet as it gave the first occasion to the Reformation itself, so was it that whereby the souls of men being set at liberty from their bondage to innumerable superstitious fears and observances, utterly inconsistent with true gospel obedience, and directed into the ways of peace with God through Jesus Christ, were made fruitful in real holiness, and to abound in all those blessed effects of the life of God, which were never found among their adversaries. The same charge was afterwards renewed by the Socinians, and continues still to be managed by them. But I suppose wise and impartial men will not lay much weight on their accusations, until they have manifested the efficacy of their contrary persuasion by better effects and fruits than yet they have done. What sort of men they were who first coined that system of religion which they adhere to, one who knew them well enough, and sufficiently inclined to their anti-trinitarian opinions, declares in one of the queries that he proposed to Socinus himself and his followers. If this, says he, be the truth which you contend for, whence comes it to pass that it is declared only by persons, *nulla pictatis commendatione, nullo laudato prioris vite exemplo commendatos: imo ut plerumque videmus, per vagabundos, et contentionum zeli carnalis plenos homines, alios ex castris, autis, ganeis protatum esse.* (*Scrupuli ab excellenti viro propositi, inter oper. Socin.*) The fiercest charge of such men against any doctrines they oppose as inconsistent with the necessary motives to godliness, are a recommendation of it to the minds of considerative men. And there cannot be a more effectual engine plied for the ruin of religion, than for men to declaim against the doctrine of justification by faith alone, and other truths concerning the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, as

those which overthrow the necessity of moral duties, good works, and gospel obedience, whilst under the conduct of the opinions which they embrace in opposition to them, they give not the least evidence of the power of truth, or grace of the gospel upon their own hearts, or in their lives. Whereas therefore the whole gospel is the truth which is after godliness, declaring and exhibiting that grace of God which teaches us to deny all ungodliness and worldly lusts, and that we should live soberly and righteously and godly in this world; we being fallen into those times wherein, under great and fierce contests about notions, opinions, and practices in religion, there is an horrible decay in true gospel purity and holiness of life amongst the generality of men, I shall readily grant, that keeping a due regard to the only standard of truth, a secondary trial of doctrines proposed and contended for, may and ought to be made by the ways, lives, walkings and conversations of them by whom they are received and professed. And although it is acknowledged that the doctrine pleaded in the ensuing discourse be liable to be abused, yea turned into licentiousness by men of corrupt minds through the prevalency of vicious habits in them (as is the whole doctrine of the grace of God by Jesus Christ) and although the way and means of its efficacy and influence upon universal obedience to God in righteousness and true holiness, be not discernible without some beam of spiritual light, nor will give an experience of their power to the minds of men utterly destitute of a principle of spiritual life; yet if it cannot preserve its station in the church by this rule, of its useful tendency to the promotion of godliness, and its necessity thereto, in all them by whom it is really believed and received in its proper light and power, and that in the experience of former and present times, I shall be content that it be exploded.

4. Finding that not a few have esteemed it compliant with their interest, to publish exceptions against some few leaves, which in the handling of a subject of another nature I occasionally wrote many years ago on this subject, I am not without apprehensions, that either the same persons or others of a like temper and principles may attempt an opposition to what is here expressly tendered thereon. On supposition of such an attempt, I shall in one word let the authors of it know, wherein alone I shall be concerned. For if they shall make it their business to cavil at expressions, to wrest my words, withdraw inferences and conclusions from them not expressly owned by me, to revile my person, to catch at advantages in any occasional passages, or other unessential parts of the discourse, labouring for an appearance of success and reputation to themselves thereby, without a due attendance to Christian moderation, candour and ingenuousness, I shall take no more notice of what they say or write, than I would do of the greatest impertinencies that can be reported in this world. The same I say concerning oppositions of the like nature to any other writings of mine; a work which as I hear, some are at present engaged in. I have some-

what else to do than to cast away any part of the small remainder of my life in that kind of controversial writings which good men bewail, and wise men deride. Whereas therefore, the principal design of this discourse, is to state the doctrine of justification from the Scripture, and to confirm it by the testimonies thereof, I shall not esteem it spoken against, unless our exposition of Scripture testimonies, and the application of them to the present argument be disproved by just rules of interpretation, and another sense of them be evinced. All other things which I conceive necessary to be spoken to, in order to the right understanding and due improvement of the truth pleaded for, are comprised and declared in the ensuing general discourses to that purpose; these few things I thought meet to mind the reader of.

JOHN OWEN.

From my Study,
May the 30th, 1677.

ADVERTISEMENT.

IN this edition of Dr. Owen's important and profound work on Justification, the punctuation, by which the meaning was, in many instances, obscured, if not destroyed, has been corrected throughout; some redundant expressions have been lopped off; some obsolete words have been changed into more intelligible ones; the Latin and Greek quotations have been removed from the text to the bottom of the page; and those which the author had left untranslated, have been translated. In most instances, the Hebrew, in quotations from the Old Testament, has been omitted, as not required by those who can consult the original, and useless to those who cannot. On the whole, it is believed that the present will not suffer in comparison with any former edition of this valuable work.

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS
PREVIOUSLY NECESSARY TO THE EXPLANATION
OF THE
DOCTRINE OF JUSTIFICATION.

THAT we may treat of the doctrine of justification usefully to its proper ends, which are the glory of God in Christ, with the peace and furtherance of the obedience of believers, some things are previously to be considered, which we must have respect to in the whole process of our discourse. And among others that might be insisted on to the same purpose, these that ensue are not to be omitted.

1. The first inquiry in this matter in a way of duty, is after the proper relief of the conscience of a sinner, pressed and perplexed with a sense of the guilt of sin. For justification is the way and means whereby such a person obtains acceptance before God, with a right and title to a heavenly inheritance. And nothing is pleadable in this cause, but what a man would speak to his own conscience in that state, or to the conscience of another, when he is anxious under that inquiry. Wherefore, the person under consideration, that is, who is to be justified, is one who in himself is *ἀσεβής*, Rom. iv. 5, “ungodly;” and thereon *ἰποδίκτος τῷ Θεῷ*; chap. iii. 19, “guilty before God;” that is, obnoxious, subject, liable *τῷ δικαίωματι τοῦ Θεοῦ*, chap. i. 32; to the righteous sentential “judgment of God,” that he who committeth sin, who is any way guilty of it, is worthy of death. Hereupon such a person finds himself *ὑπο καταραῶν*, Gal. iii. 10; “under the curse,” and “the wrath of God” therein “abiding on him,” John iii. 18, 36. In this condition he is *ἀπαρολογητός*; without plea;

“without excuse,” by any thing in and from himself, for his own relief; his mouth is stopped,” Rom. iii. 19. For he is, in the judgment of God, declared in the Scripture *συγκληθεις ἐφ’ ἑμαυτον*; Gal. iii. 22, every way “shut up under sin” and all the consequences of it. Many evils in this condition are men subject to, which may be reduced to those two of our first parents, wherein they were represented. For first, they thought foolishly to hide themselves from God, and then more foolishly, would have charged him as the cause of their sin. And such naturally are the thoughts of men under their convictions. But, whoever is the subject of the justification inquired after, is by various means brought into his apprehensions, who cried, “Sirs! what must I do to be saved?”

2. With respect to this state and condition of men, or men in this state and condition, the inquiry is: What that is, upon the account whereof God pardons all their sins, receives them into his favour, declares or pronounces them righteous, and acquitted from all guilt, removes the curse, and turns away all his wrath from them, giving them right and title to a blessed immortality, or life eternal. This is that alone wherein the consciences of sinners in this estate are concerned. Nor do they inquire after any thing, but what they may have to oppose to, or answer the justice of God in the commands and curse of the law, and what they may betake themselves to, for the obtaining of acceptance with him to life and salvation.

That the Apostle does thus and no otherwise state this whole matter, and in answer to this inquiry, declare the nature of justification and all the causes of it, in the third and fourth chapters of the Epistle to the Romans, and elsewhere, shall be afterwards declared and proved. And we shall also manifest that the Apostle James, in the second chapter of his Epistle, does not speak to this inquiry, nor give an answer to it; but it is of justification in another sense, and to another purpose whereof he treats. And whereas we cannot either safely or usefully treat of this doctrine, but with respect to the same ends for which it is declared, and whereunto it is applied in the Scripture; we should not by any pretences be turned aside from attending to this case and its resolution, in all our discourses on this subject. For it is the direction, satisfaction and peace of the consciences of men, and not the curiosity of notions or subtilty of disputations, which it is our duty to design. And therefore I shall, as much as possibly I may,

avoid all those philosophical terms and distinctions, wherewith this evangelical doctrine has been perplexed, rather than illustrated. For more weight is to be put on the steady guidance of the mind and conscience of one believer, really exercised about the foundation of his peace and acceptance with God, than on the confutation of ten wrangling disputers.

3. Now the inquiry on what account or for what cause and reason a man may be so acquitted or discharged of sin, and accepted with God as before declared, doth necessarily issue in this: Whether it be any thing in ourselves, as our faith and repentance, the renovation of our natures, inherent habits of grace, and actual works of righteousness, which we have done, or may do; or whether it be the obedience, righteousness, satisfaction, and merit of the Son of God, our mediator and surety of the covenant, imputed to us. One of these it must be, namely, something that is our own, which, whatever may be the influence of the grace of God in it, or causality of it, because wrought in and by us, is inherently our own in a proper sense; or something, which being not our own, not inherent in us, not wrought by us, is yet imputed unto us, for the pardon of our sins, and the acceptation of our persons as righteous; or the making of us righteous in the sight of God. Neither are these things capable of mixture or composition, Rom. xi. 6. Which of these it is the duty, wisdom and safety of a convinced sinner to rely upon and trust to in his appearance before God, is the sum of our present inquiry.

4. The way whereby sinners do, or ought to betake themselves to this relief, on supposition that it is the righteousness of Christ, and how they come to be partakers of, or interested in that which is not inherently their own, to as good benefit and as much advantage, as if it were there own, is of a distinct consideration. And as this also is clearly determined in the Scripture, so it is acknowledged in the experience of all them that do truly believe. Neither are we in this matter much to regard the senses or arguings of men, who were never thoroughly convinced of sin, nor have ever in their own persons "fled for refuge unto the hope set before them."

5. These things I say are always to be attended to, in our whole disquisition into the nature of evangelical justification; for without a constant respect to them, we shall quickly wander into curious and perplexed questions, wherein the consciences of guilty sinners are not concerned; and which therefore really belong not to the substance or truth of this doc-

trine, nor are to be mixed therewith. It is alone the relief of those who are in themselves *ἑποδίζονται τῷ Θεῷ*, guilty before, or obnoxious and liable to the judgment of God, that we inquire after. That this is not any thing in or of themselves, nor can so be; that it is a provision without them, made in infinite wisdom and grace by the mediation of Christ, his obedience and death therein, is secured in the Scripture, against all contradiction; and it is the fundamental principle of the gospel, Matt. xi. 28.

6. It is confessed, that many things for the declaration of the truth, and the order of the dispensation of God's grace herein, are necessarily to be insisted on; such are the nature of justifying faith, the place and use of it in justification, the causes of the new covenant, the true notion of the mediation and suretyship of Christ, and the like, which shall all of them be inquired into. But beyond what tends directly to the guidance of the minds, and satisfaction of the souls of men, who seek after a stable and abiding foundation of acceptance with God, we are not easily to be drawn, unless we are free to lose the benefit and comfort of this most important evangelical truth, in needless and unprofitable contentions. And amongst many other miscarriages which men are subject to, whilst they are conversant about these things, this, in an especial manner, is to be avoided.

7. For the doctrine of justification is directive of Christian practice, and in no other evangelical truth is the whole of our obedience more concerned; for the foundation, reasons, and motives, of all our duty towards God, are contained therein. Wherefore, in order to the due improvement of them, ought it to be taught, and not otherwise. That which alone we aim (or ought so to do) to learn in it and by it, is how we may get and maintain peace with God, and so live unto him, as to be accepted with him in what we do. To satisfy the minds and consciences of men in these things is this doctrine to be taught. Wherefore, to carry it out of the understandings of ordinary Christians, by speculative notions and distinctions, is disserviceable to the faith of the Church. Yea, the mixing of evangelical revelations with philosophical notions, has been, in sundry ages, the poison of religion. Pretence of accuracy and artificial skill in teaching, is that which gives countenance to such a way of handling sacred things. But the spiritual amplitude of Divine truths is restrained hereby, whilst low, mean philosophical senses are imposed on them. And

not only so, but endless divisions and contentions are occasioned and perpetuated. Hence, when any difference in religion is, in the pursuit of controversies about it, brought into the field of metaphysical respects and philosophical terms, whereof there is *πολλὸς νόμος εἶδα καὶ εἶδα*, sufficient provision for the supply of the combatants on both sides, the truth for the most part, as to any concernment of the souls of men therein, is utterly lost, and buried in the rubbish of senseless and unprofitable words. And thus, in particular, those who seem to be well enough agreed in the whole doctrine of justification, so far as the Scripture goes before them, and the experience of believers keeps them company, when once they engage in their philosophical definitions and distinctions, are at such an irreconcilable variance among themselves, as if they were agreed on no one thing that doth concern it. For as men have various apprehensions in coining such definitions as may be defensible against objections, which most men aim at therein; so, no proposition can be so plain, (at least in *materia probabilis*;) but that a man ordinarily versed in pædagogical terms and metaphysical notions, may multiply distinctions on every word of it.

8. Hence there has been a pretence and appearance of twenty several opinions among Protestants, about justification; as Bellarmine and Vasquez and others of the Papists charge it against them, out of Osiander, when the faith of them all was one and the same, Bellar. lib. 5. cap. 1. Vasq. in 1. 2. Quæst. 113. disp. 202, whereof we shall speak elsewhere. When men are once advanced into that field of disputation, which is all overgrown with thorns of subtilties, perplexed notions, and futile terms of art, they consider principally how they may entangle others in it; scarce at all, how they may get out of it themselves. And in this posture they oftentimes utterly forget the business which they are about, especially in this matter of justification; namely, how a guilty sinner may come to obtain favour and acceptance with God. And not only so, but I doubt they oftentimes dispute themselves beyond what they can well abide by, when they return home to a sedate meditation of the state of things between God and their own souls. And I cannot much value their notions and sentiments of this matter, who object and answer themselves out of a sense of their own appearance before God, much less of theirs, who evidence an open inconformity to the grace and truth of this doctrine, in their hearts and lives.

9. Wherefore, we do but trouble the faith of Christians, and the peace of the true Church of God, whilst we dispute about expressions, terms and notions, when the substance of the doctrine intended, may be declared and believed, without the knowledge, understanding, or use of any of them. Such are all those in whose subtle management, the captious art of wrangling does principally consist. A diligent attendance to the revelation, made hereof in the Scripture, and an examination of our own experience thereby, is the sum of what is required of us for the right understanding of the truth herein. And every true believer who is taught of God, knows how to put his whole trust in Christ alone, and the grace of God by him, for mercy, righteousness and glory, and not at all concern himself with those loads of thorns and briars, which, under the names of definitions, distinctions, accurate notions, in a number of exotic, pædagogical and philosophical terms, some pretend to accommodate them withal.

10. The Holy Ghost in expressing the most eminent acts in our justification, especially as to our believing, or the acting of that faith whereby we are justified, is pleased to make use of many metaphorical expressions. For any to use them now, in the same way, and to the same purpose, is esteemed rude, undisciplinatory, and even ridiculous; but on what grounds? He that shall deny, that there is more spiritual sense and experience conveyed by them into the hearts and minds of believers, (which is the life and soul of teaching things practical,) than in the most accurate philosophical expressions, is himself really ignorant of the whole truth in this matter. The propriety of such expressions belongs, and is confined to natural science; but spiritual truths are to be taught, not "in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth, comparing spiritual things with spiritual." God is wiser than man, and the Holy Ghost knows better what are the most expedient ways for the illumination of our minds, with that knowledge of evangelical truths, which it is our duty to have and attain, than the wisest of us all. And other knowledge of, or skill in these things, than what is required of us in a way of duty, is not to be valued.

It is therefore to no purpose to handle the mysteries of the gospel, as if Holcot and Bricot, Thomas and Gabriel, with all the Sententialists, Summists, and Quodlibetarians of the old Roman peripatetical school, were to be raked out of their graves to be our guides. Especially will they be of no use to

us, in this doctrine of justification. For whereas they pertinaciously adhered unto the philosophy of Aristotle, who knew nothing of any righteousness, but what is a habit inherent in ourselves, and the acts of it, they wrested the whole doctrine of justification unto a compliance therewithal.*

Secondly—A due consideration of Him with whom in this matter we have to do, and that immediately, is necessary to a right stating of our thoughts about it. The Scripture expresses it emphatically, that, “it is God that justifieth,” Rom. viii. 33. And he assumes it to himself as his prerogative, to do what belongs therunto. “I, even I am he that blotteth out thy transgressions for my own sake, and will not remember thy sins,” Isa. xliii. 25. And it is hard, in my apprehension, to suggest to him any other reason, or consideration of the pardon of our sins; seeing he has taken it on him to do it for his own sake, that is, “for the Lord’s sake,” Dan. ix. 17., in whom “all the seed of Israel are justified,” Isa. xlv. 25. In his sight, before his tribunal, it is, that men are justified or condemned, Psal. cxliii. 2. “Enter not into judgment with thy servant; for in thy sight shall no man living be justified.” And the whole work of justification, with all that belongs thereto, is represented after the manner of a juridical proceeding before God’s tribunal, as we shall see afterwards. Therefore, saith the Apostle, “by the deeds of the law shall no flesh be justified in his sight,” Rom. iii. 20. However any may be justified in the sight of men or angels, by their own obedience, or deeds of the law, yet in his sight, none can be so.

Necessary it is to any man who is to come to a trial, in the sentence whereof he is greatly concerned, duly to consider the judge before whom he is to appear, and by whom his cause is finally to be determined. And if we manage our disputes about justification, without a continual regard to him, by whom we must be cast or acquitted, we shall not rightly apprehend what our plea ought to be. Wherefore, the greatness, the majesty, the holiness and sovereign authority of God, are always to be present with us, in a due sense of them, when we inquire how we may be justified before him. Yet, it is hard to discern how the minds of some men are influenced by the con-

* So Pighius himself complained of them, Controv. 2. *Dissimulare non possumus, hanc vel primam doctrinæ Christianæ partem (de justificatione) obscuratam magis quam illustratam a scholasticis, spinosis plerisque questionibus, et definitionibus, secundum quas nonnulli magno supercilio primam in omnibus auctoritatem arrogantes, &c.*

sideration of these things, in their fierce contests for the interest of their own works in their justification. But the Scripture represents to us, what thoughts of him, and of themselves, not only sinners, but saints also have had, and cannot but have, upon near discoveries and effectual conceptions of God and his greatness. Thoughts hereof ensuing on a sense of the guilt of sin, filled our first parents with fear and shame, and put them on that foolish attempt of hiding themselves from him. Nor is the wisdom of their posterity one jot better under their convictions, without a discovery of the promise. That alone makes sinners wise, which tenders them relief. At present, the generality of men are secure, and do not much question but that they shall come off well enough one way or other, in the trial they are to undergo. And as such persons are altogether indifferent what doctrine concerning justification is taught and received, so for the most part, for themselves, they incline to that declaration of it, which best suits their own reason, as influenced with self-conceit, and corrupt affections. The sum hereof is, that what they cannot do themselves, what is wanting that they may be saved, be it more or less, shall one way or other be made up by Christ, either the use or the abuse of which persuasion is the greatest fountain of sin in the world, next to the depravity of our nature. And whatever be, or may be pretended to the contrary, persons not convinced of sin, not humbled for it, are, in all their ratiocinations about spiritual things, under the conduct of principles so vitiated and corrupted. See Matt. xviii. 3, 4. But when God is pleased by any means to manifest his glory to sinners, all their former trusts and contrivances issue in dreadful horror and distress. An account of their temper is given us, Isa. xxxiii. 14. "The sinners in Sion are afraid, fearfulness hath surprised the hypocrites: who among us shall dwell with the devouring fire? who among us shall dwell with everlasting burnings?" Nor is it thus only with some peculiar sort of sinners. The same will be the thoughts of all guilty persons, at some time or other. For those who through sensuality, security, or superstition, do hide themselves from the vexation of them in this world, will not fail to meet with them when their terror shall be increased, and become remediless. "Our God is a consuming fire," and men will one day find, how vain it is to set their briars and thorns against him in battle array. And we may see what extravagant contrivances convinced sinners will put themselves upon, under any real view of the majesty and

holiness of God: Micah, vi. 6, 7. "Wherewith (saith one of them) shall I come before the Lord, and bow myself before the high God? shall I come before him with burnt offerings, with calves of a year old? will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousands of rivers of oil? shall I give my first born for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?" Neither shall I ever think them meet to be contended withal about the doctrine of justification, who take no notice of these things, but rather despise them.

This is the proper effect of the conviction of sin, strengthened and sharpened with the consideration of the terror of the Lord, who is to judge concerning it. And this is that, which in the Papacy meeting with an ignorance of the righteousness of God, has produced innumerable superstitious inventions, for the appeasing of the consciences of men, who by any means fall under the disquietments of such convictions. For they quickly see that nothing of the obedience which God requires of them, as it is performed by them, will justify them before this high and holy God. Wherefore they seek for shelter in contrivances about things that he has not commanded, to try if they can put a cheat upon their consciences, and find relief in diversions.

Nor is it thus only with profligate sinners upon their convictions, but the best of men, when they have had near and efficacious representations of the greatness, holiness, and glory of God, have been cast into the deepest self-abasement, and most serious renunciations of all trust or confidence in themselves. So the prophet Isaiah, upon his vision of the glory of the Holy One, cried out, "Woe is me, I am undone, because I am a man of unclean lips;" chap. vi. 5, nor was he relieved but by an evidence of the free pardon of sin, ver. 7. So holy Job, in all his contests with his friends, who charged him with hypocrisy, and his being a sinner, guilty in a peculiar manner above other men, with assured confidence and perseverance therein, justified his sincerity, his faith and trust in God, against their whole charge and every parcel of it. And this he does with such a full satisfaction of his own integrity, as that not only he insists at large on his vindication, but frequently appeals to God himself, as to the truth of his plea. For he directly pursues that counsel which the apostle James so long after gives to all believers; nor is the doctrine of that apostle more eminently exemplified in any one instance throughout the whole Scripture, than in him. For he shows his faith

by his works, and pleads his justification thereby. As Job justified himself, and was justified by his works, so we allow it the duty of every believer to be. His plea for justification by works, in the sense wherein it is so, was the most noble that ever was in the world, nor was ever any controversy managed upon a greater occasion.

At length this Job is called into the immediate presence of God, to plead his own cause, not now as stated between him and his friends, whether he were an hypocrite or no, or whether his faith or trust in God was sincere; but as it was stated between God and him, wherein he seemed to have made some undue assumptions on his own behalf. The question was now reduced to this: on what grounds he might or could be justified in the sight of God? To prepare his mind to a right judgment in this case, God manifests his glory to him, and instructs him in the greatness of his majesty and power. And this he does by a multiplication of instances, because under our temptations, we are very slow in admitting right conceptions of God. Here the holy man quickly acknowledged, that the state of the case was utterly altered. All his former pleas of faith, hope, and trust in God, of sincerity in obedience, which with so much earnestness he before insisted on, are now quite laid aside. He saw well enough that they were not pleadable at the tribunal before which he now appeared, so that God should enter into judgment with him thereon, with respect to his justification. Wherefore, in the deepest self-abasement and abhorrence, he betakes himself unto sovereign grace and mercy. For then "Job answered the Lord and said, Behold I am vile, what shall I answer thee? I will lay mine hand upon my mouth: once have I spoken, but I will not answer, yea, twice, but I will proceed no further," Job xl. 3—5. And again, "Hear, I beseech thee, and I will speak, I will demand of thee, and declare thou unto me: I have heard of thee by the hearing of the ear, but now mine eye seeth thee: wherefore I abhor myself, and repent in dust and ashes," chap. xlii. 4—6. Let any men place themselves in the condition wherein now Job was, in the immediate presence of God; let them attend to what he really speaks to them in his word, namely what they will answer to the charge that he has against them, and what will be their best plea before his tribunal, that they may be justified. I do not believe that any man living has more encouraging grounds to plead for an interest in his own faith and obedience, in his justification before God, than

Job had; although I suppose he had not so much skill to manage a plea to that purpose with scholastic notions and distinctions, as the Jesuits have. But, however we may be harnessed with subtle arguments and solutions, I fear it will not be safe for us to adventure further upon God, than he dared to do.

There was of old, a direction for the visitation of the sick, composed, as they say, by Anselm, and published by Casparus Vlenbergius, which expresses a better sense of these things, than some seem to be convinced of.* “Dost thou believe that thou canst not be saved, but by the death of Christ? The sick man answereth, yes; then let it be said unto him, Go to, then, and whilst thy soul abideth in thee, put all thy confidence in this death alone, place thy trust in no other thing, commit thyself wholly to this death, cover thyself wholly with this alone, cast thyself wholly on this death, wrap thyself wholly in this death. And if God would judge thee, say, Lord, I place the death of our Lord Jesus Christ between me and thy judgment; and otherwise I will not contend, or enter into judgment with thee. And if he shall say unto thee, that thou art a sinner, say, I place the death of our Lord Jesus Christ between me and my sins. If he shall say unto thee, that thou hast deserved damnation, say, Lord, I put the death of our Lord Jesus Christ between thee and all my sins; and I offer his merits for my own, which I should have, and have not. If he say that he is angry with thee, say, Lord, I place the death of our Lord Jesus Christ between me and thy anger.” Those who gave these directions, seem to have been sensible of what it is to appear before the tribunal of God; and how unsafe it will be for us there to insist on any thing in ourselves. Hence are the words of the same Anselm in his meditations.† “My conscience hath

* *Credisne te non posse salvari nisi per mortem Christi? Respondet infirmus. Etiam; tum dicit illi; Age ergo dum superest in te anima, in hac sola morte fiduciam tuam constitue; in nulla alia re fiduciam habe, huic morti te totum committe, hac sola te totum contege, totum immisce te in hac morte, in hac morte totum te involve. Et si Dominus te voluerit judicare. Dic, Domine, mortem Domini nostri Jesu Christi obicio inter me et tuum iudicium; aliter tecum non contendo. Et si tibi dixerit quia peccator es, dic, mortem Domini nostri Jesu Christi pono inter me et peccata mea. Si dixerit tibi quod meruisti damnationem; dic, Domine, mortem Domini nostri Jesu Christi obtendo inter te et mala merita mea, ipsiusque merita offero pro merito quod ego debuissim habere nec habeo; si dixerit quod tibi est iratus, dic, Domine, mortem Domini Jesu Christi oppono inter me et iram tuam.*

† *Conscientia mea meruit damnationem, et penitentia mea non sufficit ad satisfactionem, sed certum est quod misericordia tua superat omnem offensionem.*

deserved damnation, and my repentance is not sufficient for satisfaction, but most certain it is, that thy mercy aboundeth above all offence." And this seems to me a better direction, than those more lately given by some of the Roman church. Such is the prayer suggested to a sick man, by Johan. Polanus, lib. *Methodus in adjuvandis morientibus*. "Lord Jesus, join my obedience with all that thou hast done and suffered, out of thy perfect charity and obedience. And with the riches of the satisfactions and merits of this love, deign to offer it to the Eternal Father."* Or that of a greater author, Antidot. Aninge, fol. 17. "O rosy company of the martyrs, offer for me, now and at the hour of my death, the merits of your faithfulness, constancy, and precious blood, together with the blood of the immaculate lamb, shed for the salvation of all."† Hierom, long before Anselm, spake to the same purpose.‡ "When the day of judgment, or of death, shall come, all hands will be dissolved, (that is, faint or fall down,) unto which it is said in another place, Be strengthened, ye hands that hang down. But all hands shall be melted down, (that is, all men's strength and confidence shall fail them,) because no works shall be found which can answer the righteousness of God; for no flesh shall be justified in his sight. Whence the Prophet says, in the Psalm, If thou, Lord, shouldst mark iniquity, who should stand?" And Ambrose to the same purpose.§ "Let no man arrogate any thing unto himself—let no man glory in his own merits or good deeds—let no man boast of his power—let us all hope to find mercy by our Lord Jesus, for we shall all stand before his judgment-seat. Of him will I beg pardon—of him will I desire indulgence—what other hope is there for sinners?"

* Domine Jesu, conjunge, obsecro, obsequium meum cum omnibus qua: tu egisti, et passus es ex tam perfecta charitate et obedientia. Et cum divitiis satisfactionum et meritorum dilectionis, Patri aeterno illud offerre digneris.

† Tu hinc O rosea Martyrum turba offer pro me, nunc et in hora mortis mee; merita fidelitatum, constantia: et pretiosi sanguinis, cum sanguine agni immaculati, pro omnium salute effusi.

‡ Cum dies judicii aut dormitionis advenerit, omnes manus dissolventur; quibus dicitur in alio loco, confortamini manus dissolute; dissolventur autem manus quia nullum opus dignum Dei justitia reperitur, et non justificabitur in conspectu ejus omnis vivens, unde Propheta dicit in Psalmo, si iniquitates attrahas Domine, quis sustinebit? lib. 6, in Isa. in cap. xiii. 5, 6, 7.

§ Nemo ergo sibi arroget, nemo de meritis gloriatur, nemo de potestate se jactet, omnes speremus per Dominum Jesum misericordiam invenire, quoniam omnes ante tribunal ejus stabimus; de illo veniam, de illo indulgentiam postulabo; quoniam spes alia peccatoribus? in Psal. cxix. Resh.

Wherefore, if men will be turned off from a continual regard to the greatness, holiness, and majesty of God, by their inventions in the heat of disputation, if they do forget a reverential consideration of what will become them, and what they may betake themselves to, when they stand before his tribunal, they may engage in such apprehensions, as they dare not abide by in their own personal trial; for, how shall man be just with God? Hence it has been observed, that the schoolmen themselves, in their meditations and devotional writings, wherein they had immediate thoughts of God, with whom they had to do, did speak quite another language, as to justification before God, than they do in their wraugling philosophical fiery disputes about it. And I had rather learn what some men really judge about their own justification, from their prayers, than their writings. Nor do I remember, that I did ever hear any good man in his prayers, use any expressions about justification, pardon of sin, and righteousness before God, wherein any plea from any thing in ourselves, was introduced or made use of. The prayer of Daniel hath, in this matter, been the substance of their supplications. "O Lord! righteousness belongeth unto thee, but unto us confusion of faces; we do not present our supplications before thee for our own righteousness, but for thy great mercies. O Lord hear, O Lord forgive, for thine own sake, O my God," Dan. ix. 7, 18, 19. Or that of the Psalmist, "Enter not into judgment with thy servant, O Lord: for in thy sight shall no man living be justified," Psal. cxliii. 2. Or, "If thou, Lord, mark iniquity, Lord, who shall stand? but there is forgiveness with thee, that thou mayest be feared," Psal. cxxx. 2—4. On which words, the exposition of Austin is remarkable, speaking of David, and applying it to himself. "Lo, he cries out under the burden of his iniquities. He has examined himself, he has examined his life, he sees it covered with scandalous crimes; wherever he looks he finds no goodness in himself. And when he sees on every hand such numerous and aggravated sins, as if in terror he exclaims, 'If thou, Lord, shouldst mark iniquities, who shall stand?' For he sees that the whole life of man is beset with sins, like barking dogs; that all consciences are accused by their own thoughts, that a pure heart can not be found which can lay hold of righteousness. This being the case, let the hearts of all lay hold of the mercy of the Lord their God, and say to him, 'If thou, Lord, shouldst mark iniquities, O Lord, who shall stand?' But what is the ground of hope? 'For there is forgive-

ness with thee.'”* And whereas we may, and ought to represent unto God in our supplications, our faith, or what it is that we believe herein; I much question, whether some men can find in their hearts to pray over and plead before him, all the arguments and distinctions they make use of, to prove the interest of our works and obedience, in our justification before him, or enter into judgment with him, upon the conclusions which they make from them. Nor will many be satisfied to make use of that prayer which Pelagius taught the widow, as it was objected to him in the Diaspoltitan Synod.† “Thou knowest, O Lord, how holy, how innocent, how pure from all deceit and rapine, are the hands which I stretch forth unto thee; how just, how unspotted with evil, how free from lying are those lips wherewith I pour forth prayers unto thee, that thou wouldst have mercy on me.” And yet, although he taught her so to plead her own purity, innocency and righteousness before God, yet he does it not, as those whereon she might be absolutely justified, but only as the condition of her obtaining mercy. Nor have I observed, that any public Liturgies (the Mass-Book only excepted, wherein there is a frequent recourse to the merits and intercession of saints,) do guide men in their prayers before God, to plead any thing for their acceptance with him, or as the means or condition thereof, but grace, mercy, the righteousness and blood of Christ alone.

Wherefore, I cannot but judge it best, (others may think of it as they please,) for those who would teach or learn the doctrine of justification in a due manner, to place their consciences in the presence of God, and their persons before his tribunal, and then, upon a due consideration of his greatness, power, majesty, righteousness, holiness, of the terror of his glory, and sovereign authority, to inquire what the Scripture, and a sense of their own condition, direct them to, as their relief and re-

* *Ecce clamat sub molibus iniquitatum suarum. Circumspexit se, circumspexit vitam suam, vidit illam undique flagitiis coopertam, quacunque respexit, nihil in se boni invenit: Et cum tanta et tam multa peccata undique viderit, tamquam exprovescens, exclamavit, si iniquitates observaris Domine, quis sustinebit? videt enim prope totam vitam humanam circumlatrari peccatis; accusari omnes conscientias cogitationibus suis, non inveniri eor. castum presumens de justitia, quod quia inveniri non potest, presumat ergo omnium eor. de misericordia Domini Dei sui, et dicat Deo, si iniquitates observaris Domine, Domine quis sustinebit? Que autem est spes? quoniam apud te propitius est.*

† *Tu nosti Domine quam sancto, quam innocentes, quam pure ab omni fraude et rapina quas ad te expando manus; quam justa, quam immacolata labia et ab omni mendacio libera, quibus tibi ut mihi miseraris preces fundo.*

fuge, and what plea it becomes them to make for themselves. Secret thoughts of God and ourselves—retired meditations—the conduct of the spirit in humble supplications—death-bed preparations for an immediate appearance before God—faith and love in exercise on Christ, speak other things for the most part, than many contend for.

3. A clear apprehension and due sense of the greatness of our apostasy from God—of the depravation of our natures thereby—of the power and guilt of sin—of the holiness and severity of the law, are necessary to a right apprehension of the doctrine of justification. Therefore, to the declaration of it does the Apostle premise a large discourse, thoroughly to convince the minds of all that seek to be justified, with a sense of these things, Rom. i. 2, 3. The rules which he has given us, the method which he prescribes, and the ends which he designs, are those which we shall choose to follow. And he lays it down in general, That the righteousness of God is revealed from faith to faith, and that the just shall live by faith, chap. i. 17. But he declares, not in particular, the causes, nature, and way of our justification, until he hath fully evinced that all men are shut up under this state of sin, and manifested how deplorable their condition is thereby. And in the ignorance of these things, in the denying or palliating of them, lies the foundation of all misbelief about the grace of God. Pelagianism in its first root, and all its present branches, is resolved therinto. For, not apprehending the dread of our original apostasy from God, nor the consequence of it in the universal depravation of our nature, they disown any necessity, either of the satisfaction of Christ, or the efficacy of divine grace, for our recovery or restoration. So, upon the matter, the principal ends of the mission, both of the Son of God, and of the Holy Spirit, are renounced; which issues in the denial of the Deity of the one, and the personality of the other. The fall which we had, being not great, and the disease contracted thereby, being easily curable, and there being little or no evil in these things, which are now unavoidable to our nature, it is no great matter to be freed or justified from all, by a mere act of favour on our own endeavours; nor is the efficacious grace of God any way needful to our sanctification and obedience, as these men suppose.

Where these or the like conceits are admitted, and the minds of men by them kept off from a due apprehension of the state and guilt of sin, and their consciences from being affected with the terror of the Lord, and curse of the law thereon, justified

tion is a notion to be dealt withal, pleasantly or subtilly, as men see occasion. And hence arise the differences about it, at present, I mean those which are really such, and not merely the different ways whereby learned men express their thoughts and apprehensions concerning it.

By some, the imputation of the actual apostasy and transgression of Adam, the head of our nature, whereby his sin became the sin of the world, is utterly denied. Hereby both the ground the Apostle proceeds on, in evincing the necessity of our justification, or our being made righteous by the obedience of another, and all the arguments brought in the confirmation of the doctrine of it, in the fifth chapter of his Epistle to the Romans, are evaded and overthrown. Socinus de Servator, par. 4. cap. 6, confesses that place to give great countenance to the doctrine of justification, by the imputation of the righteousness of Christ. And therefore he sets himself to oppose with sundry artifices, the imputation of the sin of Adam to his natural posterity. For he perceived well enough, that upon the admission thereof, the imputation of the righteousness of Christ to his spiritual seed, would unavoidably follow, according to the tenor of the Apostle's discourse.

Some deny the depravation and corruption of our nature, which ensued on our apostasy from God, and the loss of his image. Or if they do not absolutely deny it, yet they so extenuate it, as to render it a matter of no great concern to us, Some disease and distemper of the soul they will acknowledge, arising from the disorder of our affections, whereby we are apt to receive in such vicious habits and customs, as are in practice in the world. And as the guilt hereof is not much, so the danger of it is not great. And as for any spiritual filth or stain of our nature, that is in it, it is clear washed away from all, by baptism. That deformity of soul which came upon us in the loss of the image of God, wherein the beauty and harmony of all our faculties, in all their actings in order to their utmost end, did consist; that enmity unto God, even in the mind which ensued thereon; that darkness which our understandings were clouded, yea, blinded withal; the spiritual death which passed on the whole soul, and total alienation from the life of God; that impotency unto good; that inclination unto evil; that deceitfulness of sin; that power and efficacy of corrupt lusts, which the Scripture and experience so fully charge on the state of lost nature, are rejected as empty notions or fables. No wonder if such persons look upon imputed righteousness as the

shadow of a dream, who esteem those things which evidence its necessity, to be but fond imaginations. And small hope is there to bring such men to value the righteousness of Christ, as imputed to them, who are so unacquainted with their own unrighteousness inherent in them. Until men know themselves better, they will care very little to know Christ at all.

Against such as these the doctrine of justification may be defended, as we are obliged to contend for the faith once delivered to the saints, and as the mouths of gainsayers are to be stopped. But to endeavour their satisfaction in it, whilst they are under the power of such apprehensions, is a vain attempt. As our Saviour said to them to whom he had declared the necessity of regeneration; "If I have told you earthly things and ye believe not, how shall ye believe if I tell you heavenly things?" so may we say, if men will not believe those things, whereof it would be marvellous, but that the reason of it is known, that they have not an undeniable evidence and experience in themselves, how can they believe those heavenly mysteries which respect a supposition of that within themselves which they will not acknowledge?

Hence some are so far from any concernment in a perfect righteousness to be imputed to them, as that they boast of a perfection in themselves. So did the Pelagians of old, glory of a sinless perfection in the sight of God, even when they were convinced of sinful miscarriages in the sight of men, as they are charged by Jerome, lib. 2. Dialog. and by Austin, lib. 2, contra Julian, cap. 8. Such persons are not fit subjects for hearing the gospel. Men who have no sense in their own hearts and consciences of the spiritual disorder of their souls, of the secret continual actings of sin, with deceit and violence obstructing all that is good, promoting all that is evil, defiling all that is done by them through the lusting of the flesh against the spirit, as contrary to it, though no outward perpetration of sin nor actual omission of duty do ensue thereon; who are not engaged in a constant watchful conflict against the first motions of sin, to whom they are not the greatest burden and sorrow in this life; causing them to cry out for deliverance from them; who can despise those who make acknowledgments in their confession to God, of their sense of these things, with the guilt wherewith they are accompanied, will with an assured confidence reject and condemn what is offered about justification through the obedience and righteousness of Christ imputed to us. For no man will be so fond as to be solicitous of a

righteousness that is not his own, who has at home in a readiness that which is his own, which will serve his turn. It is therefore the ignorance of these things alone, that can delude men into an apprehension of their justification before God by their own personal righteousness. For if they were acquainted with them, they would quickly discern such an imperfection in the best of their duties, such a frequency of sinful irregularities in their minds, and disorders in their affections, such an unsuitableness in all that they are and do, from the inward frames of their hearts to all their outward actions, to the greatness and holiness of God, as would abate their confidence in placing any trust in their own righteousness for their justification.

By means of these and the like presumptuous conceptions of unenlightened minds, the consciences of men are kept off from being affected with a due sense of sin, and a serious consideration how they may obtain acceptance before God. Neither the consideration of the holiness or terror of the Lord; nor the severity of the law as it indispensably requires a righteousness in compliance with its commands; nor the promise of the gospel declaring and tendering a righteousness, the righteousness of God in answer thereto; nor the uncertainty of their own minds upon trials and surprisals, as having no stable ground of peace to anchor on; nor the constant secret disquietment of their consciences, if not seared or hardened through the deceitfulness of sin; can prevail with them whose thoughts are prepossessed with such slight conceptions of the state and guilt of sin, to fly for refuge to the only hope that is set before them, or really and distinctly to comport with the only way of deliverance and salvation.

Wherefore if we would either teach or learn the doctrine of justification in a due manner, a clear apprehension of the greatness of our apostasy from God, a due sense of the guilt of sin, a deep experience of its power, all with respect to the holiness and law of God, are necessary to us. We have nothing to do in this matter with men who through the fever of pride have lost the understanding of their own miserable condition. For as Austin remarks, "Nature is so evidently depraved, that not to see it, is a proof of the greatest depravity."* The whole need not the physician but the sick. Those who are pricked to the heart for sin, and cry out What

* *Natura sic apparet vitata ut hoc majoris vitii sit non videre.*

shall we do to be saved? will understand what we have to say. Against others we must defend the truth as God shall enable. And it may be made good by all sorts of instances, that as men rise in their notions about the extenuation of sin, so they fall in their regard to the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ. And it is no less true also on the other hand, as unbelief works in men a disesteem of the person and righteousness of Christ, they are cast inevitably to seek for countenance to their own consciences, in the extenuation of sin. So insensibly are the minds of men diverted from Christ and seduced to place their confidence in themselves. Some confused respect they have to him, as a relief they know not how nor wherein; but they live in that pretended height of human wisdom, to trust to themselves. So they are instructed to do by the best of the philosophers. "There is but one good, which is the cause and support of a happy life; that is to trust in yourself."* Hence also is the internal sanctifying grace of God among many equally despised with the imputation of the righteousness of Christ. The sum of their faith, and of their arguments in the confirmation of it, is given by the learned Roman orator and philosopher. "No man ever thanks God for virtue; and rightly too. For our virtue is a just ground of praise and glorying, which would not be the case if we had it as a gift from God, and not from ourselves."†

4. The opposition that the Scripture makes between grace and works in general, with the exclusion of the one and the assertion of the other in our justification, deserves a previous consideration. The opposition intended is not made between grace and works or our own obedience, as to their essence, nature and consistency in the order and method of our salvation, but only with respect to our justification. I do not design herein to plead any particular testimonies of Scripture as to their especial sense or declaration of the mind of the Holy Ghost in them, which will afterwards be with some diligence inquired into; but only to take a view which way the eye of the Scripture guides our apprehensions, and what compliance there is in our own experience with that guidance.

The principal seat of this doctrine, as will be confessed by

* *Unum bonum est, quod beate vitæ causa et firmamentum est, tibi fide-re. Senec. Epist. 31.*

† *Virtutem nemo unquam Deo acceptam retulit; nimirum recte. Propter virtutem enim jure laudamur, et in virtute recte gloriamur, quod non contingeret, si donum a Deo, non a nobis haberemus. Tull. de Nat. Deor.*

all, is in the Epistles of Paul to the Romans and Galatians, whereto that also to the Hebrews may be added. But in that to the Romans it is most eminently declared. For therein is it handled by the Apostle *ex professo* at large, and that both doctrinally, and in the way of controversy with them by whom the truth was opposed. And it is worth our consideration what process he makes towards the declaration of it, and what principles he proceeds upon therein.

1. He lays it down as the fundamental maxim which he would proceed upon, or as a general thesis including the substance of what he designed to explain and prove, that, in the gospel "the righteousness of God is revealed from faith to faith, as it is written, The just shall live by faith," chap. i. 17. All sorts of men who had any knowledge of God and themselves were then, as they must be always, inquiring, and in one degree or other labouring after righteousness. For this they looked on, and that justly, as the only means of an advantageous relation between God and themselves. Neither had the generality of men any other thoughts, but that this righteousness must be their own, inherent in them, and performed by them, as Rom. x. 3. For as this is the language of a natural conscience, and of the law, and suited to all philosophical notions concerning the nature of righteousness; so whatever testimony was given of another kind in the law and the prophets, (as such a testimony is given to a righteousness of God without the law, chap. iii. 21,) there was a veil upon it as to the understanding of all sorts of men. As therefore righteousness is that which all men seek after, and cannot but seek after who design or desire acceptance with God, so it is in vain to inquire of the law, of a natural conscience, of philosophical reason, after any righteousness but what consists in inherent habits and acts of our own. Neither law, nor natural conscience, nor reason, do know any other. But in opposition to this righteousness of our own, and the necessity thereof, testified to by the law, in its primitive constitution, by the natural light of conscience, and the apprehension of the nature of things by reason, the apostle declares that in the gospel there is revealed another righteousness which is also the righteousness of another, the righteousness of God, and that from faith to faith. For not only is the righteousness itself revealed foreign from those other principles, but also the manner of our participation of it, or its communication to us from faith to faith, (the faith of God in the revelation, and our faith in the acceptance of it, being only

here concerned) is an eminent revelation. Righteousness of all things should rather seem to be from works to works, from the work of grace in us, to the works of obedience done by us, as the papists affirm. No, says the apostle, it is from faith to faith, whereof afterwards.

This is the general thesis the Apostle proposes for confirmation, and he seems therein to exclude from justification every thing but the righteousness of God and the faith of believers. And to this purpose he considers all persons that did or might pretend to righteousness or seek after it, and all ways and means whereby they hoped to attain to it, or whereby it might most probably be obtained, declaring the failing of all persons, and the insufficiency of all means as to them, for the obtaining a righteousness of our own before God. And as to persons,

1. He considers the Gentiles, with all their notions of God, their practice in religious worship, with their conversation thereon. And from the whole of what might be observed amongst them, he concludes that they neither were, nor could be justified before God, but that they were all, and that most deservedly, obnoxious to the sentence of death. And whatever men may discourse concerning the justification and salvation of any, without the revelation of the righteousness of God by the Gospel from faith to faith, it is expressly contradictory to his whole discourse, chap. i. from ver. 19 to the end.

2. He considers the Jews who enjoyed the written law, and the privileges wherewith it was accompanied, especially that of circumcision, which was the outward seal of God's covenant. And on many considerations, with many arguments, he excludes them also from any possibility of attaining justification before God by any of the privileges they enjoyed, or their own compliance therewithal, chap. ii. And both sorts he excludes distinctly from this privilege of righteousness before God, with this one argument, that both of them sinned openly against that which they took for the rule of their righteousness, namely, the Gentiles against the light of nature, and the Jews against the law; whence it inevitably follows, that none of them could attain to the righteousness of their own rule. But he proceeds further to that which is common to them all. And,

3. He proves the same against all sorts of persons, whether Jews or Gentiles, from the consideration of the universal deprivation of nature in them all, and the horrible effects that necessarily ensue thereon in the hearts and lives of men, chap.

iii. So evincing, that as they all were, so it could not fall out but that all must be shut up under sin, and come short of righteousness. So from persons he proceeds to things or means of righteousness. And,

4. Because the law was given of God immediately as the whole and only rule of our obedience to him, and the works of the law are therefore all that is required of us, these may be pleaded with some pretence as those whereby we may be justified. Wherefore in particular he considers the nature, use, and end of the law, manifesting its utter insufficiency to be a means of our justification before God, chap. iii. 19, 20.

5. It may be yet objected, that the law and its works may be thus insufficient as it is obeyed by unbelievers in the state of nature, without the aids of grace administered in the promise; but with respect to them who are regenerate and do believe, whose faith and works are accepted with God, it may be otherwise. To obviate this objection, he gives an instance in two of the most eminent believers under the Old Testament, namely, Abraham and David, declaring that all works whatsoever were excluded in and from their justification, chap. iv.

On these principles, and by this gradation, he peremptorily concludes, that all and every one of the sons of men, as to any thing that is in themselves or can be done by them, or be wrought in them, are "guilty before God," obnoxious to death, shut up under sin, and have their mouths so stopped, as to be deprived of all pleas in their own excuse; that they had no righteousness wherewith to appear before God, and that all the ways and means whence they expected it, were insufficient to that purpose.

Hereon he proceeds with his inquiry how men may be delivered from this condition, and come to be justified in the sight of God. And in the resolution hereof he makes no mention of any thing in themselves, but only faith whereby we receive the atonement. That whereby we are justified, he says, is the righteousness of God which is by the faith of Christ Jesus, or that we are justified freely by grace through the redemption that is in him, chap. iii. 22—25. And not content here with this answer to the inquiry how lost convinced sinners may come to be justified before God, namely, that it is by the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith, by grace, by the blood of Christ, as he is set forth for a propitiation; he immediately proceeds to a positive exclusion of every thing in and of ourselves that might pretend to an interest herein, as

that which is inconsistent with the righteousness of God as revealed in the gospel, and witnessed to by the law and the prophets. How contrary their scheme of divinity is to this design of the Apostle, and his management of it, who affirm that before the law men were justified by obedience to the light of nature, and some particular revelations made to them in things of their own especial private concernment; and that after the giving of the law they were so by obedience to God according to the directions thereof, as also that the heathen might obtain the same benefit in compliance with the dictates of reason, cannot be contradicted by any who have not a mind to be contentious.

Answerable to this declaration of the mind of the Holy Ghost herein by the Apostle, is the constant tenor of the Scripture speaking to the same purpose. The grace of God, the promise of mercy, the free pardon of sin, the blood of Christ, his obedience and the righteousness of God in him, rested in and received by faith, are every where asserted as the causes and means of our justification, in opposition to any thing in ourselves, so expressed as it useth to express the best of our obedience and the utmost of our personal righteousness. Wherever mention is made of the duties, obedience, and personal righteousness of the best of men with respect to their justification, they are all renounced by them, and they betake themselves to sovereign grace and mercy alone. Some places to this purpose may be recounted.

The foundation of the whole is laid in the first promise wherein the destruction of the work of the devil by the suffering of the seed of the woman, is proposed as the only relief for sinners, and only means of the recovery of the favour of God. "It shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel," Gen. iii. 15. "Abraham believed in the Lord, and he counted it unto him for righteousness," Gen. xv. 6. "And Aaron shall lay both his hands on the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them on the head of the goat; and the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities unto a land not inhabited," Lev. xvi. 21, 22. "I will go in the strength of the Lord God, I will make mention of thy righteousness, even of thine only," Psal. lxxi. 16. "If thou shouldst mark iniquity, O Lord, who shall stand? but there is forgiveness with thee that thou mayest be feared," Psal. cxxx. 3, 4. "Enter not into judgment with thy servant, for in thy sight

shall no man living be justified," Psal. cxliii. 2. "Behold, he put no trust in his servants, and his angels he charged with folly, how much less on them that dwell in houses of clay, whose foundation is in the dust," Job iv. 18, 19. "Fury is not in me; who would set the briers and thorns against me in battle? I would go through them, I would burn them together. Or let him take hold of my strength that he may make peace with me, and he shall make peace with me," Isa. xxvii. 4, 5. "Surely shall one say, In the Lord have I righteousness and strength, in the Lord shall all the seed of Israel be justified and glory," Isa. xlv. 24, 25. "All we like sheep have gone astray, we have turned every one to his own way, and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all. By his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many, for he shall bear their iniquities," Isa. liii. 6, 11. "For this is his name whereby he shall be called, the Lord our Righteousness," Jer. xxiii. 6. "But we are all as an unclean thing, and all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags," Isa. xliv. 6. "He shall finish the transgression and make an end of sin, and make reconciliation for iniquity, and bring in everlasting righteousness," Dan. ix. 24. "Unto as many as received him he gave power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe in his name," John i. 12. "For as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life," chap. iii. 14, 15; see ver. 16—18. "Be it known therefore unto you men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins, and by him all that believe are justified from all things from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses," Acts xiii. 38, 39. "That they may receive forgiveness of sins and inheritance among them that are sanctified by faith that is in me," chap. xxvi. 18. "Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ, Jesus whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God. To declare at this time his righteousness, that he might be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus. Where then is boasting? it is excluded: by what law? of works? nay, but by the law of faith. Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law," Rom. iii. 24—28. "For if Abraham were justified by works, he hath whereof to glory, out not before God; for what saith the Scripture? Abraham be-

lieved God, and it was counted to him for righteousness; now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace but of debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness. Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works, saying, Blessed are those whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered; Blessed is the man unto whom the Lord will not impute sin," Rom. iv. 2--8. "But not as the offence, so also is the free gift; for if through the offence of one, many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many. And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift; for the judgment was by one to condemnation: but the free gift is of many offences unto justification. For if by one man's offence death reigned by one, much more they which receive abundance of grace, and of the gift of righteousness, shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ. Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men unto condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous," chap. v. 15--19. "There is therefore no condemnation unto them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit. For the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus, hath made me free from the law of sin and death; for what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh. That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us," chap. viii. 1--4. "For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness unto every one that believeth," chap. x. 4. "And if by grace, then it is no more of works, otherwise grace is no more grace; but if it be of works, then it is no more grace, otherwise work is no more work," chap. xi. 6. "But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption," 1 Cor. i. 30. "For he 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. "Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ: even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law: for by the

works of the law shall no flesh be justified," Gal. ii. 16. "But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, is evident. For the just shall live by faith, and the law is not of faith; but the man that doth them shall live in them. Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us," chap. iii. 11—13. "For by grace ye are saved through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God. Not of works, lest any man should boast. For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them," Ephes. ii. 8—10. "Yea, doubtless, and I count all things loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord, for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung that I may win Christ; and be found in him, not having my own righteousness which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith," Phil. iii. 8, 9. "Who hath saved us and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according unto his own purpose and grace which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began," 2 Tim. i. 9. "That being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life," Tit. iii. 7. "He hath once appeared in the end of the world to put away sin," Heb. ix. 26. 28. "Having in himself purged our sins," chap. i. 3. "For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified," chap. x. 14. "For the blood of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, cleaueth us from all sin," 1 John i. 7. "Wherefore unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his father, to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever, Amen." Rev. i. 5, 6.

These are some of the places which at present occur to remembrance, wherein the Scripture represents to us the grounds, causes, and reasons of our acceptation with God. The especial import of many of them, and the evidence of truth that is in them, will be afterwards considered. Here we take only a general view of them. And every thing in and of ourselves under any consideration whatever, seems to be excluded from our justification before God, faith alone excepted whereby we receive his grace and the atonement. And on the other side, the whole of our acceptation with him seems to be assigned to grace, mercy, the obedience and blood of Christ; in opposition to our own worth and righteousness, or our own works and obedience. And I cannot but suppose that the

soul of a convinced sinner, if not prepossessed with prejudice, will in general not judge amiss whether of these things that are set in opposition one to the other, he should betake himself to, that he may be justified.

But it is replied, these things are not to be understood absolutely and without limitations. Sundry distinctions are necessary, that we may come to understand the mind of the Holy Ghost and sense of the Scripture in these ascriptions to grace, and exclusions of the law, our own works and righteousness from our justification. For (1.) the law is either the moral or the ceremonial law; the latter indeed is excluded from any place in our justification, but not the former. (2.) Works required by the law are either wrought before faith, without the aid of grace; or after believing, by the help of the Holy Ghost. The former are excluded from our justification, but not the latter. (3.) Works of obedience wrought after grace received, may be considered either as sincere only, or absolutely perfect, according to what was originally required in the covenant of works. Those of the latter sort are excluded from any place in our justification, but not those of the former. (4.) There is a two-fold justification before God in this life, a first and a second; and we must diligently consider with respect to whether of these justifications any thing is spoken in the Scripture. (5.) Justification may be considered either as to its beginning, or as to its continuation, and so it has divers causes under these divers respects. (6.) Works may be considered either as meritorious *ex condigno*, so as their merit should arise from their own intrinsic worth, or *ex congruo*, only with respect to the covenant and promise of God. Those of the first sort are excluded, at least from the first justification; the latter may have place both in the first and second. (7.) Moral causes may be of many sorts; preparatory, dispositive, meritorious, conditionally efficient, or only *sine quibus non*. And we must diligently inquire in what sense, under the notion of what cause or causes, our works are excluded from our justification, and under what notions they are necessary therunto. And there is no one of these distinctions but it needs many more to explain it, which accordingly are made use of by learned men. And so specious a colour may be put on these things, when warily managed by the art of disputation, that very few are able to discern the ground of them, or what there is of substance in that which is pleaded for; and fewer yet, on whether side the truth doth lie. But he who is really convinced of sin, and

being also sensible of what it is to enter into judgment with the holy God, inquires for himself and not for others, how he may come to be accepted with him, will be apt upon the consideration of all these distinctions and sub-distinctions wherewith they are attended, to say to their authors, *Fecistis probe: incertior sum multo, quam dudum.* "You have done well! I am much more at a loss than before." My inquiry is, how shall I come before the Lord, and bow myself before the high God? how shall I escape the wrath to come? what shall I plead in judgment before God, that I may be absolved, acquitted, justified? where shall I have a righteousness that will endure a trial in his presence? If I should be harnessed with a thousand of these distinctions, I am afraid they would prove thorns and briars, which he would pass through and consume.

The inquiry therefore is, upon the consideration of the state of the person to be justified before mentioned and described, and the proposal of the reliefs in our justification as now expressed, whether it be the wisest and safest course for such a person seeking to be justified before God, to betake himself absolutely, his whole trust and confidence, to sovereign grace and the mediation of Christ, or to have some reserve for, or to place some confidence in, his own graces, duties, works and obedience. In putting this great difference to umpirage, that we may not be thought to fix on a partial arbitrator, we shall refer it to one of our greatest and most learned adversaries in this cause. And he positively gives us his determination and resolution in those known words.* "By reason of the uncertainty of our own righteousness, and the danger of vain glory, it is the safest course to repose our whole trust in the mercy and kindness or grace of God alone."

And this determination of this important inquiry, he confirms with two testimonies of Scripture, as he might have done it with many more. But those which he thought meet to mention are not impertinent. The first is Dan. ix. 18. "We do not present our supplications before thee for our righteousnesses but for thy great mercies." And the other is that of our Saviour, Luke xvii. 10. "When ye have done all these things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants." And after he has confirmed his resolution with sundry testimonies of the fathers, he closes his discourse with this dilemma,

* Propter incertitudinem propriæ justitiæ, et periculum inanis gloriæ, tutissimum est fiduciam totam in sola misericordia Dei et benignitate repone, Bellar. de Justificat. lib. v. cap. 7, prop. 3.

“Either a man hath true merits, or he hath not. If he hath not, he is perniciously deceived (when he trusts in any thing but the mercy of God alone) and seduces himself, trusting in false merits. If he has them, he loses nothing whilst he looks not to them, but trusts in God alone.” So that whether a man have any good works or no, as to his justification before God, it is best and safest for him, not to have any regard to them, or put any trust in them. And if this be so, he might have spared all his pains he took in writing his sophistical books about justification, whose principal design is to seduce the minds of men into a contrary opinion. And so, for aught I know, they may spare their labour also without any disadvantage to the church of God, or their own souls, who so earnestly contend for some kind of interest or other, for our own duties and obedience in our justification before God, seeing it will be found that they place their own whole trust and confidence in the grace of God by Jesus Christ alone. For to what purpose do we labour and strive with endless disputations, arguments and distinctions to prefer our duties and obedience to some office in our justification before God, if when we have done all, we find it the safest course in our own persons to abhor ourselves with Job in the presence of God, to betake ourselves to sovereign grace and mercy with the publican, and to place all our confidence in them through the obedience and blood of Christ?

So died that great Emperor Charles V. as Thuanus gives the account of his *Novissima*. So he reasoned with himself; * “That in himself he was altogether unworthy to obtain the kingdom of heaven by his own works or merits, but that his Lord God who enjoyed it on a double right or title, by inheritance of the Father, and the merit of his own passion, was contented with the one himself, and freely granted unto him the other; on whose free grant he laid claim thereunto, and in confidence thereof he should not be confounded; for the oil of mercy is poured only into the vessel of faith or trust; that this

* *Se quidem indignum esse qui propriis meritis regnum caelorum obtineret; sed Dominum Deum suum qui illud duplici jure obtineat, et patris hereditate, et passionis merito, altero contentum esse, alterum sibi donare; ex ejus dono illud sibi merito vendicet, hacque fiducia fretus minime confundatur; neque enim oleum misericordiae nisi in vase fiduciae poni; hanc hominis fiduciam esse a se deficientis et inotentis domino suo; alioquin propriis meritis fidere, non fidei esse sed perfidiae; peccata deleri per Dei indulgentiam, ideoque credere nos debere peccata deleri non posse nisi ab eo cui soli peccavimus, et in quem peccatum non cadit, per quem solum nobis peccata condonantur.*

is the trust of a man despairing in himself, and resting in his Lord; otherwise to trust to his own works or merits, is not faith but treachery; that sins are blotted out by the mercy of God; and therefore we ought to believe that our sins can be pardoned by him alone against whom alone we have sinned; with whom there is no sin, and by whom alone sins are forgiven."

This is the faith of men when they come to die, and of those who are exercised with temptations whilst they live. Some are hardened in sin, and endeavour to leave this world without thoughts of another. Some are stupidly ignorant, who neither know nor consider what it is to appear in the presence of God, and to be judged by him. Some are seduced to place their confidence in merits, pardons, indulgences, and future suffrages for the dead. But such as are acquainted with God and themselves in any spiritual manner, who take a view of the time that is past, and approaching eternity, into which they must enter by the judgment seat of God, however they may have thought, talked, and disputed about their own works and obedience, looking on Christ and his righteousness only to make up some small defects in themselves, will come at last to an universal renunciation of what they have been and are, and betake themselves to Christ alone for righteousness or salvation. And in the whole ensuing discourse I shall as little as is possible mix myself in any curious scholastical disputes. This is the substance of what is pleaded for, that men should renounce all confidence in themselves, and every thing that may give countenance thereto; betaking themselves to the grace of God by Christ alone, for righteousness and salvation. This God designs in the gospel, 1 Cor. i. 29—31, and herein, whatever difficulties we may meet withal in the explication of some propositions and terms that belong to the doctrine of justification, about which men have various conceptions, I doubt not of the internal concurrent suffrage of them who know any thing as they ought of God and themselves.

Fifthly, There is in the Scripture represented to us a commutation between Christ and believers, as to sin and righteousness, that is, in the imputation of their sins to him, and of his righteousness to them. In the improvement and application hereof to our own souls, no small part of the life and exercise of faith consists.

This was taught the church of God in offering of the scape goat. "And Aaron shall lay his hands on the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of

Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them on the head of the goat; and the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities," Levit. xvi. 21, 22. Whether this goat sent away with this burthen upon him did live, and so was a type of the life of Christ in his resurrection after his death, or whether he perished in the wilderness, being cast down the precipice of a rock by him that conveyed him away as the Jews suppose; it is generally acknowledged, that what was done to him and with him, was only a representation of what was done really in the person of Jesus Christ. And Aaron did not only confess the sins of the people over the goat, but he also put them all on his head, וְהָיָה אֵלָיו כָּל־חַטֹּאתֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל "and he shall give them all to be on the head of the goat;" in answer whereto it is said that he bare them all upon him. This he did by virtue of the divine institution, wherein was a ratification of what was done. He did not transfuse sin from one subject into another, but transferred the guilt of it from one to another. And to evidence this translation of sin from the people to the sacrifice, in his confession he put and fixed both his hands on its head. Thence the Jews say, that all Israel was made as innocent on the day of expiation as they were in the day of creation;—from ver. 30. Wherein they came short of perfection or consummation thereby, the Apostle declares, Heb. x. But this is the language of every expiatory sacrifice, *quod in ejus caput sit*; let the guilt be on him. Hence the sacrifice itself was called חַטָּאת and חַטֵּאת sin and guilt, Levit. iv. 29, vii. 2, 10, 17. And therefore where there was an uncertain murder, and none could be found that was liable to punishment thereon, that guilt might not come upon the land, nor the sin be imputed to the whole people, an heifer was to be slain by the elders of the city that was next to the place where the murder was committed to take away the guilt of it, Deut. 1—7. But whereas this was only a moral representation of the punishment due to guilt, and no sacrifice, the guilty persons being not known; those who slew the heifer did not put their hands on her, so to transfer their own guilt to her, but washed their hands over her, to declare their personal innocency. By these means, as in all other expiatory sacrifices, did God instruct the church in the transferring of the guilt of sin, to Him who was to bear all their iniquities, with their discharge and justification thereby.

So God "laid on Christ the iniquities of us all," that "by his stripes we might be healed," Isa. liii. 5, 6. Our iniquity

was laid on him, and he bare it, ver. 11, and through his bearing of it, we are freed from it. His stripes are our healing; our sin was his, imputed to him; his merit is ours, imputed to us. "He was made sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might become the righteousness of God in him," 2 Cor. v. 21. This is that commutation I mentioned. He was made sin for us, we are made the righteousness of God in him; God not imputing sin to us, ver. 19, but imputing righteousness to us, doth it on this ground alone, that he was "made sin for us." And if by his being made sin, only his being made a sacrifice for sin is intended, it is to the same purpose. For the formal reason of any thing being made an expiatory sacrifice, was the imputation of sin to it by divine institution. The same is expressed by the same Apostle, Rom. viii. 3, 4. "God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh, that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us." The sin was made his, he answered for it, and the righteousness which God requires by the law is made ours; the righteousness of the law is fulfilled in us; not by our doing it, but by his. This is that blessed change and commutation wherein alone the soul of a convinced sinner can find rest and peace. So he hath "redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us, that the blessing of faithful Abraham might come upon us," Gal. iii. 13, 14. The curse of the law contained all that was due to sin; this belonged unto us. But it was transferred on him. He was made a curse, whereof his hanging on a tree was the sign and token. Hence he is said to "bear all our sins in his own body upon the tree," 1 Pet. i. 24, because his hanging on the tree was the token of his bearing the curse. For he that is hanged on a tree is the curse of God, Deut. xxi. 23. And in the blessing of faithful Abraham, all righteousness and acceptance with God is included; for Abraham believed God, and it was imputed to him for righteousness.

But because some, who for reasons best known to themselves, do take all occasions to except against my writings, have in particular raised an impertinent clamour about somewhat that I formerly delivered to this purpose, I shall declare the whole of my judgment herein, in the words of some of those whom they can pretend no quarrel against that I know of.

The excellent words of Justin Martyr deserve the first place. "He gave his Son a ransom for us; the Holy for trans-

gressors; the innocent for the nocent; the just for the unjust; the incorruptible for the corrupt; the immortal for mortals. For what else could hide or cover our sins but his righteousness? in whom else could we wicked and ungodly ones be justified, [or esteemed righteous,] but in the Son of God alone? O SWEET COMMUTATION; [or change!] O unsearchable work [or curious operation!] O blessed beneficence exceeding all expectation! That the iniquity of many should be hid in one just one, and the righteousness of one should justify many transgressors.”* And Gregory Nyssen speaks to the same purpose. “He hath transferred unto himself the filth of our sins, and communicated unto me his purity, and made me partaker of his beauty.”† So Augustine also. “He was sin that we might be righteousness, not our own but the righteousness of God, not in ourselves but in him. As he was sin not his own but ours; not in himself but in us.”‡ The old Latin translation rendering those words, Psal. xxii. 1. וְרַב־וַיְרִיב *Verba delictorum meorum*; he thus comments on the place. “How, saith he, of my sins; but because he prayeth for our sins; and hath made our sins to be his, that he might make his righteousness to be ours?”§ *ω της γλυκειας ανταλλαγης*; O sweet commutation and change! And Chrysostom to the same purpose; on those words of the apostle, “That we might be made the righteousness of God in him.”|| “What word, what speech is this, what mind can comprehend or express it? for he saith, he

* Αυτος τον ιδιον υιον απελοτο λυτρον υπερ ημων, τον αγιον υπερ των ανων, τον ακακον υπερ των κακων, τον δικαιον υπερ των αδικων, τον αφαρτον υπερ των θνητων, τι γαρ αλλο τας αμαρτιας ημων ηδυνηθη καλυψαι η εκεινος δικαιοσυνη; εν τινι δικαιωθηναι δεκατου τοις ανομοις ημας και ασβητες η εν μονω τω υιω του θεου; ω της γλυκειας ανταλλαγης, ω της ανεξιχνιαστου δημοσιωγίας, ω των απροσδοκητων ευεργουσιων; ινα αι ομοι μεν πολλων εν δικαιο ενι κρυφθη, δικαιοσυνη δε ε ους πολλων ανομοις δικαιοση. *Epist. ad Diognet.*

† Μεταβηθι γαρ προς εαυτον τον των ημων αμαρτιων ρυπον, μετεβλεπε μοι της λυτρον καθαροτητος κοινομον με τον εαυτον καλλους απεργασμενος. *Orat. ii. in Cant.*

‡ *Ipse peccatum ut nos justitia, nec nostra sed Dei; nec in nobis sed in ipso, sicut ipse peccatum non suum sed nostrum, nec in se sed in nobis constitutum. Enchirid. ad Laurent. cap. 41.*

§ *Quomodo ergo dicit, delictorum meorum, nisi quia pro delictis nostris ipse precatur; et delicta nostra, delicta sua fecit, ut justitiam suam nostram justitiam faceret?*

|| Ποις ταυτα λογος, ποις ταυτα παρασθησας δυνασεται υους; τον γαρ δικαιον, φησιν, εποισεν αμαρτωλον, ινα τοις αμαρτωλοις ποιηση δικαιοις, μαλλον ην ουδεις ουτως ειπεν; αλλα ο πολλω μειον ηι; οη γαρ εξεν εβηκει, αλλ' αυτην την ποιησθη, οη γαρ ειπεν, εποισεν αμαρτωλον, αλλ' αμαρτια; ουχι τον μεν αμαρτωλοντα μονον, αλλα τον μηδε γνωστα αμαρτιαν, ινα και ημας γνωμησθε, οκ εισε, δικαιοι, αλλα δικαιοσυνη. θεου γαρ εστιν αυτη, υιου ηη εξ εργων (δταν και κλησιδα απαντων τιμα ηη ερηθησεται) αλλ' απο χαριτος δικαιοθωμεν, ευθα πασα αμαρτια εφανισται. *In 2 Epist. ad Corinth. cap. v. Hom. 11.*

made him who was righteous to be made a sinner, that he might make sinners righteous; nor yet doth he say so merely, but that which is far more sublime and excellent. For he speaks not of an inclination or affection, but expresseth the quality itself. For he says not, he made him a sinner, but sin, that we might be made not merely righteous but righteousness, and that, the righteousness of God, when we are justified not by works, (for if we should, there must be no spot found in them) but by grace, whereby all sin is blotted out. "So Bernard also *Epist.* 190, ad Innocent. "It was man who owed the debt, it was man who paid it. For, he says, 'if one died for all, then were all dead;' to wit, that the satisfaction of one might be imputed to all, as he alone bore the sins of all. Nor can it now be found that one has sinned, and another made satisfaction; because Christ alone is the head and body."* And many more speak to the same purpose. Hence Luther before he engaged in the work of reformation, in an epistle to one George Spenlein, a monk, was not afraid to write after this manner; "My dear brother, learn Christ and him crucified; learn to sing to him, and despairing of yourself, to say to him, 'Thou, Lord Jesus, art my righteousness, but I am thy sin; thou hast assumed what was mine, and given me what was thine; thou hast assumed what thou wast not, and given to me what I was not.' He has undertaken for thee, and made thy sins his own, and his righteousness, thine; cursed is he who believeth not this."†

If those who show themselves now so quarrelsome almost about every word that is spoken concerning Christ and his righteousness, had ever been harassed in their consciences about the guilt of sin, as this man was, they would think it no strange matter to speak and write as he did. Yea some there are who have lived and died in the communion of the church of Rome itself that have given their testimony to this

* *Homo qui debuit, homo qui solvit. Nam si unus, inquit, pro omnibus mortuus est, ergo omnes mortui sunt; ut videlicet satisfactio unius omnibus imputetur, sicut omnium peccata unus ille portavit. Nec alter jam invenitur qui foras fecit, alter qui satisfecit; quia caput et corpus unus est Christus.*

† *Mi dulcis frater, discce Christum et hunc crucifixum, discce ei cantare, et de teipso desperans dicere ei; Tu Domine Jesu es justitia mea, ego autem sum peccatum tuum; tu assumpsisti meum, et dedisti mihi tuum, assumpsisti quod non eras, et dedisti mihi quod non eram. Ipse suscepit te et peccata tua fecit sua, et suam justitiam fecit tuam; maledictus qui hæc non credit. *Epist. An.* 1516. Tom. i.*

truth. So speaks Taulerus; *Meditat. vitæ Christ.* cap. 7.* “Christ took upon him all the sins of the world, and willingly underwent such grief of heart for them, as if he himself had committed them.” And again speaking in the person of Christ.† “Whereas the great sin of Adam cannot go away, I beseech thee, heavenly Father, punish it in me. For I take all his sins upon myself. If then this tempest of anger be risen for me, cast me into the sea of my most bitter passion.” See in the justification of these expressions, Heb. x. 5—10. The discourse of Albertus Pighius to this purpose, though often cited and urged, shall be once again repeated, both for its worth and truth, as also to let some men see how fondly they have pleased themselves in reflecting on some expressions of mine, as though I had been singular in them. His words are, after others to the same purpose: “God was in Christ, saith the apostle, reconciling the world unto himself; not imputing unto men their sins. In him, therefore, we are justified before God, not in ourselves, not by our own, but by his righteousness, which is imputed unto us now communicating with him. Wanting righteousness of our own, we are taught to seek for righteousness without ourselves in him. So he saith, ‘him who knew not sin, he made to be sin for us,’ that is, an expiatory sacrifice for sin, ‘that we might be made the righteousness of God in him;’ we are made righteous in Christ not with our own but with the righteousness of God. By what right? the right of friendship, which makes all common among friends, according to the ancient celebrated proverb. Being ingrafted into Christ, fastened, united to him, he makes his things ours, communicates his riches to us, interposes his righteousness between the judgment of God and our unrighteousness, and under that, as under a shield and buckler, he hides us from that divine wrath which we have deserved; he defends and protects us therewith, yea he communicates it to us, and makes it ours, so as that being covered and adorned therewith, we may boldly and securely place ourselves before the divine tribunal and judgment, so as not only to appear righteous, but so to be. For even as the apostle affirms, that by one man’s fault we were all made sinners, so is the righteousness of Christ alone,

* *Christus omnia mundi peccata in se recepit, tantumque pro illis ultro sibi assumpsit dolorem cordis ac si ipse ea perpetrasset*

† *Quandoquidem peccatum Adæ multum abire non potest, obsecro te pater celestis, ut ipsum in me vindices. Ego enim omnia illius peccata in me recipio. Si hæc iræ tempestas, propter me orta est, mitte me in mare amarissimæ passionis.*

efficacious in the justification of us all; and ‘as by the disobedience of one man many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one man (saith he) many are made righteous.’ This is the righteousness of Christ, even his obedience, whereby in all things he fulfilled the will of his Father. As on the other hand our unrighteousness is our disobedience, and our transgression of the commands of God. But that our righteousness is placed in the obedience of Christ, it is from hence, that we being incorporated into him, it is accounted unto us as if it were ours; so as that therewith we are esteemed righteous. And as Jacob of old, whereas he was not the first born, being hid under the habit of his brother, and clothed with his garment which breathed a sweet savour, presented himself to his father, that in the person of another, he might receive the blessing of the primogeniture; so is it necessary that we should lie hid under the precious purity of the first born, our eldest brother, be fragrant with his sweet savour, and have our sin buried and covered with his perfection, that we may present ourselves before our most Holy Father, to obtain from him the blessing of righteousness.” And again; “God therefore doth justify us by his free grace or goodness wherewith he embraces us in Christ Jesus, when he clothes us with his innocency and righteousness as we are ingrafted into him; for as that alone is true and perfect which only can endure in the sight of God, so that alone ought to be presented and pleaded for us before the divine tribunal, as the advocate of, or plea in our cause; resting hereon, we here obtain the daily pardon of sin; with whose purity being covered, our filth and the uncleanness of our imperfections are not imputed to us, but are covered as if they were buried, that they may not come into the judgment of God; until the old man being destroyed and slain in us, divine goodness receives us into peace with the second Adam.”* So far he; ex-

* *Quoniam quidem (inquit Apostolus) Deus erat in Christo, mundum reconcilians sibi, non imputans hominibus sua delicta; et depositus apud nos verbum reconciliationis. In illo ergo justificamur coram Deo, non in nobis; non nostra sed illius justitia, quæ nobis cum illo jam communicantibus imputatur. Propria justitia inopes, extra nos, in illo docemur justitiam querere. Eum, inquit, qui peccatum non noverat, pro nobis peccatum fecit; hoc est, hostiam peccati expiaticem, ut nos efficeremur justitia Dei in ipso: non nostra, sed Dei justitia justi efficimur in Christo; quo jure? Amicitia, quæ communionem omnium inter amicos facit, juxta vetus et celebratissimum proverbium; Christo insertis, conglutinis et unitis, et sua nostra facit, suas divitias nobis communicat, suam justitiam inter Patris judicium et nostram injustitiam interponit, et sub ea veluti sub umbone ac clypeo a divina quam commoverimus, ira nos abscondit, tuetur ac protegit, imo eandem nobis impertit et nostram facit, qua tecti ornatique audacter et secure jam divino*

pressing the power which the influence of divine truth had on his mind, contrary to the interest of the cause wherein he was engaged, and the loss of his reputation with them, for whom in all other things, he was one of the fiercest champions. And some among the Roman Church, who cannot bear this assertion of the commutation of sin and righteousness by imputation between Christ and believers, no more than some among ourselves, do yet affirm the same concerning the righteousness of other men. "Paul seems to instruct us in a kind of merchandise. He says, You abound in money and are destitute of righteousness; on the contrary, they abound in righteousness and are in want of money. Let an exchange be made. Give to the pious poor the money which you have in abundance and they need; so they in return will communicate to you their righteousness in which they abound, and of which you are destitute."* But I have mentioned these testimonies principally to be a relief to some men's ignorance, who are ready to speak evil of what they understand not.

nos sistamus tribunali et judicio: justique non solum appareamus, sed etiam simus. Quemadmodum enim unius delicto peccatores nos etiam factos affirmat Apostolus: ita unius Christi justitiam in justificandis nobis omnibus efficacem esse; Et sicut per inobedientiam unius hominis peccatores constituti sunt multi, sic per obedientiam unius justus (inquit) constituatur multi. Hæc est Christi justitia, ejus obedientia, qua voluntatem Patris sui perfecit in omnibus; sicut contra, nostra injustitia est nostra inobedientia, et mandatorum Dei prævaricatio. In Christi autem obedientia quod nostra collocatur justitia inde est, quod nobis illi incorporatis, ac si nostra esset, accepta ea fertur: ut ea ipsa etiam nos justus habeamur. Et velut ille quondam Jacob, quum nativitate primogenitus non esset, sub habitu fratris occultatus, atque ejus veste indutus, quæ odorem optimum spirabat, seipsum insinnavit patri, ut sub aliena persona benedictionem primogenituræ acciperet: Ita et nos sub Christi primogeniti fratris nostri preciosa puritate delitescere, bono ejus odore fragrare, ejus perfectione vitia nostra sepleri et obtegi, atque ita nos piissimo Patri ingerere, ut justitiæ benedictionem ab eodem assequamur, necesse est. And afterwards. Justificat ergo nos Deus Pater bonitate sua gratuita, qua nos in Christo complectitur, dum eidem insertos innocentia et justitia Christi nos induit; quæ una ut vera et perfecta est quæ Dei sustinere conspectum potest, ita unum pro nobis sisti oportet tribunali divini judicii et veluti causæ nostræ intercessorem eidem representari: qua subnixi etiam hic obtineremus remissionem peccatorum nostrorum assiduam: cujus puritate velata, non imputantur nobis sordes nostræ; imperfectionum inmunditiæ, sed veluti sepultæ conteguntur, ne in judicium Dei veniant: donec confecto in nobis, et plane extincto veteri homine, divina bonitas nos in beatam pacem cum novo Adam recipiat.

* Mercaturam quandam docere nos Paulus videtur. Abundatis, inquit, vos pecunia et estis inopes justitiæ; contra illi abundant justitiæ, et sunt inopes pecuniæ; fiat quædam commutatio; date vos piis egentibus pecuniam quæ vobis affluit, et illis deficit; sic futurum est ut illi vicissim justitiam suam qua abundant, et qua vos estis destituti, vobis communicent. Hosius; de expresso Dei verbo, tom. ii. pag. 21.

This blessed permutation as to sin and righteousness, is represented to us in the Scripture as a principal object of our faith; as that whereon our peace with God is founded. And although both these, the imputation of sin to Christ, and the imputation of righteousness to us, be the acts of God and not ours, yet are we by faith to exemplify them in our own souls, and really to perform what on our part is required to their application to us, whereby we receive the atonement, Rom. v. 11. Christ calls to him all those that are "weary and heavy laden," Matt. xi. 28. The weight that is upon the consciences of men, wherewith they are laden, is the burden of sin. So the Psalmist complains that his sins were a burden too heavy for him, Psalm xxxviii. 4. Such was Cain's apprehension of his guilt, Gen. iv. 13. This burden Christ bore when it was laid on him by divine estimation. For so it is said יָשַׁב עָלָיו יְהוָה יִשְׂרָאֵל Isa. liii. 11. "He shall bear their sins" on him as a burden. And this he did when God "made to meet upon him the iniquity of us all," ver. 6. In the application of this to our own souls, as it is required that we be sensible of the weight and burden of our sins, and how it is heavier than we can bear, so the Lord Christ calls us to him with it, that we may be eased. This he doth in the preaching of the gospel, wherein he is evidently crucified before our eyes, Gal. iii. 1. In the view which faith hath of Christ crucified, (for faith is a looking to him, Isa. xlv. 22, chap. lxxv. 1, answering to their looking to the brazen serpent who were stung with fiery serpents, John iii. 14, 15.) and under a sense of his invitation, (for faith is our coming to him upon his call and invitation) to come to him with our burdens, a believer considers that God has laid all our iniquities upon him, yea that he has done so, is an especial object whereon faith is to act itself, which is faith in his blood. Hereon doth the soul approve of, and embrace the righteousness and grace of God, with the infinite condescension and love of Christ himself. It gives its consent that what is thus done, is what becomes the infinite wisdom and grace of God, and therein it rests. Such a person seeks no more to establish his own righteousness, but submits to the righteousness of God. Herein by faith doth he leave that burden on Christ, which he called him to bring with him, and complies with the wisdom and righteousness of God in laying it upon him. And herewithal doth he receive the everlasting righteousness, which the Lord Christ brought in when he made an end of sin, and reconciliation for transgressors.

The reader may be pleased to observe, that I am not debating these things argumentatively in such propriety of expressions as is required in a scholastical disputation, which shall be done afterwards so far as I judge it necessary. But I am doing that which indeed is better and of more importance; namely, declaring the experience of faith in the expressions of the Scripture, or such as are analogous to them. And I had rather be instrumental in the communication of light and knowledge to the meanest believer, than to have the clearest success against prejudiced disputers. Wherefore by faith thus acting are we justified and have peace with God. Other foundation in this matter can no man lay that will endure the trial.

Nor are we to be moved that men who are unacquainted with these things in their reality and power, do reject the whole work of faith herein, as an easy effort of fancy or imagination. For the preaching of the cross is foolishness to the best of the natural wisdom of men. Neither can any understand them but by the Spirit of God. Those who know the terror of the Lord, who have been really convinced and made sensible of the guilt of their apostasy from God, and of their actual sins in that state, and what a fearful thing it is to fall into the hands of the living God, seeking thereon after a real solid foundation whereon they may be accepted with him, have other thoughts of these things, and find believing to be a thing quite of another nature than such men suppose. It is not a work of fancy or imagination to men to deny and abhor themselves, to subscribe to the righteousness of God in denouncing death as due to their sins, to renounce all hopes and expectations of relief from any righteousness of their own, to mix the word and promise of God concerning Christ and righteousness by him with faith, so as to receive the atonement, and therewithal to give up themselves to an universal obedience to God. And as for them to whom through pride and self-conceit on the one hand, or ignorance on the other, it is so; we have in this matter no concernment with them. For to whom these things are only the work of fancy, the gospel is a fable.

Something to this purpose I had written long since in a practical discourse concerning communion with God. And whereas some men of an inferior condition, have found it useful for the strengthening themselves in their dependences on some of their superiors, or in compliance with their own inclination, to cavil at my writings and revile their author; that book has been principally singled out to exercise their faculty and good inten-

tions upon. This course is steered of late by one Mr. Hotchkisse, in a book about justification, wherein in particular he falls very severely on that doctrine which for the substance of it, is here again proposed. And were it not that I hope it may be somewhat useful to him to be a little warned of his immoralities in that discourse, I should not in the least have taken notice of his other impertinences. The good man, I perceive, can be angry with persons whom he never saw, and about things which he cannot or will not understand, so far as to revile them with most opprobrious language. For my part, although I have never written any thing designedly on this subject, or the doctrine of justification before now; yet he could not but discern by what was occasionally delivered in that discourse, that I maintain no other doctrine herein, but what is the common faith of the most learned men in all Protestant churches. And the reasons why I am singled out for the object of his petulancy and spleen, are too manifest to need repetition. But I shall yet inform him of what perhaps he is ignorant; namely, that I esteem it no small honour that the reproaches wherewith the doctrine opposed by him is reproached, fall upon me. And the same I say concerning all the reviling and contemptuous expressions that his ensuing pages are filled with. But as to the present occasion I beg his excuse if I believe him not, that the reading of the passages which he mentions out of my book, filled him "with horror and indignation," as he pretends. For whereas he acknowledges that my words may have a sense which he approves of (and which therefore must of necessity be good and sound) what honest and sober person would not rather take them in that sense, than wrest them to another, so to cast himself under the disquietment of a fit of horrible indignation? In this fit I suppose it was, if such a fit indeed did befall him (as one evil begets another) that he thought he might insinuate something of my denial of "the necessity of our own personal repentance and obedience." For no man who had read that book only of all my writings, could with the least regard to conscience or honesty give countenance to such a surmise, unless his mind was much discomposed by the unexpected invasion of a fit of horror. But such is his dealing with me from first to last, nor do I know where to fix on any one instance of his exceptions against me, wherein I can suppose he had escaped his pretended fit, and was returned to himself, that is to honest and ingenuous thoughts, wherewith I hope he is mostly conversant. But though I cannot

miss in the justification of this charge by considering any instance of his reflections, yet I shall at present take that which he insists longest upon, and fills his discourse about it with most scurrility of expressions. And this is in the 164th page of his book and those that follow. For there he disputes fiercely against me for making this to be an undue end of our serving God, namely, that we may flee from the wrath to come. And who would not take this for an inexpressible crime in any, especially in him who has written so much of the nature and use of threatenings under the gospel, and the fear that ought to be ingenerated by them in the hearts of men, as I have done? Wherefore so great a crime being the object of them, all his revilings seem not only to be excused but hallowed. But what if all this should prove a wilful prevarication, not becoming a good man, much less a minister of the gospel! My words as reported and transcribed by himself are these: "some there are that do the service of the house of God as the drudgery of their lives; the principle they yield obedience upon is a spirit of bondage unto fear; the rule they do it by is the law in its dread and rigour, exacting it of them to the utmost without mercy or mitigation; the end they do it for is to fly from the wrath to come, to pacify conscience, and to seek for righteousness as it were by the works of the law." What follows to the same purpose he omits, and what he adds as my words are not so, but his own. *Ubi pudor, ubi fides?* That which I affirmed to be a part of an evil end when and as it makes up one entire end by being mixed with sundry other things expressly mentioned, is singled out, as if I had denied that *in any sense* it might be a part of a good end in our obedience, which I never thought, I never said, I have spoken and written much to the contrary. And yet to countenance himself in this disingenuous procedure, besides many other untrue reflections, he adds that I insinuate, that those whom I describe, are Christians that seek righteousness by faith in Christ. I must needs tell this author that my faith in this matter is, that such works as these will have no influence in his justification; and that the principal reason why I suppose I shall not in my progress in this discourse take any particular notice of his exceptions either against the truth or me, next to this consideration, that they are all trite and obsolete, and as to what seems to be of any force in them will occur to me in other authors from whom they are derived, is that I may not have a continual occasion to declare how forgetful he has been of all the rules of ingenu-

ousness, yea and of common honesty in his dealing with me. For that which gave the occasion to this present displeasing digression, it being no more as to the substance of it, but that our *sins were imputed unto Christ*, and that his *righteousness is imputed unto us*, is that, in the faith whereof I am assured I shall live and die, though he should write twenty as learned books against it, as those which he has already published; and in what sense I believe these things, shall be afterwards declared. And although I judge no men upon the expressions that fall from them in polemical writings, wherein on many occasions they affront their own experience, and contradict their own prayers, yet as to those who understand not that blessed commutation of sins and righteousness as to the substance of it, which I have pleaded for, and the actings of our faith with respect thereto, I shall be bold to say, that "if the gospel be hid, it is hid to them that perish."

Sixthly, We can never state our thoughts aright in this matter, unless we have a clear apprehension of, and satisfaction in the introduction of grace by Jesus Christ into the whole of our relation to God, with its respect to all parts of our obedience. There was no such thing, nothing of that nature or kind, in the first constitution of that relation and obedience by the law of our creation. We were made in a state of immediate relation to God in our own persons, as our creator, preserver and rewarder. There was no mystery of grace in the covenant of works. No more was required to the consummation of that state, but what was given us in our creation, enabling us to render rewardable obedience. "Do this and live," was the sole rule of our relation to God. There was nothing in religion originally of that which the gospel celebrates under the name of the grace, kindness and love of God, whence all our favourable relation to God now proceeds, and whereinto it is resolved; nothing of the interposition of a mediator with respect to our righteousness before God and acceptance with him, which is at present the life and soul of religion, the substance of the gospel, and the centre of all the truths revealed in it. The introduction of these things is that which makes our religion a mystery, yea, a *great mystery*, if the apostle may be believed, 1 Tim. iii. 16. All religion at first was suited and commensurable to reason; but being now become a mystery, men for the most part are very unwilling to receive it. But so it must be; and unless we are restored to our primitive rectitude, a religion suited to the principles of our reason, which

it has none but what answer that first state, will not serve our turns.

Wherefore of this introduction of Christ and grace in him into our relation to God, there are no notions in the natural conceptions of our minds, nor are they discoverable by reason in the best and utmost of its exercise, 1 Cor. ii. 14. For before our understandings were darkened, and our reason debased by the fall, there were no such things revealed or proposed to us; yea, the supposition of them is inconsistent with, and contradictory to, that whole state and condition wherein we were to live to God; seeing they all suppose the entrance of sin. And it is not likely that our reason as now corrupted, should be willing to embrace that which it knew nothing of in its best condition, and which was inconsistent with that way of attaining happiness which was absolutely suited to it. For it has no faculty or power but what it has derived from that state. And to suppose it is now of itself suited and ready to embrace such heavenly mysteries of truth and grace, as it had no notions of, nor could have, in the state of innocency, is to suppose that by the fall our eyes were "opened to know good and evil," in the sense that the serpent deceived our first parents with an expectation of. Whereas, therefore, our reason was given us for our only guide in the first constitution of our natures, it is naturally unready to receive what is above it, and, as corrupted, has an enmity thereto.

Hence in the first open proposal of this mystery, namely, of the love and grace of God in Christ, of the introduction of a mediator and his righteousness into our relation to God, in that way which God in infinite wisdom had designed; the whole of it was looked on as mere folly by the generality of the wise and rational men of the world, as the apostle declares at large, 1 Cor. ch. i. Neither was the faith of them ever really received in the world, without an act of the Holy Ghost upon the mind in its renovation. And those who judge that there is nothing more needful to enable the mind of man to receive the mysteries of the gospel in a due manner, but the outward proposal of the doctrine thereof, do not only deny the depravity of our nature by the fall, but, by just consequence, wholly renounce that grace whereby we are to be recovered. Wherefore reason (as has been elsewhere proved) acting on and by its own innate principles and abilities, conveyed to it from its original state, and as now corrupted, is repugnant to the whole introduction of grace by Christ into our relation to God Rom. viii.

7. An endeavour, therefore, to reduce the doctrine of the gospel, or what is declared therein, concerning the hidden mystery of the grace of God in Christ, to the principles and inclinations of the minds of men, or to reason as it remains in us after the entrance of sin, under the power at least of those notions and conceptions of things religious, which it retains from its first state and condition, is to debase and corrupt them, (as we shall see in sundry instances) and so make way for their rejection.

Hence it is very difficult to keep up, doctrinally and practically, the minds of men to the reality and spiritual height of this mystery. For men naturally neither understand it, nor like it. And therefore every attempt to accommodate it to the principles and inbred notions of corrupt reason is very acceptable to many, yea, to the most. For the things which such men speak and declare, are, without more ado, without any exercise of faith or prayer, without any supernatural illumination, easily intelligible, and exposed to the common sense of mankind. But whereas, a declaration of the mysteries of the gospel can obtain no admission into the minds of men, but by the effectual working of the Spirit of God, Ephes. i. 17—19, it is generally looked on as difficult, perplexed, unintelligible; and even the minds of many who find they cannot contradict it, are yet not at all delighted with it. And here lies the advantage of all those who, in these days, attempt to corrupt the doctrine of the gospel in the whole or any part of it; for the accommodation of it to the common notions of corrupted reason, is the whole of what they design. And in the confidence of the suffrage hereof, they not only oppose the things themselves, but despise the declarations of them as enthusiastical canting. And by nothing do they more prevail themselves, than by a pretence of reducing all things to reason, and a contempt of what they oppose, as unintelligible fanaticism. But I am not more satisfied in any thing of the most uncontrollable evidence, than that the understanding of these men is no just measure or standard of spiritual truth. Wherefore, notwithstanding all this fierceness and scorn, with the pretended advantages which some think they have made by traducing expressions in the writings of some men, which are perhaps improper, perhaps only not suited to their own genius and capacity in these things, we are not to be “ashamed of the gospel of Christ, which is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth.”

Of this repugnancy to the mystery of the wisdom and grace of God in Christ, and the foundation of its whole economy in the distinct operations of the persons of the Holy Trinity therein, there are two parts or branches.

I. That which would reduce the whole of it to the private reason of men, and their own weak imperfect management thereof. This is the entire design of the Socinians. Hence,

1. The doctrine of the Trinity itself is denied, impugned, yea derided by them, and that solely on this account. They plead that it is incomprehensible by reason; for there is in that doctrine, a declaration of things absolutely infinite and eternal, which cannot be exemplified in, nor accommodated to, things finite and temporal. This is the substance of all their pleas against the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, that which gives a seeming life and sprightly vigour to their objections against it; wherein yet under the pretence of the use and exercise of reason they fall, and resolve all their reasonings into the most absurd and irrational principles that ever the minds of men were besotted with. For unless you will grant them that what is above their reason is therefore contradictory to true reason; that what is infinite and eternal is perfectly comprehensible, and in all its concerns and respects to be accounted for; that what cannot be in things finite and of a separate existence, cannot be in things infinite whose being and existence can be but one, with other such irrational, yea brutish imaginations, all the arguments of these pretended men of reason against the Trinity, become like chaff that every breath of wind will blow away. Hereon they must, as they do, deny the distinct operations of any persons in the Godhead in the dispensation of the mystery of grace. For if there are no such distinct persons, there can be no such distinct operations. Now as upon a denial of these things no one article of faith can be rightly understood, nor any one duty of obedience be performed to God in an acceptable manner, so in particular, we grant that the doctrine of justification by the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, cannot stand.

2. On the same ground the incarnation of the Son of God is rejected as *ἀτοκῶν ἀτοκοτάτων*, the most absurd conception that ever befel the minds of men. Now it is to no purpose to dispute with men so persuaded about justification. Yea we will freely acknowledge that all things we believe about it are no better than "old wives' tales," if the incarnation of the Son of God be so also. For I can as well understand how he who is a

mere man, however exalted, dignified and glorified, can exercise a spiritual rule in and over the hearts, consciences, and thoughts of all the men in the world, being intimately knowing of and present to them all equally at all times, (which is another of their fopperies) as how the righteousness and obedience of one should be esteemed the righteousness of all that believe, if that one be no more than a man, if he be not acknowledged to be the Son of God incarnate.

Whilst the minds of men are prepossessed with such prejudices, nay unless they firmly assent to the truth in these foundations of it, it is impossible to convince them of the truth and necessity of that justification of a sinner which is revealed in the gospel. Allow the Lord Christ to be no other person but what they believe him to be, and I will grant there can be no other way of justification than what they declare; though I cannot believe that ever any sinner will be justified thereby. These are the issues of an obstinate refusal to give way to the introduction of the mystery of God and his grace, into the way of salvation and our relation to him.

And he who would desire an instance of the fertility of men's inventions in forging and coining objections against heavenly mysteries in the justification of the sovereignty of their own reason as to what belongs to our relation to God, need go no further than the writings of these men against the Trinity and incarnation of the Eternal Word. For this is their fundamental rule in things divine and doctrines of religion, that not what the Scripture saith is therefore to be accounted true, although it seems repugnant to any reasonings of ours, or is above what we can comprehend; but what seems repugnant to our reason, let the words of the Scripture be what they will, *that* we must conclude that the Scripture does not say, though it seems never so expressly so to do.* "Wherefore because the Scripture affirms both these" (that is the efficacy of God's grace and the freedom of our wills) "we cannot conclude from thence, that they are not repugnant; but because these things are repugnant to one another, we must determine, that one of them is not spoken in the Scripture;" no, it seems, let it say what it will. This is the handsomest way they can take in advancing their own reason

* Itaque non quia utrumque scriptura dicat, propterea hæc inter se non pugnare concludendum est; sed potius quia hæc inter se pugnant, ideo alterutrum a scriptura non dici statuendum est. Schlicting. ad Meissn. def. Socin. p. 102.

above the Scripture, which yet savours of intolerable presumption. So Socinus himself speaking of the satisfaction of Christ, says in plain terms;* “For my part if this (doctrine) were extant and written in the holy Scripture, not once but often, yet would I not therefore believe it to be so as you think; for whereas it can by no means be so” (whatever the Scripture saith) “I would as I do with others in other places, make use of some less incommodious interpretation, whereby I would draw a sense out of the words that should be consistent with itself.” And how he would do this he declares a little before; he would “explain the words into another sense than what they sound or propose, even by unusual tropes.” And indeed such uncouth tropes does he apply as so many engines and machines to pervert all the divine testimonies concerning our redemption, reconciliation, and justification by the blood of Christ.

Having therefore fixed this as their rule, constantly to prefer their own reason above the express words of the Scripture, which must therefore by one means or other be so perverted or wrested to be made compliant therewith, it is endless to trace them in their multiplied objections against the holy mysteries, all resolved into this one principle, that their reason cannot comprehend them, and does not approve of them. And if any man would have an especial instance of the serpentine wits of men, winding themselves from under the power of conviction by the spiritual light of truth, or at least endeavouring so to do, let him read the comments of the Jewish Rabbins on Isaiah liii. and of the Socinians on the beginning of the gospel of John.

Secondly, The second branch of this repugnancy springs from the want of a due comprehension of that harmony which is in the mystery of grace, and between all the parts of it. This comprehension is the principal effect of that wisdom which believers are taught by the Holy Ghost. For our understanding of the wisdom of God in a mystery is neither an art nor a science, whether purely speculative or more practical, but a spiritual wisdom. And this spiritual wisdom is such as understands and apprehends things, not so much, or not only in the notion of them, as in their power, reality, and efficacy towards

* *Ego quidem etiamsi non semel sed sæpius id in sacris monumentis scriptum extaret, non ideo tamen ita prorsus rem se habere crederem, ut vos opinamini; cum enim id omnino fieri non possit, non secus atque in multis aliis Scripturæ testimoniis, una cum cæteris omnibus facio; aliqua quæ minus incommoda videretur, interpretatione adhibita, eum sensum ex ejusmodi verbis elicerem qui sibi constaret.*

their proper ends. And therefore although it may be that very few, unless they be learned, judicious, and diligent in the use of means of all sorts, attain to it clearly and distinctly in the doctrinal notions of it; yet are all true believers, yea the meanest of them, directed and enabled by the Holy Spirit as to their own practice and duty, to act suitably to a comprehension of this harmony, according to the promise that "they shall be all taught of God." Hence those things which appear to others contradictory and inconsistent one with another, so that they are forced to offer violence to the Scripture and their own experience in the rejection of the one or other of them, are reconciled in their minds, and made mutually useful or helpful to one another, in the whole course of their obedience. But these things must be further spoken to.

Such a harmony as that intended, there is in the whole mystery of God. For it is the most curious effect and product of divine wisdom; and it is no impeachment of the truth of it, that it is not discernible by human reason. A full comprehension of it no creature can in this world arise to. Only in the contemplation of faith, we may arrive to such an understanding admiration of it, as shall enable us to give glory to God, and to make use of all the parts of it in practice as we have occasion. Concerning it the holy man mentioned before cried out, *ὡ ἀνεξετάστου δημιουργίας*; "O unsearchable contrivance and operation!" and so is it expressed by the apostle, as that which has an unfathomable depth of wisdom in it, *ὡ βάθος πλουτου*, &c. "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God; how unsearchable are his ways and his judgments past finding out," Rom. xi. 33—36. See to the same purpose, Eph. iii. 8—10.

There is a harmony, a suitableness of one thing to another in all the works of creation. Yet we see that it is not perfectly nor absolutely discoverable to the wisest and most diligent of men. How far are they from an agreement about the order and motions of the heavenly bodies, of the sympathies and qualities of sundry things here below, in the relation of causality and efficiency between one thing and another. The new discoveries made concerning any of them, only evidence how far men are from a just and perfect comprehension of them. Yet such a universal harmony there is in all the parts of nature and its operations, that nothing in its proper station and operation is destructively contradictory either to the whole, or any part of it, but every thing contributes to the preservation

and use of the universe. But although this harmony be not absolutely comprehensible by any, yet do all living creatures, who follow the conduct or instinct of nature, make use of it, and live upon it, and without it neither their being could be preserved, nor their operations continued.

But in the mystery of God and his grace, the harmony and suitableness of one thing to another, with their tendency to the same end, is incomparably more excellent and glorious than that which is seen in nature or the works of it. For whereas God made all things at first in wisdom, yet is the new creation of all things by Jesus Christ, ascribed peculiarly to the riches, stores, and treasures of that infinite wisdom. Neither can any discern it unless they are taught of God, for it is only spiritually discerned. But yet is it by the most despised. Some seem to think that there is no great wisdom in it, and some that no great wisdom is required to the comprehension of it. Few think it worth the while to spend half that time in prayer, in meditation, in the exercise of self denial, mortification and holy obedience, doing the will of Christ that they may know of his word to the attaining of a due comprehension of the mystery of godliness, that some do in diligent study, and trial of experiments, who design to excel in natural or mathematical sciences. Wherefore there are three things evident herein.

1. That such a harmony there is in all the parts of the mystery of God, wherein all the blessed properties of the divine nature are glorified, our duty in all instances is directed and engaged, our salvation in the way of obedience secured, and Christ as the end of all exalted. Wherefore we are not only to consider and know the several parts of the doctrine of spiritual truth, but their relation also one to another, their consistency one with another in practice, and their mutual furtherance of one another to their common end. And a disorder in our apprehensions about any part of that, whose beauty and use arises from its harmony, gives some confusion of mind with respect to the whole.

2. That to a comprehension of this harmony in a due measure, it is necessary that we be "taught of God," without which we can never be wise in the knowledge of the mystery of his grace. And herein ought we to place the principal part of our diligence in our inquiries into the truths of the gospel.

3. All those who are taught of God to know his will, unless

it be when their minds are disordered by prejudices, false opinions or temptations, have an experience in themselves and their own practical obedience, of the consistency of all parts of the mystery of God's grace and truth in Christ among themselves, of their spiritual harmony and cogent tendency to the same end. The introduction of the grace of Christ into our relation to God, makes no confusion or disorder in their minds, by the conflict of the principles of natural reason, with respect to our first relation to God, and those of grace with respect to that whereto we are renewed.

From the want of a due comprehension of this divine harmony it is, that the minds of men are filled with imaginations of an inconsistency between the most important parts of the mystery of the gospel, from whence the confusions that are at this day in Christian religion proceed.

Thus the Socinians can see no consistency between the *grace* or love of God, and the *satisfaction* of Christ, but imagine if the one of them be admitted, the other must be excluded out of our religion. Wherefore they principally oppose the latter under a pretence of asserting and vindicating the former. And where these things are expressly conjoined in the same proposition of faith; as where it is said that we are "justified freely by the grace of God, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood," as Rom. iii. 24, 25, they will offer violence to common sense and reason, rather than disturb that harmony which they cannot understand. For although it be plainly affirmed to be a redemption by his blood, as he is a propitiation, as his blood was a ransom or price of redemption, yet they will contend, that it is only metaphorical, a mere deliverance by power, like that of the Israelites by Moses. But these things are clearly stated in the gospel, and therefore not only consistent, but such as that the one cannot subsist without the other. Nor is there any mention of any especial love or grace of God to sinners, but with respect to the satisfaction of Christ as the means of the communication of all their effects to them. See John iii. 16; Rom. iii. 23—25, viii. 30—33; 2 Cor. v. 19—21; Eph. i. 7, &c.

In like manner, they can see no consistency between the satisfaction of Christ, and the necessity of holiness or obedience in them that believe. Hence they continually clamour, that by our doctrine of the mediation of Christ, we overthrow all obligations to a holy life. And by their sophistical reason-

ings to this purpose, they prevail with many to embrace their delusions, who have not a spiritual experience to confront their sophistry with. But as the testimony of the Scripture lies expressly against them, so those who truly believe, and have real experience of the influence of that truth upon the life of God, and how impossible it is to yield any acceptable obedience herein without respect thereto, are secured from their snares.

These and the like imaginations arise from the unwillingness of men to admit of the introduction of the mystery of grace, into our relation to God. For suppose us to stand before God on the old constitution of the covenant of creation, which alone natural reason likes and comprehends, and we acknowledge these things to be inconsistent. But the mystery of the wisdom and grace of God in Christ, cannot stand without them both.

So likewise God's efficacious grace in the conversion of sinners, and the exercise of the faculties of their minds in a way of duty are asserted as contradictory and inconsistent. And although they seem both to be positively and frequently declared in the Scripture, yet say these men, their consistency being repugnant to their reason, let the Scripture say what it will, yet it is to be said by us, that the Scripture does not assert one of them. And this is from the same cause; men cannot in their wisdom see it possible that the mystery of God's grace should be introduced into our relation and obedience to God. Hence have many ages of the church, especially the last of them, been filled with endless disputes, in opposition to the grace of God, or to accommodate the conceptions of it, to the interests of corrupted reason.

But there is no instance more pregnant to this purpose than that under our present consideration. Free justification through the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, is cried out against as inconsistent with a necessity of personal holiness and obedience; and because the Socinians insist principally on this pretence, it shall be fully and diligently considered apart, and that holiness, which without it, they and others deriving from them, pretend to, shall be tried by the unerring rule.

Wherefore I desire it may be observed that in pleading for this doctrine, we do it as a principal part of the introduction of grace into our whole relation to God. Hence we grant:

1. That it is unsuited, yea foolish, and as some speak child-

ish, to the principles of unenlightened and unsanctified reason, or understandings of men. And this we conceive to be the principal cause of all the oppositions that are made to it, and all the depravations of it that the church is pestered with. Hence are the wits of men so fertile in sophistical cavils against it, so ready to load it with seeming absurdities, and I know not what unsuitableness to their wondrous rational conceptions. And no objection can be made against it, be it ever so trivial, but is highly applauded by those, who look on that introduction of the mystery of grace which is above their natural conceptions, as unintelligible folly.

2. That the necessary relation of these things one to the other, namely, of justification by the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, and the necessity of our personal obedience, will not be clearly understood nor duly improved, but by and in the exercise of the wisdom of faith. This we grant also; and let who will make what advantage they can of this concession. True faith has such spiritual light in it, or accompanying it, that it is able to receive it, and to conduct the soul to obedience by it. Wherefore, reserving the particular consideration hereof, to its proper place, I say in general,

1. That this relation is evident to that spiritual wisdom whereby we are enabled doctrinally and practically to comprehend the harmony of the mystery of God, and the consistency of all the parts of it one with another.

2. That it is made evident by the Scripture, wherein both these things, justification through the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, and the necessity of our personal obedience, are plainly asserted and declared. And we defy that rule of the Socinians, that seeing these things are inconsistent in their apprehension or to their reason, therefore we must say that one of them is not taught in the Scripture; for whatever it may appear to their reason, it does not so to ours; and we have at least as good reason to trust to our own reason, as to theirs. Yet, we absolutely acquiesce in neither, but in the authority of God in the Scripture; rejoicing only in this, that we can set our seal to his revelations by our own experience. For,

3. It is fully evident in the gracious conduct which the minds of them that believe are under, even that of the "Spirit of truth and grace," and the inclinations of that new principle of the divine life whereby they are actuated. For although from the remainders of sin and darkness that are in them,

temptations may arise to a continuance in sin, because grace has abounded, yet are their minds so formed and framed by the doctrine of this grace, and the grace of this doctrine, that the abounding of grace herein, is the principal motive to their abounding in holiness, as we shall see afterwards.

And this we aver to be the spring of all those objections which the adversaries of this doctrine continually endeavour to entangle it with. As (1) If the passive righteousness (as it is commonly called,) that is, his death and suffering be imputed to us, there is no need nor can be, that his active righteousness or the obedience of his life, should be imputed to us; and so on the contrary; for both together are inconsistent. (2) That if all sin be pardoned, there is no need of the righteousness; and so on the contrary, if the righteousness of Christ be imputed to us, there is no room for or need of the pardon of sin. (3) If we believe the pardon of our sins, then are our sins pardoned before we believe, or we are bound to believe that which is not so. (4) If the righteousness of Christ be imputed to us, then are we esteemed to have done and suffered, what indeed we never did nor suffered; and it is true, that if we are esteemed ourselves to have done it, imputation is overthrown. (5) If Christ's righteousness be imputed to us, then are we as righteous as was Christ himself. (6) If our sins were imputed to Christ, then was he thought to have sinned, and was a sinner subjectively. (7) If good works be excluded from any interest in our justification before God, then are they of no use to our salvation. (8) That it is ridiculous to think, that where there is no sin, there is not all the righteousness that can be required. (9) That righteousness imputed is only a putative or imaginary righteousness, &c.

Now, although all these and the like objections however subtilly managed, (as Socinus boasts that he had used more than ordinary subtilty in this cause,)* are capable of plain and clear solutions, and we shall avoid the examination of none of them; yet at present I shall only say, that all the shades which they cast on the minds of men, vanish and disappear before the light of express Scripture testimonies, and the experience of them that believe, where there is a due comprehension of the mystery of grace in any tolerable measure.

Seventhly—There are some common prejudices that are

* In quo si subtilius aliquanto quam opus esse videretur, quædam a nobis disputata sunt; De Servat. par. 4. cap. 4.

usually pleaded against the doctrine of the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, which because they will not orderly fall under a particular consideration in our progress, may be briefly examined in these general previous considerations.

1. It is usually urged against it, that this imputation of the righteousness of Christ is no where mentioned expressly in the Scripture. This is the first objection of Bellarmine against it.* “As yet they have not been able to find a single passage which asserted that the righteousness of Christ was imputed to us for righteousness; or that we were righteous through the righteousness of Christ imputed to us.” An objection, doubtless, unreasonably and inmodestly urged by men of his persuasion. For, not only do they make profession of their whole faith, or their belief of all things in matters of religion, in terms and expressions no where used in the Scripture, but believe many things also, as they say, with faith divine, not at all revealed or contained in the Scripture, but drained by them out of the traditions of the church. I do not therefore understand how such persons can modestly manage this as an objection against any doctrine, that the terms wherein some do express it, are not in so many words found in the Scripture, just in that order of one word after another as by them they are used. For this rule may be much enlarged, and yet be kept strait enough to exclude the principal concerns of their church out of the confines of Christianity. Nor can I apprehend much more equity in others who reflect with severity on this expression of the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, as unscriptural, as if those who make use thereof, were criminal in no small degree; when themselves immediately in the declaration of their own judgment, make use of such terms, distinctions and expressions, as are so far from being in the Scripture, that it is odds they had never been in the world, had they escaped Aristotle’s mint, or that of the schools deriving from him.

And thus although a sufficient answer has frequently enough, if any thing can be so, been returned to this objection in Bellarmine, yet has one of late amongst ourselves made the translation of it into English, to be the substance of the first chapter of a book about justification; though he needed not to have given such an early intimation to whom he is beholden for the

* *Hactenus, nullum omnino locum invenire potuerunt ubi legeretur Christi iustitiam nobis imputari ad justitiam; vel nos justos esse per Christi iustitiam nobis imputatam. De Justificat. lib. 2. cap. 7.*

greatest part of his ensuing discourse, unless it be what is taken up in despicable reviling of other men. For take from him what is not his own on the one hand, and impertinent cavils at the words and expressions of other men, with forged imputations on some of them, on the other, and his whole book will disappear. But yet, although he affirms that none of the Protestant writers who speak of the imputation of the righteousness of Christ to us, (which were all of them without exception until of late) have “precisely kept to the form of wholesome words, but have rather swerved and varied from the language of the Scripture,” yet he will excuse them from open error, if they intend no more thereby, but that we are made partakers of the benefits of the righteousness of Christ. But if they intend that the righteousness of Christ itself is imputed to us, (that is, so as to be our righteousness before God, whereon we are pardoned and accepted with him, or receive the forgiveness of sins, and a right to the heavenly inheritance) then are they guilty of that error which makes us to be esteemed to do ourselves what Christ did; and so on the other side, Christ to have done what we do and did. But these things are not so. For if we are esteemed to have done any thing in our own persons, it cannot be imputed to us as done for us by another; as it will appear when we shall treat of these things afterwards. But the great and holy persons intended, are as little concerned in the accusations or apologies of some writers, as those writers seem to be acquainted with that learning, wisdom and judgment, wherein they excelled, and the characters whereof are so eminently conspicuous in all their writings.

But the judgment of most Protestants is not only candidly expressed, but approved of also by Bellarmine himself in another place.* “It were not absurd if any one should say that the righteousness and merits of Christ are imputed to us, when they are given and applied to us, as if we ourselves had satisfied God.” And this he confirms with that saying of Bernard,† “For if one died for all, then were all dead; that is to say, that the satisfaction of one is imputed to all, as he alone bore the sins of all.” And those who will acknowledge no

* Non esset absurdum si quis diceret nobis imputari Christi justitiam et merita; cum nobis donentur et applicentur; ac si nos ipsi Deo satisfecissemus. De Justif. lib. 2. cap. 10.

† Nam si unus pro omnibus mortuus est, ergo omnes mortui sunt, ut videlicet satisfactio unius omnibus imputetur, sicut omnium peccata unus ille portavit. Bernard ad Innocent. Epist. 190.

more in this matter, but only a participation *quovis modo*, one way or other, of the benefits of the obedience and righteousness of Christ, wherein we have the concurrence of the Socinians also, might do well as I suppose, plainly to deny all imputation of his righteousness to us in any sense, as they do, seeing the benefits of his righteousness cannot be said to be imputed to us, what way soever we are made partakers of them. For to say, that the righteousness of Christ is imputed to us with respect to the benefits of it, when neither the righteousness itself is imputed to us, nor can the benefits of it be imputed to us, as we shall see afterwards, ministers great occasion of much needless variance and contests. Neither do I know any reason why men should seek countenance to this doctrine under such an expression as themselves reflect upon as unscriptural, if they be contented that their minds and sense should be clearly understood and apprehended. For truth needs no subterfuge.

The Socinians now principally make use of this objection. For finding the whole Church of God in the use of sundry expressions, in the declaration of the most important truths of the gospel, that are not *literally* contained in the Scripture, they hoped for an advantage from thence in their opposition to the things themselves. Such are the terms of the *Trinity*, the *incarnation*, *satisfaction* and *merit* of Christ, as this also of the *imputation* of his righteousness. How little they have prevailed in the other instances has been sufficiently manifested by them with whom they have had to do. But as to that part of this objection which concerns the imputation of the righteousness of Christ to believers, those by whom it is asserted say:

1. That it is the thing alone intended which they plead for. If that be not contained in the Scripture, if it be not plainly taught and confirmed therein, they will speedily relinquish it. But if they can prove that the doctrine which they intend in this expression, and which is thereby plainly declared to the understandings of men, is a divine truth, sufficiently witnessed to in the Scripture, then is this expression of it reductively Scriptural, and the truth itself so expressed a divine verity. To deny this, is to take away all use of the interpretation of the Scripture; and to overthrow the ministry of the church. This therefore is to be alone inquired into.

2. They say, the same thing is taught and expressed in the Scripture, in phrases equivalent. For it affirms that "by the obedience of One;" (that is Christ) "shall many be made right-

eous," Rom. v. 19. And that we are made righteous by the imputation of righteousness to us. "Blessed is the man unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works," chap. iv. 6. And if we are made righteous by the imputation of righteousness to us, that obedience or righteousness, whereby we are made righteous, is imputed to us. And they will be content with this expression of this doctrine, That the obedience of Christ, whereby we are made righteous, is the righteousness that God imputes to us. Wherefore this objection is of no force to disadvantage the truth pleaded for.

3. Socinus objects in particular against this doctrine of justification by the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, and of his satisfaction, that there is nothing said of it in the Evangelists, nor in the report of the sermons of Christ to the people, no, nor yet in those of his private discourses with his disciples. And he urges it vehemently and at large, against the whole of the expiation of sin by his death. And as it is easy, *malis inventis pejora addere*, this notion of his is not only made use of and pressed at large by one among ourselves, but improved also by a dangerous comparison between the writings of the Evangelists and the other writings of the New Testament. For to enforce this argument, that the histories of the gospel wherein the sermons of Christ are recorded, make no mention of the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, as in his judgment they do not, nor of his satisfaction, or merit or expiation of sin, or of redemption by his death, as they do not in the judgment of Socinus, it is added by him, that for his part he is "apt to admire our Saviour's sermons, who was the author of our religion, before the writings of the Apostles, though inspired men." To which many dangerous insinuations and reflections on the writings of St. Paul, contrary to the faith and sense of the church in all ages, are subjoined.

But this boldness is not only unwarrantable, but to be abhorred. What place of Scripture, what ecclesiastical tradition, what single precedent of any one sober Christian writer, what theological reason, will countenance a man making the comparison mentioned, and so determining thereon? Such juvenile boldness, such want of a due apprehension and understanding of the nature of Divine inspirations, with the order and design of the writings of the New Testament, which are the springs of this precipitate censure, ought to be reflected on. At present, to remove this pretence out of our way, it may be observed,

1. That what the Lord Christ taught his disciples in his personal ministry on the earth, was suited to that economy of the church, which was antecedent to his death and resurrection. Nothing did he withhold from them, that was needful to their faith, obedience and consolation in that state. Many things he instructed them in, out of the Scripture, many new revelations he made to them, and many times did he occasionally instruct and rectify their judgments. Howbeit he made no clear distinct revelation of those sacred mysteries to them, which are peculiar to the faith of the New Testament, nor were to be distinctly apprehended before his death and resurrection.

2. What the Lord Christ revealed afterwards by his Spirit to the Apostles, was no less immediately from himself, than was the truth which he spoke to them with his own mouth in the days of his flesh. An apprehension to the contrary is destructive of Christianity. The epistles of the Apostles are no less Christ's sermons, than that which he delivered on the mount. Wherefore,

3. Neither in the things themselves, nor in the way of their delivery or revelation, is there any advantage of the one sort of writings above the other. The things written in the epistles proceed from the same wisdom, the same grace, the same love, with the things which he spoke with his own mouth in the days of his flesh, and are of the same Divine veracity, authority and efficacy. The revelation which he made by his Spirit, is no less divine and immediate from himself, than what he spoke to his disciples on the earth. To distinguish between these things on any of these accounts, is intolerably folly.

4. The writings of the Evangelists do not contain the whole of all the instructions which the Lord Christ gave to his disciples personally on earth. For he was "seen of them after his resurrection forty days, and spoke with them of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God," Acts i. 3. And yet nothing hereof is recorded in their writings, but only some few occasional speeches. Nor had he given them before a clear and distinct understanding of those things which were delivered concerning his death and resurrection in the Old Testament, as is plainly declared, Luke xxiv. 25—27. For it was not necessary for them in that state wherein they were. Wherefore,

5. As to the extent of Divine revelations objectively, those which he granted by his Spirit to his Apostles after his ascension, were beyond those which he personally taught them, so

far as they are recorded in the writings of the Evangelists. For he told them plainly, not long before his death, that he had many things to say to them, which then they could not bear, John xvi. 12. And for the knowledge of those things, he refers them to the coming of the Spirit to make revelation of them from himself, in the next words: "Howbeit when He, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth; for he shall not speak of himself, but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak, and he will show you things to come. He shall glorify me, for he shall receive of mine and show it unto you," ver. 13, 14. And on this account he had told them before, that it was expedient for them that he should go away, that the Holy Spirit might come unto them, whom he would send from the Father, ver. 7. Hereunto he referred the full and clear manifestation of the mysteries of the gospel. So false, as well as dangerous and scandalous, are those insinuations of Socinus and his followers.

Secondly, The writings of the Evangelists are full to their proper ends and purposes. These were to record the genealogy, conception, birth, acts, miracles and teachings of our Saviour, so far as to evince him to be the true only promised Messiah. So he testifies who wrote the last of them. "Many other signs truly did Jesus, which are not written in this book; but these are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God," John xx. 30, 31. To this end every thing is recorded by them that is needful to the ingenerating and establishment of faith. Upon this confirmation, all things declared in the Old Testament concerning him, all that was taught in types and sacrifices, became the object of faith in that sense wherein they were interpreted in the accomplishment: and that in them this doctrine was before revealed, shall be proved afterwards. It is therefore no wonder if some things, and those of the highest importance, should be declared more fully in other writings of the New Testament, than they are in those of the Evangelists.

Thirdly, The pretence itself is wholly false. For there are as many pregnant testimonies given to this truth in one alone of the Evangelists, as in any other book of the New Testament; namely, in the book of John. I shall refer to some of them which will be pleaded in their proper place, John i. 12, 17, 19, iii. 14—18, 36, v. 24.

But we may pass this by, as one of those inventions concerning which Socinus boasts in his epistle to Michael Vajo-

ditus, that his writings were "esteemed by many for the singularity of the things asserted in them."

Fourthly, The difference that has been among Protestant writers about this doctrine is pleaded to the prejudice of it. Osiander in the entrance of the Reformation fell into a vain imagination, that we were justified or made righteous with the essential righteousness of God, communicated to us by Jesus Christ. And whereas he was opposed herein with some severity by the most learned persons of those days, to countenance himself in his singularity he pretended that there were twenty different opinions among the Protestants themselves, about the formal cause of our justification before God. This was quickly laid hold of by them of the Roman church, and is urged as a prejudice against the whole doctrine, by Bellarmine, Vasquez, and others. But the vanity of this pretence of his has been sufficiently discovered; and Bellarmine himself could fancy but four opinions among them, that seemed to be different from one another, reckoning that of Osiander for one. But whereas he knew that the imagination of Osiander was exploded by them all, the other three that he mentions are indeed but distinct parts of the same entire doctrine. Wherefore until of late it might be truly said, that the faith and doctrine of all Protestants was in this article entirely the same. For however they differed in the way, manner, and methods of its declaration, and too many private men were addicted to definitions and descriptions of their own, under pretence of logical accuracy in teaching, which gave an appearance of some contradiction among them, yet in this they generally agreed, that it is the righteousness of Christ and not our own, on the account whereof we receive the pardon of sin, acceptance with God, are declared righteous by the gospel, and have a right and title to the heavenly inheritance. Hereon, I say, they were generally agreed, first against the Papists, and afterwards against the Socinians; and where this is granted, I will not contend with any man about his way of declaring the doctrine of it.

And that I may add it by the way, we have herein the concurrence of the fathers of the primitive church. For although by justification, following the etymology of the Latin word, they understood the making us righteous with internal personal righteousness, at least some of them did so, as Austin in particular, yet that we are pardoned and accepted with God on any other account, but that of the righteousness of

Christ, they believed not. And whereas, especially in their controversy with the Pelagians after the rising of that heresy, they plead vehemently that we are made righteous by the grace of God, changing our hearts and natures, and creating in us a principle of spiritual life and holiness, and not by the endeavours of our own free will, or works performed in the strength thereof, their words and expressions have been abused contrary to their intention and design.

For we wholly concur with them, and subscribe to all that they dispute about the making of us personally righteous and holy, by the effectual grace of God, against all merit of works and operations of our own free will, (our sanctification being every way as much of grace, as our justification properly so called) and that in opposition to the common doctrine of the Roman church about the same matter; only they call our being made inherently and personally righteous by grace, sometimes by the name of *justification* which we do not. And this is laid hold of as an advantage by those of the Roman church who do not concur with them in the way and manner whereby we are so made righteous. But whereas by our justification before God, we intend only that righteousness whereon our sins are pardoned, wherewith we are made righteous in his sight, or for which we are accepted as righteous before him, it will be hard to find any of them assigning it to any other causes than the Protestants do. So it is fallen out, that what they design to prove, we entirely comply with them in; but the way and manner whereby they prove it, is made use of by the Papists to another end, which they intended not.

But as to the way and manner of the declaration of this doctrine among Protestants themselves, there ever was some variety and difference in expressions. Nor will it be otherwise whilst the abilities and capacities of men, whether in the conceiving of things of this nature, or in the expression of their conceptions, are so various as they are. And it is acknowledged that these differences of late have had by some as much weight laid upon them, as the substance of the doctrine generally agreed in. Hence some have composed entire books consisting almost of nothing, but impertinent cavils at other men's words and expressions. But these things proceed from the weakness of some men, and other vicious habits of their minds, and do not belong to the cause itself. And such persons, as for me, may write as they do, and fight on until they are weary. Neither has the multiplication of questions, and

the curious discussions of them in the handling of this doctrine, wherein nothing ought to be diligently insisted on, but what is directive of our practice, been of much use to the truth itself, though it has not been directly opposed in them.

That which is of real difference among persons who agree in the substance of the doctrine may be reduced to a very few heads. As (1) There is something of this kind about the nature of faith whereby we are justified, with its proper object in justifying, and its use in justification. And an instance we have herein, not only of the weakness of our intellects in the apprehension of spiritual things, but also of the remainders of confusion and disorder in our minds, at least how true it is that we "know only in part," and "prophesy only in part," whilst we are in this life. For whereas this faith is an act of our minds, put forth in the way of duty to God, yet many by whom it is sincerely exercised, and that continually, are not agreed either in the nature or proper object of it. Yet is there no doubt but that some of them who differ amongst themselves about these things, have delivered their minds free from the prepossession of prejudices and notions derived from other artificial reasonings imposed on them, and do really express their own conceptions as to the best and utmost of their experience. And notwithstanding this difference, they do yet all of them please God in the exercise of faith as it is their duty, and have such respect to its proper object, as secures both their justification and salvation. And if we cannot on this consideration bear with, and forbear one another in our different conceptions, and expressions of those conceptions about these things, it is a sign we have a great mind to be contentious, and that our confidences are built on very weak foundations. For my part I had much rather my lot should be found among them who do really "believe with the heart unto righteousness," though they are not able to give a tolerable definition of faith to others, than among them who can endlessly dispute about it with seeming accuracy and skill, but are negligent in the exercise of it as their own duty. Wherefore some things shall be briefly spoken of in this matter, to declare my own apprehensions of the things mentioned without the least design to contradict or oppose the conceptions of others.

2. There has been a controversy more directly stated among some learned divines of the reformed churches, (for the Lutherans are unanimous on the one side) about the righteousness of Christ that is said to be imputed to us. For some would

have this to be only his suffering of death, and the satisfaction which he made for sin thereby, and others include therein the obedience of his life also. The occasion, original, and progress of this controversy, the persons by whom it has been managed, with the writings wherein it is so, and the various ways that have been endeavoured for its reconciliation, are sufficiently known to all, who have inquired into these things. Neither shall I engage herein, in the way of controversy or in opposition to others, though I shall freely declare my own judgment in it, so far as the consideration of the righteousness of Christ under this distinction is inseparable from the substance of the truth itself which I plead for.

3. Some difference there has been also, whether the righteousness of Christ imputed to us, or the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, may be said to be the formal cause of our justification before God, wherein there appears some variety of expression among learned men, who have handled this subject in the way of controversy with the Papists. The true occasion of the differences about this expression has been this and no other. Those of the Roman church constantly assert, that the righteousness wherby we are righteous before God, is the formal cause of our justification. And this righteousness, they say, is our own inherent personal righteousness, and not the righteousness of Christ imputed to us. Wherefore they treat of this whole controversy, namely, what is the righteousness on the account whereof we are accepted with God, or justified, under the name of the formal cause of justification, which is the subject of the second book of Bellarmine concerning justification. In opposition to them, some Protestants contending that the righteousness wherewith we are esteemed righteous before God, and accepted with him, is the righteousness of Christ, imputed to us, and not our own inherent, imperfect personal righteousness, have done it under this inquiry, namely, what is the formal cause of our justification? which some have said to be the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, some the righteousness of Christ imputed. But what they designed herein was not to resolve this controversy into a philosophical inquiry about the nature of a formal cause, but only to prove that *that* truly belonged to the righteousness of Christ in our justification, which the Papists ascribed to our own, under that name. That there is an habitual infused habit of grace which is the formal cause of our personal inherent righteousness they

grant. But they all deny that God pardons our sins, and justifies our persons with respect to this righteousness as the formal cause thereof. Nay they deny that in the justification of a sinner there either is, or can be any inherent formal cause of it. And what they mean by a formal cause in our justification, is only that which gives the denomination to the subject, as the imputation of the righteousness of Christ does to a person that he is justified.

Wherefore notwithstanding the differences that have been among some in the various expression of their conceptions, the substance of the doctrine of the reformed churches is by them agreed upon and retained entire. For they all agree that God justifies no sinner, absolves him not from guilt, nor declares him righteous, so as to have a title to the heavenly inheritance, but with respect to a true and perfect righteousness; as also that this righteousness is truly the righteousness of him that is so justified. That this righteousness becomes ours by God's free grace and donation, the way on our part whereby we come to be really and effectually interested therein, being faith alone: and that this is the perfect obedience or righteousness of Christ imputed to us;—these things, as they shall be afterwards distinctly explained, contain the whole of that truth, whose explanation and confirmation is the design of the ensuing discourse. And because those by whom this doctrine in the substance of it, is of late impugned, derive more from the Socinians than the Papists, and make a nearer approach to their principles, I shall chiefly insist on the examination of those original authors, by whom their notions were first coined, and whose weapons they make us of in their defence.

Eighthly, To close these previous discourses, it is worthy our consideration what weight was laid on this doctrine of justification at the first Reformation, and what influence it had upon the whole work thereof. However the minds of men may be changed as to sundry doctrines of faith among us, yet none can justly own the name of Protestant, but he must highly value the first Reformation. And they cannot well do otherwise, whose present even temporal advantages are resolved thereinto. However I intend none but such as own an especial presence and guidance of God with those who were eminently and successfully employed therein. Such persons cannot but grant that their faith in this matter, and the concurrence of their thoughts about its importance, are worthy consideration.

Now it is known, that the doctrine of justification gave the first occasion to the whole work of Reformation, and was the main hinge whereon it turned. This those mentioned declared to be *articulus stantis aut cadentis ecclesie*, "an article by which the church stands or falls;" and that the vindication thereof alone, deserved all the pains that was taken in the whole endeavour of reformation. But things are now, and that by virtue of their doctrine herein, much changed in the world, though it be not so understood or acknowledged. In general no small benefit redounded to the world by the Reformation, even among them by whom it was not, nor is received, though many bluster with contrary pretensions. For all the evils which have accidentally ensued thereon, arising most of them from the corrupt passions and interests of them by whom it has been opposed, are usually ascribed to it; and all the light, liberty, and benefit of the minds of men which it has introduced, are ascribed to other causes. But this may be signally observed with respect to the doctrine of justification, with the causes and effects of its discovery and vindication. For the first reformers found their own, and the consciences of other men, so immersed in darkness, so pressed and harassed with fears, terrors, and disquietments under the power of it, and so destitute of any steady guidance into the ways of peace with God, as that with all diligence (like persons sensible that herein their spiritual and eternal interest was concerned) they made their inquiries after the truth in this matter, which they knew must be the only means of their deliverance. All men in those days were either kept in bondage under endless fears and anxieties of mind upon the convictions of sin, or sent for relief to indulgences, priestly pardons, penances, pilgrimages, satisfactory works of their own, and supererogatory of others, or kept under chains of darkness for purgatory unto the last day. Now he is no way able to compare things past and present, who sees not how great an alteration is made in these things even in the Papal church. For before the Reformation, whereby the light of the gospel, especially in this doctrine of justification, was diffused among men, and shone even into their minds who never comprehended nor received it, the whole almost of religion among them was taken up with and confined to these things. And to instigate men to an abounding sedulity in the observation of them, their minds were stuffed with traditions and stories of visions, apparitions, frightful spirits, and other imaginations that poor mortals are apt to be amazed

with, and which their restless disquietments gave countenance to. These were the principal objects of their creed, and matter of their religious conversation. That very church itself is comparatively at ease from these things, in comparison with what it was before the Reformation; though so much of them is still retained, as to blind the eyes of men from discerning the necessity as well as the truth of the evangelical doctrine of justification.

It is fallen out herein not much otherwise than it did at the first entrance of Christianity into the world. For there was an emanation of light and truth from the gospel which affected the minds of men, by whom yet the whole of it in its general design, was opposed and persecuted. For from thence the very vulgar sort of men came to have better apprehensions and notions of God and his properties, or the original and rule of the universe, than they had arrived to in the midnight of their paganism. And a sort of learned speculative men there were, who by virtue of that light of truth which sprung from the gospel, and was now diffused into the minds of men, reformed and improved the old philosophy, discarding many of those falsehoods and impertinences wherewith it had been encumbered. But when this was done, they still maintained their cause on the old principles of the philosophers, and indeed their opposition to the gospel was far more plausible and pleadable than it was before. For after they had discarded the gross conceptions of the common sort about the divine nature and rule, and had blended the light of truth which broke forth in the Christian religion with their own philosophical notions, they made a vigorous attempt for the reinforcement of heathenism against the main design of the gospel. And things have not, as I said, fallen out much otherwise in the Reformation. For as by the light of truth which therein broke forth, the consciences of even the vulgar sort are in some measure freed from those childish terrors which they were before in bondage to; so those who are learned have been enabled to reduce the opinions and practices of their church, into a more defensible posture, and make their opposition to the truths of the gospel more plausible than they formerly were. Yea that doctrine which in the way of its teaching and practice among them, as also in its effects on the consciences of men, was so horrid as to drive innumerable persons from their communion in that and other things also, is now in the new representation of it, with the artificial covering provided for its former effects

in practice, thought an argument meet to be pleaded for a return to its entire communion.

But to root out the superstitions mentioned from the minds of men, to communicate to them the knowledge of the righteousness of God which is revealed from faith to faith, and thereby to deliver them from their bondage, fears, and distress, directing convinced sinners to the only way of solid peace with God, did the first reformers labour so diligently in the declaration and vindication of the evangelical doctrine of justification; and God was with them. And it is worth our consideration, whether we should, on every cavil and sophism of men not so taught, not so employed, not so tried, not so owned of God as they were, and in whose writings there do not appear such characters of wisdom, sound judgment, and deep experience as in theirs, easily part with that doctrine of truth, wherein alone they found peace to their own souls, and whereby they were instrumental to give liberty and peace with God to the souls and consciences of others innumerable, accompanied with the visible effects of holiness of life, and fruitfulness in the works of righteousness, to the praise of God by Jesus Christ.

In my judgment, Luther spake the truth when he said; *amisso articulo Justificationis, simul amissa est tota doctrina Christiana.* "The loss of the article of Justification, involves the loss of the whole Christian doctrine." And I wish he had not been a true prophet, when he foretold that in the following ages the doctrine hereof would be again obscured; the causes whereof I have elsewhere inquired into.

Some late writers, indeed, among the Protestants, have endeavoured to reduce the controversy about justification with the Papists, to an appearance of a far less real difference, than is usually judged to be in it. And a good work it is, no doubt, to pare off all unnecessary occasions of debate and differences in religion, provided we go not so near the quick, as to let out any of its vital spirits. The way taken herein is to proceed upon some concessions of the most sober among the Papists, in their ascriptions to grace and the merit of Christ on the one side; and the express judgment of the Protestants variously delivered, of the necessity of good works to them that are justified. Besides it appears that in different expressions which either party adhere to, as it were by tradition, the same things are indeed intended. Among those who have laboured in this kind, Ludovicus le Blanc, for his perspicuity and plainness, his moderation, and freedom from a contentious frame of spirit,

is almost alone worthy to be read. He is like the ghost of Tiresias in this matter. But I must needs say, that I have not seen the effect that might be desired of any such undertaking. For when each party comes to the interpretation of their own concessions, which is in common justice to be allowed to them, and which they will be sure to do in compliance with their judgment, in the substance of the doctrine wherein the main stress of the difference lies, the distance and breach continue as wide as ever they were. Nor is there the least ground towards peace obtained by any of our condescensions or compliances herein. For unless we can come up entirely to the decrees and canons of the council of Trent, wherein the doctrine of the Old and New Testament is *anathematized*, they will make no other use of any men's compliances, but only to increase the clamour of differences among ourselves. I mention nothing of this nature to hinder any man from granting whatever he can or pleases to them, without the prejudice of the substance of truths professed in the Protestant churches; but only to intimate the uselessness of such concessions in order to peace and agreement with them, whilst they have a Procrustes' bed to lay us upon; and from whose size they will not recede.

Here and there one, (not above three or four in all, may be named within this hundred and thirty years,) in the Roman communion, has owned our doctrine of justification for the substance of it. So did Albertus Pighius and the Antidogma Coloniense, as Bellarmine acknowledges. And what he says of Pighius is true, as we shall see afterwards; the other I have not seen. Cardinal Contarenus, in a Treatise of Justification, written before, and published about the beginning of the Trent council, delivers himself in favour of it. But upon the observation of what he had done, some say he was shortly after poisoned, though I must confess I know not where they had the report.

But do what we can for the sake of peace, (as too much cannot be done for it, with the safety of truth,) it cannot be denied but that the doctrine of justification as it works effectually in the church of *Rome*, is the foundation of many enormities among them both in judgment and practice. They do not continue, I acknowledge, in that visible predominancy and rage as formerly; nor are the generality of the people in so much slavish bondage to them as they were. But the streams of them still issue from this corrupt fountain, to the dangerous infection of the souls of men. For the expiatory sacrifice of

the mass for the living and the dead, the necessity of auricular confession, with authoritative absolution, penances, pilgrimages, sacramentals, indulgences, commutations, works satisfactory and supererogatory, the merit and intercession of saints departed, with especial devotions and applications to this or that particular saint or angel, purgatory, yea in fact the whole of monastic devotion, depend thereon. They are all nothing but ways invented to pacify the consciences of men, or divert them from attending to the charge which is given in against them by the law of God; sorry supplies they are of a righteousness of their own, for them who know not how to submit themselves to the righteousness of God. And if the doctrine of free justification by the blood of Christ were once again exploded, or corrupted and made unintelligible; to these things, as absurd and foolish as now to some they seem to be, or to something not one jot better, men must and will again betake themselves. For if once they are diverted from putting their trust in the righteousness of Christ and grace of God alone, and do practically thereon follow after, take up with, or rest in that which is their own, the first impressions of a sense of sin which shall befall their consciences, will drive them from their present hold, to seek for shelter in any thing that tenders to them the least appearance of relief. Men may talk and dispute what they please whilst they are at peace in their own minds without a real sense either of sin or righteousness; yea and scoff at them who are not under the power of the same security. But when they shall be awakened with other apprehensions of things than yet they are aware of, they will be put on new resolutions. And it is in vain to dispute with any about justification, who have not been duly convinced of a state of sin, and of its guilt; for such men neither understand what they say, nor that whereof they dogmatize.

We have therefore the same reasons that the first reformers had to be careful about the preservation of this doctrine of the gospel pure and entire; though we may not expect the like success with them in our endeavours to that end. For the minds of the generality of men are in another posture than they were, when they dealt with them. Under the power of ignorance and superstition they were, but yet multitudes of them affected with a sense of the guilt of sin. With us for the most part things are quite otherwise. Notional light, accompanied with an insensibility of sin, leads men to a contempt of

this doctrine, indeed of the whole mystery of the gospel. We have had experience of the fruits of the faith which we now plead for in this nation for many years, yea now for some ages. And it cannot well be denied that those who have been most severely tenacious of the doctrine of justification by the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, have been the most exemplary in a holy life; I speak of former days. And if this doctrine be yet further corrupted, debased, or unlearned among us, we shall quickly fall into one of the extremes wherewith we are at present urged on either side. For although the reliefs provided in the church of Rome, for the satisfaction of the consciences of men are at present by the most disliked, yea despised; yet if they are once brought to a loss how to place their whole trust and confidence in the righteousness of Christ and grace of God in him, they will not always live at such an uncertainty of mind, as the best of their own personal obedience will hang them on the briars of; but betake themselves to somewhat that tenders them certain peace and security, though at present it may seem foolish to them. And I doubt not that some, out of a mere ignorance of the righteousness of God, which either they have not been taught, or have no mind to learn, have with some integrity in the exercise of their consciences, betaken themselves to that pretended rest which the church of Rome offers them. For being troubled about their sins, they think it better to betake themselves to that great variety of means for the ease and discharge of their consciences which the Roman church affords, than to abide where they are, without the least pretence of relief, as men will find in due time, there is no such thing to be found or obtained in themselves. They may go on for a time with good satisfaction to their own minds; but if once they are brought to a loss through the conviction of sin, they must look beyond themselves for peace and satisfaction, or sit down without them to eternity. Nor are the principles and ways which others take up with in another extreme upon the rejection of this doctrine, although more plausible, yet at all more really useful to the souls of men, than those of the Roman church which they reject as obsolete, and unsuited to the genius of the present age. For they all of them arise from, or lead to, the want of a due sense of the nature and guilt of sin, as also of the holiness and righteousness of God with respect thereto. And when such principles as these once grow prevalent in the minds of men, they quickly

grow careless, negligent, secure in sinning, and end for the most part in atheism, or a great indifference to all religion, and all the duties thereof.



CHAPTER I.

JUSTIFYING FAITH, THE CAUSES, OBJECT, AND NATURE OF IT, DECLARED.

THE means of justification on our part is *faith*. That we are "justified by faith," is so frequently, and so expressly affirmed in the Scripture, that it cannot directly and in terms by any be denied. For whereas some begin, by an excess of partiality to which controversial engagements and provocations incline them, to affirm that our justification is more frequently ascribed to other things, graces or duties, than to faith, it is to be passed by in silence, and not contended about. But yet also the explanation which some others make of this general concession, that we are justified by faith, does as fully overthrow what is affirmed therein, as if it were in terms rejected. And it would more advantage the understandings of men, if it were plainly refused upon its first proposal, than to be led about in a maze of words, and distinctions to its real exclusion; as is done both by the Romanists and Socinians. At present we may take the proposition as granted, and only inquire into the true genuine sense and meaning of it. That which first occurs to our consideration is faith; and that which concerns it may be reduced to two heads: (1) Its nature; (2) Its use in our justification.

Of the nature of faith in general, of the especial nature of justifying faith, of its characteristic distinctions from that which is called faith, but is not justifying, so many discourses (divers of them the effects of sound judgment and good experience,) are already extant, that it is altogether needless to engage at large in a further discussion of them. However, something must be spoken to declare in what sense we understand these things; what is that faith to which we ascribe our justification, and what is its use therein.

The distinctions that are usually made concerning faith, (as it is a word of various significations) I shall wholly omit; not only as obvious and known, but as not belonging to our present ar-

gument. That which we are concerned in is, that in the Scripture there is mention made plainly of a twofold faith, whereby men believe the gospel. For there is a faith whereby we are justified, which he who has shall be assuredly saved, which purifies the heart, and works by love. And there is a faith or believing which does nothing of all this; which he who has, and has no more, is not justified, nor can be saved. Wherefore every faith, whereby men are said to believe, is not justifying. Thus it is said of Simon the Magician that he "believed," Acts viii. 13; when he was "in the gall of bitterness and bond of iniquity," and therefore did not believe with that faith which purifieth the heart," Acts xv. 9. And, that "many believed on the name of Jesus when they saw the miracles that he did, but Jesus did not commit himself unto them because he knew what was in man," John ii. 23, 24. They did not believe on his name as those do, or with that kind of faith, who thereon receive "power to become the sons of God," John i. 12. And some when they hear the word, receive it with joy, believing for a while, but have no root; Luke viii. 13. And faith without a root in the heart will not justify any. For "with the heart men believe unto righteousness," Rom. x. 10. So it is with them who shall cry, at the last day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? whilst yet they were always "workers of iniquity," Matt. vii. 22, 23.

This faith is usually called historical faith. But this denomination is not taken from the object of it, as though it were only the history of the Scripture, or the historical things contained in it. For it respects the whole truth of the word, yea of the promises of the gospel as well as other things. But it is so called from the nature of the assent wherein it consists. For it is such as we give to historical things that are credibly testified to us.

And this faith has divers differences or degrees, both in respect to the grounds or reasons of it, and also its effects. For as to the first, all faith is an assent upon testimony; and divine faith is an assent upon a divine testimony. According as this testimony is received, so are the differences or degrees of this faith. Some apprehend it on human motives only, and its credibility to the judgment of reason; and their assent is a mere natural act of their understanding, which is the lowest degree of this historical faith. Some have their minds enabled to it by spiritual illumination, making a discovery of the evidences of divine truth whereon it is to be believed; the assent they give

heretofore is more firm and operative than that of the former sort.

Again, it has its differences or degrees with respect to its effects. With some it no way or very little influences the will or the affections, or works any change in the lives of men. So is it with them that profess they believe the gospel, and yet live in all manner of sins. In this degree it is called by the Apostle James, a *dead faith*, and is compared to a dead carcass, without life or motion; and it is an assent of the very same nature and kind with that which devils are compelled to give. And this faith abounds in the world. With others it has an effectual work upon the affections, and that in many degrees also, represented in the several sorts of ground whereinto the seed of the word is cast; and produces many effects in their lives. In the utmost improvement of it, both as to the evidence it proceeds from, and the effects it produces, it is usually called *temporary faith*; for it is neither permanent against all oppositions, nor will bring any to eternal rest. The name is taken from that expression of our Saviour concerning him who believes with this faith, *προσκαιρος εστι*, "dureth for a while," Matt. xiii. 21.

This faith I grant to be true in its kind, and not merely to be equivocally so called; it is not *πιστις ψευδωρημος*, "a faith falsely so called," it is so as to the general nature of faith; but of the same special nature with justifying faith it is not. Justifying faith is not a higher, or the highest degree of this faith, but is of another kind or nature. Wherefore sundry things may be observed concerning this faith in the utmost improvement of it to our present purpose. As,

1. This faith with all the effects of it, men may have, and not be justified; and if they have not faith of another kind they cannot be justified. For justification is no where ascribed to it, yea it is affirmed by the Apostle James, that none can be justified by it.

2. It may produce great effects in the minds, affections, and lives of men, although not one of those that are peculiar to justifying faith. Yet such they may be, as that those in whom they are wrought may be, and ought in the judgment of charity to be looked on as true believers.

3. This is that faith which may be alone. We are justified by faith alone. But we are not justified by that faith which can be alone. *Alone*, respects its influence on our justification, not its nature and existence. And we absolutely deny that

we can be justified by that faith which can be alone, that is without a principle of spiritual life and universal obedience, operative in all the works of it, as duty requires.

These things I have observed, only to obviate that calumny and reproach which some endeavour to fix on the doctrine of justification by faith only, through the mediation of Christ. For those who assert it must be Solifidians, Antinomians, and I know not what; such as oppose or deny the necessity of universal obedience or good works. Most of those who manage it cannot but know in their own consciences that this charge is false. But this is the way of handling controversies with many. They can aver any thing that seems to advantage the cause they plead, to the great scandal of religion. If by Solifidians, they mean those who believe that faith alone is, on our part, the means, instrument, or condition (of which afterwards) of our justification, all the Prophets and Apostles were so, and were so taught by Jesus Christ, as shall be proved. If they mean, those who affirm that the faith whereby we are justified is alone, separate or separable from a principle and the fruit of holy obedience, they must find them out themselves, we know nothing of them. For we allow no faith to be of the same kind or nature with that whereby we are justified, but what virtually and radically contains in it universal obedience, as the effect is in the cause, the fruit in the root; and which acts itself in all particular duties, according as by rule and circumstances they are made so to be. Yea we allow no faith to be justifying, or to be of the same kind with it, which is not itself and in its own nature a spiritually vital principle of obedience and good works. And if this be not sufficient to prevail with some, not to seek for advantages by such shameful calumnies, yet is it so with others, to free their minds from any concernment in them.

For the especial nature of justifying faith which we inquire into, the things whereby it is evidenced may be reduced to these four heads. (1) The causes of it on the part of God. (2) What is in us previously required to it. (3) The proper object of it. (4) Its proper peculiar acts and effects. Which shall be spoken to so far as is necessary to our present design.

1. The doctrine of the causes of faith as to its first original in the divine will, and the way of its communication to us, is so large, and so mixed with that of the way and manner of the operation of efficacious grace in conversion (which I have handled elsewhere) that I shall not here insist upon it. For as it

cannot in a few words be spoken to according to its weight and worth, so to engage in a full handling of it, would too much divert us from our present argument. This I shall only say, that from thence it may be uncontrollably evidenced, that the faith whereby we are justified, is of an especial kind or nature, wherein no other faith which justification is not inseparable from, partakes with it.

2. Wherefore our first inquiry is concerning what was proposed in the second place, namely, what is on our part, in a way of duty, previously required thereto; or what is necessary to be found in us antecedent to our believing to the justification of life. And I say there is supposed in them in whom this faith is wrought, on whom it is bestowed, and whose duty it is to believe therewith, the work of the law in the conviction of sin; or conviction of sin is a necessary antecedent to justifying faith. Many have disputed what belongs hereto, and what effects it produces in the mind, that dispose the soul to the receiving of the promise of the gospel. But whereas there are different apprehensions about these effects or concomitants of conviction, (in compunction, humiliation, self-judging, with sorrow for sin committed, and the like) as also about the degrees of them, as ordinarily prerequisite to faith and conversion to God; I shall speak very briefly to them, so far as they are inseparable from the conviction asserted. And I shall first consider this conviction itself, with what is essential thereto, and then the effects of it in conjunction with that temporary faith before spoken of. I shall do so, not as to their nature, the knowledge whercof I take for granted, but only as they have respect to our justification.

As to the first I say, the work of conviction in general, whereby the soul of man has a practical understanding of the nature of sin, its guilt and the punishment due to it, and is made sensible of his own interest therein, both with respect to sin original and actual, with his own utter inability to deliver himself out of the state and condition, wherein on the account of these things he finds himself to be, is that which we affirm to be antecedently necessary to justifying faith; that is in the adult, and of whose justification the word is the external means and instrument.

A convinced sinner alone is a subject capable of justification; not that every one that is convinced is or must necessarily be justified. There is not any such disposition or preparation of the subject by this conviction, its effects and consequences,

as that the form of justification, as the Papists speak, or justifying grace must necessarily ensue or be introduced thereon. Nor is there any such preparation in it, as that by virtue of any divine compact or promise, a person so convinced, shall be pardoned and justified. But as a man may believe with any kind of faith that is not justifying, such as that before mentioned, without this conviction, so it is ordinarily and necessarily previous to that faith which is to the justification of life. The motive to it, is not that thereon a man shall be assuredly justified; but that without it he cannot be so.

This I say is required in the person to be justified in order of nature antecedent to that faith whereby we are justified, which we shall prove with the ensuing arguments. For (1) without the due consideration and supposition of it, the true nature of faith can never be understood. For as we have showed before, justification is God's way of the deliverance of the convinced sinner, or one whose "mouth is stopped," and who is "guilty before God," obnoxious to the law, and shut up under sin. A sense therefore of this estate and all that belongs to it, is required to believing. Hence Le Blanc who has searched with some diligence into these things, commends the definition of faith given by Mestrezat; that it is "the flight of a penitent sinner to the mercy of God in Christ." And there is indeed more sense and truth in it, than in twenty other that seem more accurate. But without a supposition of the conviction mentioned, there is no understanding of this definition of faith. For it is that alone which puts the soul upon a flight to the mercy of God in Christ, to be saved from the wrath to come; Heb. vi. 18; "fled for refuge."

2. The order, relation, and use of the law and the gospel uncontrollably evince the necessity of this conviction previously to believing. For that which any man has first to deal with, with respect to his eternal condition, both naturally and by God's institution, is the *law*. This is first presented to the soul, with its terms of righteousness and life, and with its curse in case of failure. Without this the gospel cannot be understood, nor the grace of it duly valued. For it is the revelation of God's way for the relieving the souls of men from the sentence and curse of the law, Rom. i. 17. That was the nature, that was the use and end of the first promise, and of the whole work of God's grace revealed in all the ensuing promises, or in the whole gospel. Wherefore the faith which we treat of being *evangelical*, that which in its especial nature

and use, not the law but the gospel requires, that which has the gospel for its principle, rule, and object, it is not required of us, cannot be acted by us, but on a supposition of the work and effect of the *law* in the conviction of sin, by giving the knowledge of it, a sense of its guilt, and the state of the sinner on the account thereof. And that faith which has not respect hereto, we absolutely deny to be that faith whereby we are justified, Gal. iii. 22—24. Rom. x. 4.

3. This our Saviour himself directly teaches in the gospel. For he calls to him only those who are "weary and heavy laden," affirms that "the whole have no need of the physician but the sick;" and that he "came not to call the righteous but sinners to repentance." In all which he intends not those who were really sinners, as all men are, for he makes a difference between them, offering the gospel to some and not to others; but such as were convinced of sin, burdened with it, and sought after deliverance.

So those to whom the Apostle Peter proposed the promise of the gospel with the pardon of sin thereby, as the object of gospel faith, were "pricked to the heart" upon the conviction of their sin, and cried, "What shall we do?" Acts ii. 37—39. Such also was the state of the jailor to whom the Apostle Paul proposed salvation by Christ, as what he was to believe for his deliverance, Acts xvi. 30, 31.

4. The state of Adam and God's dealing with him therein, is the best representation of the order and method of these things. As he was after the fall, so are we by nature in the very same state and condition. Really he was utterly lost by sin, and convinced he was both of the nature of his sin, and of the effects of it, in that act of God by the law on his mind, which is called the opening of his eyes. For it was nothing but the communication to his mind by his conscience of a sense of the nature, guilt, effects, and consequences of sin, which the law could then teach him, and could not do so before. This fills him with shame and fear; against the former whereof he provided by fig-leaves, and against the latter by hiding himself among the trees of the garden. Nor, however they may please themselves with them, are any of the contrivances of men, for freedom and safety from sin, either wiser or more likely to have success. In this condition, God by an immediate inquiry into the matter of fact, sharpens this conviction by the addition of his own testimony to its truth, and casts him actually under the curse of the law, in a juridical denunciation of it

In this lost, forlorn, hopeless condition God proposes the promise of redemption by Christ to him. And this was the object of that faith whereby he was to be justified.

Although these things are not thus eminently and distinctly transacted in the minds and consciences of all who are called to believing by the gospel, yet for the substance of them, and as to the previousness of the conviction of sin to faith, they are found in all that sincerely believe.

These things are known, and for the substance of them generally agreed to. But yet are they such as being duly considered will discover the vanity and mistakes of many definitions of faith that are obtruded on us. For any definition or description of it, which has not express, or at least virtual respect hereto, is but a deceit, and no way answers the experience of them that truly believe. And such are all those who place it merely in an assent to divine revelation, of what nature soever that assent be, and whatever effects are ascribed to it. For such an assent there may be without any respect to this work of the law. Nor do I, to speak plainly, at all value the most accurate disputations of any about the nature and act of justifying faith, who never had in themselves an experience of the work of the law in conviction and condemnation for sin, with the effects of it upon their consciences; or who omit the due consideration of their own experience, wherein what they truly believe is better stated than in all their disputations. That faith whereby we are justified is in general the acting of the soul towards God, as revealing himself in the gospel for deliverance out of this state and condition, or from under the curse of the law applied to the conscience, according to his mind, and by the ways that he has appointed. I give not this as any definition of faith, but only express, what has a necessary influence upon it, whence the nature of it may be discerned.

2. The effects of this conviction, with their respect to our justification, real or pretended, may also be briefly considered. And whereas this conviction is a mere work of the law, it is not with respect to these effects to be considered alone, but in conjunction with, and under the conduct of that temporary faith of the gospel before described. And these two, temporary faith and legal conviction, are the principles of all works or duties in religion antecedent to justification, and which therefore we must deny to have in them any causality thereof. But it is granted that many acts and duties both internal and external, will ensue on real convictions. Those that are inter-

nal may be reduced to three heads. (1) Displeasure and sorrow that we have sinned. It is impossible that any one should be really convinced of sin in the way before declared, but that a dislike of sin, and of himself that he has sinned, shame of it, and sorrow for it, will ensue thereon. And it is a sufficient evidence that he is not really convinced of sin, whatever he profess, or whatever confession he make, whose mind is not so affected, Jer. xxxvi. 24. (2) Fear of punishment due to sin. For conviction respects not only the instructive and preceptive part of the law, whereby the being and nature of sin are discovered, but the sentence and curse of it also, whereby it is judged and condemned, Gen. iv. 13, 14. Wherefore, where fear of the punishment threatened does not ensue, no person is really convinced of sin; nor has the law had its proper work towards him, as it is previous to the administration of the gospel. And whereas by faith we "flee from the wrath to come," where there is not a sense and apprehension of that wrath as due to us, there is no ground or reason for our believing. (3) A desire of deliverance from that state wherein a convicted sinner finds himself upon his conviction, is unavoidable to him. And it is naturally the first thing that conviction works in the minds of men, and that in various degrees of care, fear, solicitude and restlessness, which from experience and the conduct of Scripture light, have been explained by many, to the great benefit of the church, and sufficiently derided by others. These internal acts of the mind will also produce sundry external duties which may be referred to two heads. (1) Abstinence from known sin to the utmost of men's power. For they who begin to find that it is an evil thing and a bitter that they have sinned against God, cannot but endeavour a future abstinence from it. And as this has respect to all the former internal acts, as causes of it, so it is a peculiar consequence of the last of them, the desire of deliverance from the state wherein such persons are. For this they suppose to be the best expedient for it, or at least that without which it will not be. And herein usually their spirits act by promises and vows, with renewed sorrow on surprisals into sin, which will befall them in that condition. (2) The duties of religious worship in prayer and hearing of the word, with diligence in the use of the ordinances of the church, will ensue hereon. For without these they know that no deliverance is to be obtained. Reformation of life and conversation in various degrees partly consists in these things, and partly follows

upon them. And these things are always so, where the convictions of men are real and abiding.

But yet it must be said, that they are neither severally nor jointly, though in the highest degree, either necessary dispositions, preparations, previous congruities in a way of merit, or conditions of our justification. For,

1. They are not conditions of justification. For where one thing is the condition of another, that other thing must follow the fulfilling of that condition. Otherwise it is not the condition of it. But they may be all found where justification does not ensue. Wherefore there is no covenant, promise, or constitution of God, making them to be such conditions of justification, though in their own nature they may be subservient to what is required of us with respect thereto. But a certain infallible connexion with it by virtue of any promise or covenant of God (as it is with faith) they have not. And other condition, but what is constituted and made to be so by divine compact or promise, is not to be allowed. For otherwise conditions might be endlessly multiplied, and all things natural as well as moral made to be so. So the meat we eat may be a condition of justification. Faith and justification are inseparable, but so are not justification and the things we now insist upon, as experience evinces.

2. Justification may be where the outward acts and duties mentioned, proceeding from convictions under the conduct of temporary faith, are not. For Adam was justified without them, so also were the converts in the Acts, chap. ii. For what is reported concerning them is all of it essentially included in conviction; ver. 37. And so likewise was it with the jailor; Acts xvi. 30, 31. And as to many of them, it is so with most that do believe. Therefore they are not conditions. For a condition suspends the event of that whereof it is a condition.

3. They are not formal dispositions to justification, because it consists not in the introduction of any new form or inherent quality in the soul, as has been in part already declared, and shall yet afterwards be more fully evinced. Nor 4, are they moral preparations for it; for being antecedent to evangelical faith, no man can have any design in them, but only to seek for righteousness by the works of the law, which is no preparation to justification. All discoveries of the righteousness of God, with the soul's adherence to it, belong to faith alone. There is indeed a repentance which accompanies faith, and is included in the nature of it, at least radically. This is re-

quired to our justification. But that legal repentance which precedes gospel faith and is without it, is neither a disposition, preparation, nor condition of our justification.

In brief, the order of these things may be observed in the dealing of God with Adam, as was before intimated. And there are three degrees in it. (1) The opening of the eyes of the sinner, to see the filth and guilt of sin in the sentence and curse of the law applied to his conscience, Rom. vii. 9, 10. This effects in the mind of the sinner the things before mentioned, and puts him upon all the duties that spring from them. For persons on their first convictions ordinarily judge no more but that their state being evil and dangerous, it is their duty to better it, and that they can or shall do so accordingly, if they apply themselves to it. But all these things as to a protection or deliverance from the sentence of the law, are no better than fig-leaves and hiding. (2) Ordinarily God by his providence, or in the dispensation of the word, gives life and power to this work of the law in a peculiar manner; in answer to the charge which he gave to Adam after his attempt to hide himself. Hereby the mouth of the sinner is stopped, and he becomes thoroughly sensible of his guilt before God, and satisfied that there is no relief or deliverance to be expected from any of those ways of sorrow or duty that he has put himself upon. (3) In this condition it is a mere act of sovereign grace, without any respect to these things foregoing, to call the sinner to believing, or faith in the promise, to the justification of life. This is God's order; yet so that what precedes his call to faith, has no causality thereof.

3. The next thing to be inquired into is the proper object of justifying faith, or of true faith, in its office, work and duty, with respect to our justification. And herein we must first consider what we cannot so well close with. For besides other differences that seem to be about it, which indeed are but different explanations of the same thing for the substance, there are two opinions which are looked on as extremes, the one in an excess and the other in defect. The first is that of the Roman church, and those who comply with them therein. And this is, that the object of justifying faith as such, is all divine verity, all divine revelation, whether written in the Scripture, or delivered by tradition represented to us by the authority of the church. In the latter part of this description we are not at present concerned. That the whole Scripture and all the parts of it, and all the truths of what sort soever they be that are con-

tained in it, are equally the object of faith in the discharge of its office in our justification, is that which they maintain. Hence as to the nature of it they cannot allow it to consist in any thing but an assent of the mind. For supposing the whole Scripture, and all contained in it, laws, precepts, promises, threatenings, stories, prophecies, and the like, to be the object of it, and these not as containing in them things good or evil to us, but under this formal consideration as divinely revealed, they cannot assign or allow any other act of the mind to be required hereto, but *assent* only. And so confident are they herein, namely, that faith is no more than an assent to divine revelation, as that Bellarmine in opposition to Calvin, who placed knowledge in the description of justifying faith, affirms that it is better defined by ignorance than by knowledge.

This description of justifying faith and its object, has been so discussed, and on such evident grounds of Scripture and reason rejected by Protestant writers of all sorts, that it is needless to insist much upon it again. Some things I shall observe in relation to it, whereby we may discover what is of truth in what they assert, and wherein it falls short thereof. Neither shall I respect only them of the Roman church, who require no more to faith or believing, but only a bare assent of the mind to divine revelations, but them also who place it wholly in such a firm assent as produces obedience to all divine commands. For as it does both these, as both these are included in it, so to the especial nature of it more is required. It is, as justifying, neither a mere assent, nor any such firm degree of it, as should produce such effects.

1. All faith whatever is an act of that power of our souls in general, whereby we are able firmly to assent to the truth upon testimony, in things not evident to us by sense or reason. It is "the evidence of things not seen." And all divine faith is in general an assent to the truth that is proposed to us upon divine testimony. And hereby, as it is commonly agreed, it is distinguished from opinion and moral certainty on the one hand, and science or demonstration on the other.

2. Wherefore in justifying faith, there is an assent to all divine revelation upon the testimony of God the revealer. By no other act of our mind, wherein this is not included or supposed, can we be justified; not because it is not justifying, but because it is not faith. This assent I say is included in justifying faith. And therefore we find it often spoken of in the Scripture (the instances whereof are gathered up by Bellarmine

and others,) with respect to other things, and not restrained to the especial promise of grace in Christ, which is that which they oppose. But besides, that in most places of that kind, the proper object of faith as justifying is included and ultimately referred to, though diversely expressed by some of its causes or concomitant adjuncts, it is granted that we believe all divine truth, with that very faith whereby we are justified, so that other things may well be ascribed to it.

3. On these concessions we yet say two things. (1) That the whole nature of justifying faith does not consist merely in an assent of the mind, be it never so firm and steadfast, nor whatever effects of obedience it may produce. (2) That in its duty and office in justification, whence it has that especial denomination, which alone we are in the explanation of, it does not equally respect all divine revelation as such, but has a peculiar object proposed to it in the Scripture. And whereas both these will be immediately evinced in our description of the proper object and nature of faith, I shall at present oppose some few things to this description of them, sufficient to manifest how foreign it is from the truth.

1. This assent is an act of the understanding only; an act of the mind with respect to truth evidenced to it, be it of what nature it will. So we believe the worst of things and the most grievous to us, as well as the best and the most useful. But believing is an act of the heart, which in the Scripture comprises all the faculties of the soul, as one entire principle of moral and spiritual duties. "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness." Rom. x. 10. And it is frequently described by an act of the will, though it be not so alone. But without an act of the will no man can believe as he ought. See John v. 40; John i. 12, chap. vi. 35. We come to Christ in an act of the will, and let "whosoever will" come. And to "be willing" is taken for to believe, Psa. cx. 3, and "unbelief" is disobedience, Heb. iii. 18, 19.

2. All divine truth is equally the object of this assent. It respects not the especial nature or use of any one truth, be it of what kind it will, more than another; nor can it do so, since it regards only divine revelation. Hence that Judas was the traitor must have as great an influence upon our justification, as that Christ died for our sins. But how contrary this is to the Scripture, the analogy of faith, and the experience of all that believe, needs neither declaration nor confirmation.

3. This assent to all divine revelation may be true and sin-

cere, where there has been no previous work of the law, nor any conviction of sin. No such thing is required thereto, nor are they found in many who yet do so assent to the truth. But, as we have showed, this is necessary to evangelical justifying faith; and to suppose the contrary is to overthrow the order and use of the law and gospel, with their mutual relation to one another in subservience to the design of God in the salvation of sinners.

4. It is not a way of seeking relief to a convinced sinner, whose mouth is stopped, in that he is become guilty before God. Such alone are capable subjects of justification, and do or can seek after it in a due manner. A mere assent to divine revelation is not peculiarly suited to give such persons relief. For it is that which brings them into that condition, from whence they are to be relieved. For the knowledge of sin is by the law. But faith is a peculiar acting of the soul for deliverance.

5. It is no more than what the devils themselves have, as the Apostle James affirms. For that instance of their believing one God, proves that they believe also whatever this one God, who is the first essential truth, reveals to be true. And it may consist with all manner of wickedness, and without any obedience; and so make God a liar, 1 John ii. 4. And it is no wonder if men deny us to be justified by faith, who know no other faith but this.

6. It no way answers the descriptions that are given of justifying faith in the Scripture. Particularly it is by faith as it is justifying that we are said to "receive Christ;" John i. 12; Col. ii. 6. To receive the promise, the word, the grace of God, the atonement, James i. 21; John iii. 33; Acts ii. 41, chap. xi. 1; Rom. v. 11; Heb. xi. 17. To cleave unto God, Deut. iv. 4; Acts xi. 23. And so in the Old Testament it is generally expressed by trust and hope. Now none of these things are contained in a mere assent to the truth; but they require other actings of the soul than what are peculiar to the understanding only.

7. It answers not the experience of them that truly believe. This all our inquiries and arguments in this matter must have respect to. For the sum of what we aim at, is only to discover what they do, who really believe to the justification of life: It is not what notions men may have hereof, nor how they express their conceptions, how defensible they are against objections by accuracy of expressions and subtile distinctions; but

only what we ourselves do, if we truly believe, that we inquire after. And although our differences about it argue the great imperfection of that state wherein we are, so that those who truly believe cannot agree what they do in their so doing, which should give us a mutual tenderness and forbearance towards each other; yet if men would attend to their own experience in the application of their souls to God, for the pardon of sin and righteousness to life, more than to the notions which on various occasions their minds are influenced by, or prepossessed with, many differences and unnecessary disputations about the nature of justifying faith would be prevented or cut off. I deny therefore that this general assent to the truth, how firm soever it be, or what effects in the way of duty or obedience soever it may produce, answers the experience of any one true believer, as containing the entire actings of his soul towards God for pardon of sin and justification.

8. That faith alone is justifying which has justification actually accompanying it. For thence alone it has that denomination. To suppose a man to have justifying faith, and not to be justified, is to suppose a contradiction. Nor do we inquire after the nature of any other faith but that whereby a believer is actually justified. But it is not so with all them in whom this assent is found; nor will those that plead for it, allow that upon it alone any are immediately justified. Wherefore it is sufficiently evident that there is somewhat more required to justifying faith, than a real assent to all divine revelations, although we give that assent by the faith whereby we are justified.

But on the other side, it is supposed that, by some, the object of justifying faith is so much restrained, and the nature of it thereby determined to such a peculiar acting of the mind, as comprises not the whole of what is in the Scripture ascribed to it. So some have said, that it is the pardon of our sins in particular that is the object of justifying faith; faith therefore they make to be a full persuasion of the forgiveness of our sins through the mediation of Christ; or that what Christ did and suffered as our mediator, he did for us in particular. And a particular application of especial mercy to our own souls and consciences is hereby made the essence of faith. Or to believe that our own sins are forgiven, seems hereby to be the first and most proper act of justifying faith. Hence it would follow that whosoever does not believe, or has not a firm persuasion of the forgiveness of his own sins in particular, has no saving faith, is no true believer; which is by no means to be admitted.

And if any have been or are of this opinion, I fear that they were in the asserting of it, negligent of their own experience; or it may be rather, that they knew not how in their experience all the other actings of faith, wherein its essence consists, were included in this persuasion, which in an especial manner they aimed at; whereof we shall speak afterwards. And there is no doubt to me but that this which they propose, faith is suited to, aims at, and ordinarily effects in true believers, who improve it, and grow in its exercise in a due manner.

Many great divines at the first Reformation, did (as the Lutherans generally yet do) thus make the mercy of God in Christ, and thereby the forgiveness of our own sins, to be the proper object of justifying faith, as such; whose essence therefore they placed in a fiducial trust in the grace of God by Christ declared in the promises, with a certain unwavering application of them to ourselves. And I say with some confidence, that those who endeavour not to attain to this, either understand not the nature of believing, or are very negligent both of the grace of God, and of their own peace.

That which inclined those great and holy persons so to express themselves in this matter, and to place the essence of faith in the highest acting of it, (wherein yet they always included and supposed its other acts) was the state of the consciences of men with whom they had to do. Their contest in this article with the Roman Church, was about the way and means whereby the consciences of convinced troubled sinners might come to rest and peace with God. For at that time they were no otherwise instructed, but that these things were to be obtained, not only by works of righteousness which men did themselves in obedience to the commands of God, but also by the strict observance of many inventions of what they called the church; with an ascription of a strange efficacy to the same ends, to the sacrifice of the mass, sacraments, absolutions, penances, pilgrimages, and other the like superstitions. Hereby they observed that the consciences of men were kept in perpetual disquietments, perplexities, fears and bondage, exclusive of that rest, assurance, and peace with God through the blood of Christ, which the gospel proclaims and tenders. And when the leaders of the people in that church had observed this, that indeed the ways and means which they proposed and presented, would never bring the souls of men to rest, nor give them the least assurance of the pardon of sins, they made it a part of their doctrine, that the belief of the pardon of our own sins,

and assurance of the love of God in Christ, were false and pernicious. For what should they else do, when they knew well enough, that in their way, and by their propositions they were not to be attained? Hence the principal controversy in this matter which the reformed divines had with those of the church of Rome was this, whether there be according to and by the gospel, a state of rest and assured peace with God to be attained in this life. And having all advantages imaginable for the proof hereof, from the very nature, use, and end of the gospel, from the grace, love, and design of God in Christ, from the efficacy of his mediation in his oblation and intercession, they assigned these things to be the especial object of justifying faith, and that faith itself to be a fiducial trust in the especial grace and mercy of God, through the blood of Christ, as proposed in the promises of the gospel. That is, they directed the souls of men to seek for peace with God, the pardon of sin, and a right to the heavenly inheritance, by placing their sole trust and confidence in the mercy of God by Christ alone. But yet withal I never read any of them, (I know not what others have done,) who affirmed that every true and sincere believer always had a full assurance of the especial love of God in Christ, or of the pardon of his own sins; though they plead that this the Scripture requires of them in a way of duty, and that this they ought to aim at the attainment of.

And these things I shall leave as I find them, to the use of the church. For I shall not contend with any about the way and manner of expressing the truth, where the substance of it is retained. That which in these things is aimed at, is the advancement and glory of the grace of God in Christ, with the conduct of the souls of men to rest and peace with him. Where this is attained or aimed at, and that in the way of truth for the substance of it, variety of apprehensions and expressions concerning the same things, may tend to the useful exercise of the faith and edification of the church. Wherefore neither opposing nor rejecting what has been delivered by others as their judgments herein, I shall propose my own thoughts concerning it; not without some hopes that they may tend to communicate light in the knowledge of the thing itself inquired into, and the reconciliation of some differences about it amongst learned and holy men. I say therefore, that the Lord Jesus Christ himself, as the ordinance of God in his work of mediation for the recovery and salvation of lost sinners, and as to that end proposed in the promise of the gospel, is the adequate proper object of

justifying faith, or of saving faith in its work and duty with respect to our justification.

The reason why I thus state the object of justifying faith, is because it completely answers all that is ascribed to it in the Scripture, and all that the nature of it requires. What belongs to it as faith in general is here supposed; and what is peculiar to it as justifying, is fully expressed. And a few things will serve for the explication of the thesis which shall afterwards be confirmed.

1. The Lord Jesus Christ himself is asserted to be the proper object of justifying faith. For so it is required in all those testimonies of Scripture where that faith is declared to be our "believing in him, on his name," our "receiving of him, or looking to him," to which the promise of justification and eternal life is annexed; whereof afterwards. See John i. 12; iii. 16, 36; vi. 29, 47; vii. 38; xv. 25. Acts x. 41; xiii. 38, 39; xvi. 31; xxvi. 18, &c.

2. He is not proposed as the object of our faith to the justification of life absolutely, but as the ordinance of God even the Father to that end, who therefore also is the immediate object of faith as justifying; in what respects we shall declare immediately. So justification is frequently ascribed to faith as peculiarly acted on him, John v. 24. "He that believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into judgment, but is passed from death into life." And herein is comprised that grace, love and favour of God, which is the principal moving cause of our justification, Rom. iii. 23, 24. Add hereto, John vi. 29., and the object of faith is complete. "This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent." God the Father as sending, and the Son as sent, that is, Jesus Christ in the work of his mediation, as the ordinance of God for the recovery and salvation of lost sinners, is the object of our faith, See 1 Pet. i. 21.

3. That he may be the object of our faith, whose general nature consists in assent, which is the foundation of all its other acts, he is proposed in the promises of the gospel, which I therefore place as concurring to its complete object. Yet do I not herein consider the promises merely as peculiar divine revelations, in which sense they belong to the formal object of faith; but as they contain, propose, and exhibit Christ as the ordinance of God and the benefits of his mediation to them that believe. There is an especial assent to the promises of the gospel, wherein some place the nature and essence of justifying faith, or of faith in

its work and duty with respect to our justification. And so they make the promises of the gospel to be the proper object of it. And it cannot be, but that in the actings of justifying faith there is a peculiar assent to them. Howbeit this being only an act of the mind, neither the whole nature nor the whole work of faith can consist therein. Wherefore so far as the promises concur to the complete object of faith, they are considered materially also, namely, as they contain, propose, and exhibit Christ to believers. And in that sense are they frequently affirmed in the Scripture to be the object of our faith to the justification of life, Acts ii. 39; xxvi. 6. Rom. iv. 16, 20; xv. 8. Gal. iii. 16, 18. Heb. iv. 1; vi. 13; viii. 6; x. 36.

4. The end for which the Lord Christ, in the work of his mediation, is the ordinance of God, and as such proposed in the promises of the gospel, namely, the recovery and salvation of lost sinners, belongs to the object of faith as justifying. Hence the forgiveness of sin and eternal life are proposed in the Scripture as things that are to be believed to justification, or as the object of our faith, Matt. ix. 2. Acts ii. 38, 39; v. 31; xxvi. 18. Rom. iii. 25; iv. 7, 8. Col. ii. 13. Tit. i. 2, &c. And whereas the just is to live by his faith, and every one is to believe for himself, or make an application of the things believed to his own behoof, some from hence have affirmed the pardon of our own sins, and our own salvation to be the proper object of faith; and indeed it does belong thereto, when in the way and order of God and the gospel, we can attain to it, 1 Cor. xv. 3, 4. Gal. ii. 20. Ephes. i. 6, 7.

Wherefore asserting the Lord Jesus Christ in the work of his mediation to be the object of faith to justification, I include therein the grace of God which is the cause, the pardon of sin which is the effect, and the promises of the gospel which are the means, of communicating Christ and the benefit of his mediation to us.

And all these things are so united, so intermixed in their mutual relations and respects, so concatenated in the purpose of God, and the declaration made of his will in the gospel, that the believing of any one of them virtually includes the belief of the rest. And they by whom any one of them is disbelieved, frustrate and make void all the rest, and so faith itself.

The due consideration of these things solves all the difficulties that arise about the nature of faith, either from the Scripture, or from the experience of them that believe, with respect to its object. Many things in the Scripture are we said to

believe with it and by it, and that to justification. But two things are hence evident. (1) That no one of them can be asserted to be the complete adequate object of our faith. (2) That none of them are so absolutely, but as they relate to the Lord Christ, as the ordinance of God for our justification and salvation.

And this answers the experience of all that truly believe. For these things being united and made inseparable in the constitution of God, all of them are virtually included in every one of them. (1) Some fix their faith and trust principally on the grace, love, and mercy of God; especially they did so under the Old Testament before the clear revelation of Christ and his mediation. So did the Psalmist, Psal. cxxx. 34; xxxiii. 18, 19. And the publican, Luke xviii. 13. And these are in places of the Scripture innumerable proposed as the causes of our justification. See Rom. iii. 24; Ephes. ii. 4—8. Tit. iii. 5—7. But this they do not absolutely, but with respect to the redemption that is in the blood of Christ; Dan. ix. 17. Nor does the Scripture any where propose them to us, but under that consideration. See Rom. iii. 24, 25. Ephes. i. 6—8. For this is the cause, way, and means of the communication of that grace, love, and mercy to us. (2) Some place and fix them principally on the Lord Christ, his mediation and the benefits thereof. This the Apostle Paul proposes frequently to us in his own example. See Gal. ii. 20; Phil. iii. 8—10. But this they do not absolutely, but with respect to the grace and love of God, whence it is that they are given and communicated to us, Rom. viii. 32; John iii. 16; Ephes. i. 6—8. Nor are they otherwise any where proposed to us in the Scripture as the object of our faith to justification. (3) Some in a peculiar manner fix their souls in believing on the promises. And this is exemplified in the instance of Abraham, Gen. xv. 16; Rom. iv. 20. And so are they proposed in the Scripture as the object of our faith, Acts ii. 39; Rom. iv. 16; Heb. iv. 1, 2; vi. 12, 13. But this they do not merely as they are divine revelations, but as they contain and propose to us the Lord Christ and the benefits of his mediation, from the grace, love, and mercy of God. Hence the apostle disputes at large in his Epistle to the Galatians, that if justification be any way but by the promise, both the grace of God and the death of Christ are evacuated and made of none effect. And the reason is, because the promise is nothing but the way and means of the communication of them to us. (4) Some fix their faith on

the things themselves which they aim at; namely, the pardon of sin and eternal life. And these also in the Scripture are proposed to us as the object of our faith, or that which we are to believe to justification, Psa. cxxx. 4; Acts xxvi. 18; Tit. i. 2. But this is to be done in its proper order, especially as to the application of them to our own souls. For we are no where required to believe them, or our own interest in them, but as they are effects of grace, and love of God, through Christ and his mediation proposed in the promises of the gospel. Wherefore the belief of them is included in the belief of these, and is in order of nature antecedent thereto. And the belief of the forgiveness of sins and eternal life, without the due exercise of faith in those causes of them, is but presumption.

I have therefore given the entire object of faith as justifying, or in its work and duty with respect to our justification, in compliance with the testimonies of the Scripture and the experience of them that believe.

Allowing therefore their proper place to the promises, and to the effect of all in the pardon of sins and eternal life; that which I shall further confirm is, that the Lord Christ in the work of his mediation, as the ordinance of God for the recovery and salvation of lost sinners, is the proper adequate object of justifying faith. And the true nature of evangelical faith consists in the respect of the heart (which we shall immediately describe) to the love, grace, and wisdom of God, with the mediation of Christ, in his obedience, with the sacrifice, satisfaction, and atonement for sin which he made by his blood. These things are impiously opposed by some as inconsistent. For the second head of the Socinian impiety is, that the grace of God, and satisfaction of Christ are opposite and inconsistent, so that if we allow of the one we must deny the other. But as those things are so proposed in the Scripture, that without granting them both, neither can be believed; so faith which respects them as subordinate, namely, the mediation of Christ to the grace of God, that fixes itself on the Lord Christ and that redemption which is in his blood, as the ordinance of God, the effect of his wisdom, grace and love, finds rest in both, and in nothing else.

For the proof of the assertion I need not labour in it; it being not only abundantly declared in the Scripture, but that which contains in it a principal part of the design and substance of the gospel. I shall therefore only refer to some of the places wherein it is taught, or the testimonies that are given to it.

The whole is expressed in that place of the apostle wherein the doctrine of justification is most eminently proposed to us, Rom. iii. 24, 25: "Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood; to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins." Whereto we may add, Ephes. i. 6, 7. "He hath made us accepted in the beloved, in whom we have redemption through his blood, according to the riches of his grace." That whereby we are justified is the especial object of our faith to justification. But this is the Lord Christ in the work of his mediation. For we are justified by the redemption that is in Jesus Christ; for in him we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sin. Christ as a propitiation is the cause of our justification, and the object of our faith, or we attain it by faith in his blood. But this is so under this formal consideration, as he is the ordinance of God for that end appointed, given, proposed, set forth from and by the grace, wisdom, and love of God. God set him forth to be a propitiation. He makes us accepted in the beloved. We have redemption in his blood, according to the riches of his grace, whereby he makes us accepted in the beloved. And herein he abounds towards us in all wisdom; Ephes. i. 8. This therefore is that which the gospel proposes to us, as the especial object of our faith to the justification of life.

But we may also in the same manner confirm the several parts of the assertion distinctly.

1. The Lord Jesus Christ as proposed in the promise of the gospel, is the peculiar object of faith to justification. There are three sorts of testimonies whereby this is confirmed.

1. Those wherein it is positively asserted; as Acts x. 41. "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name, whosoever believeth in him shall receive the remission of sins." Christ believed in as the means and cause of the remission of sins, is that which all the prophets give witness to, Acts xvi. 31. "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved." It is the answer of the apostles to the jailor's inquiry; "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" His duty in believing, and the object of it, "the Lord Jesus Christ," is what they return thereto, Acts iv. 12. "Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved." That which is proposed to us as the only way and means of our justification and salvation,

and that in opposition to all other ways, is the object of faith to our justification; but this is Christ alone, exclusively to all other things. This is testified to by Moses and the prophets, the design of the whole Scripture being to direct the faith of the church to the Lord Christ alone, for life and salvation. Luke xxiv. 25—27.

2. All those wherein justifying faith is affirmed to be our believing in him, or believing on his name, which are multiplied. John i. 12. "He gave power to them to become the sons of God, who believed on his name." iii. 16. "That whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." ver. 36. "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life." vi. 29. "This is the work of God that ye believe on him whom he hath sent." ver. 47. "He that believeth on me hath everlasting life." vii. 38. "He that believeth on me, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water." So, ix. 35—37; xi. 25; Acts xxvi. 18. "That they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them that are sanctified, by faith that is in me." 1 Pet. ii. 6, 7. In all which places, and many other, we are not only directed to place and fix our faith on him, but the effect of justification is ascribed thereto. So expressly, Acts xiii. 38, 39, which is what we design to prove.

3. Those which give us such a description of the acts of faith, as make him the direct and proper object of it. Such are they wherein it is called a "receiving of him." John i. 12. "To as many as received him." Col. ii. 6. "As you have received Christ Jesus the Lord." That which we receive by faith is the proper object of it. And it is represented by their looking to the brazen serpent when it was lifted up, who were stung by fiery serpents, John iii. 14, 15; xii. 32. Faith is that act of the soul whereby convinced sinners, ready otherwise to perish, look to Christ as he was made a propitiation for their sins; and they who so do shall not perish but have everlasting life. He is therefore the object of our faith.

2. He is so as he is the ordinance of God to this end which consideration is not to be separated from our faith in him. And this also is confirmed by several sorts of testimonies.

1. All those wherein the love and grace of God are proposed as the only cause of giving Jesus Christ to be the way and means of our recovery and salvation, whence they become, or God in them, the supreme efficient cause of our justification. John iii. 16. "God so loved the world that he gave his only

begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life." So Rom. v. 8; 1 John iv. 9, 10. "Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ." Rom. iii. 23; Ephes. i. 6—8. This the Lord Christ directs our faith to continually, referring all to him that sent him, and whose will he came to do. Heb. x. 5.

2. All those wherein God is said to set forth and propose Christ, and to make him be for us, and to us, what he is so, to the justification of life. Rom. iii. 25. "Whom God hath proposed to be a propitiation." 1 Cor. i. 30. "Who of God is made unto us wisdom and righteousness, and sanctification and redemption." 2 Cor. v. 21. "He hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." Acts v. 35, &c. Wherefore in the acting of faith in Christ to justification, we can no otherwise consider him but as the ordinance of God to that end; he brings nothing to us, does nothing for us, but what God appointed, designed, and made him to be. And this must diligently be considered, that by our regard by faith to the blood, the sacrifice, the satisfaction of Christ, we take off nothing from the free grace, favour and love of God.

3. All those wherein the wisdom of God, in the contrivance of this way of justification and salvation is proposed to us: Ephes. i. 7, 8. "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 understanding." See Ephes. iii. 10, 11; 1 Cor. i. 24.

The whole is comprised in that of the Apostle; "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them," 2 Cor. v. 19. All that is done in our reconciliation to God, as to the pardon of our sins, and acceptance with him to life, was by the presence of God in his grace, wisdom, and power in Christ, designing and effecting of it.

Wherefore the Lord Christ proposed in the promise of the gospel as the object of our faith to the justification of life, is considered as the ordinance of God to that end. Hence the love, the grace, and the wisdom of God in the sending and giving of him, are comprised in that object; and not only the actings of God in Christ towards us, but all his actings towards the person of Christ himself to the same end belong thereto. So as to his death; God set him forth to be a propitiation; Rom. iii. 24. He spared him not but delivered him up for

us all, Rom. viii. 32. And therein laid all our sins upon him, Isa. liii. 6. So he was raised for our justification, Rom. iv. 25. And our faith is in God who raised him from the dead, Rom. x. 9, and in his exaltation, Acts v. 31. Which things complete the record that God hath given of his Son, 1 John v. 10—12.

The whole is confirmed by the exercise of faith in prayer, which is the soul's application of itself to God for the participation of the benefits of the mediation of Christ. And it is called our access through him to the Father; Eph. ii. 18. Our coming through him to the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need, Heb. iv. 15, 16, and through him, as both a high priest and sacrifice, Heb. x. 19—21. So do we bow our knees to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, Ephes. iii. 14. This answers the experience of all who know what it is to pray. We come therein in the name of Christ, by him, through his mediation, to God even the Father, to be through his grace, love and mercy, made partakers of what he has designed and promised to communicate to poor sinners by him. And this represents the complete object of our faith.

The due consideration of these things will reconcile and reduce into perfect harmony, whatever is spoken in the Scripture concerning the object of justifying faith, or what we are said to believe therewith. For whereas this is affirmed of sundry things distinctly, none of them can be supposed to be the entire adequate object of faith. But consider them all in their relation to Christ, and they have all of them their proper place therein; namely, the grace of God, which is the cause; the pardon of sin, which is the effect; and the promises of the gospel, which are the means of communicating the Lord Christ and the benefits of his mediation to us.



CHAPTER II.

THE NATURE OF JUSTIFYING FAITH.

THAT which we shall now inquire into, is the nature of justifying faith; or of faith in that act and exercise of it whereby we are justified, or whereon justification according to God's

ordination and promise ensues. And the reader is desired to take along with him a supposition of those things which we have already ascribed to it, as it is sincere faith in general; as also of what is required previously thereto, as to its especial nature, work and duty in our justification. For we deny that ordinarily and according to the method of God's proceeding with us declared in the Scripture, wherein the rule of our duty is prescribed, any one does, or can truly believe with faith to justification, in whom the work of conviction before described, has not been wrought. All descriptions or definitions of faith that have not a respect thereto, are but vain speculations. And hence some give us such definitions of faith, as it is hard to conceive, that they ever asked of themselves, what they do, in their believing on Jesus Christ for life and salvation.

The nature of justifying faith with respect to that exercise of it whereby we are justified, consists in the heart's approbation of the way of justification and salvation of sinners by Jesus Christ proposed in the gospel, as proceeding from the grace, wisdom and love of God, with its acquiescence therein, as to its own concernment and condition.

There needs no more for the explanation of this declaration of the nature of faith, than what we have before proved concerning its object; and what may seem wanting thereto, will be fully supplied in the ensuing confirmation of it. The Lord Christ and his mediation, as the ordinance of God for the recovery, life and salvation of sinners, is supposed as the object of this faith. And they are all considered as an effect of the wisdom, grace, authority, and love of God, with all their actings in and towards the Lord Christ himself, in his susception and discharge of his office. Hereto he constantly refers all that he did and suffered, with all the benefits redounding to the church thereby. Hence, as we observed before, sometimes the grace, or love, or especial mercy of God, sometimes his actings in or towards the Lord Christ himself, in sending him, giving him up to death, and raising him from the dead, are proposed as the object of our faith to justification. But they are so always with respect to his obedience and the atonement that he made for sin. Neither are they so altogether absolutely considered, but as proposed in the promises of the gospel. Hence a sincere assent to the divine veracity in those promises, is included in this approbation.

What belongs to the confirmation of this description of faith

shall be reduced to these four heads. (1) The declaration of its contrary, or the nature of privative unbelief upon the proposal of the gospel. For these things mutually illustrate one another. (2) The declaration of the design and end of God in and by the gospel. (3) The nature of faith's compliance with that design, or its actings with respect thereto. (4) The order, method, and way of believing as declared in the Scripture.

1. The gospel is the revelation or declaration of that way of justification and salvation for sinners by Jesus Christ, which God in infinite wisdom, love and grace, has prepared. And upon a supposition of the reception thereof, it is accompanied with precepts of obedience, and promises of rewards. Therein "the righteousness of God," that which he requires, accepts and approves to salvation, "is revealed from faith unto faith," Rom. i. 17. This is the record of God therein "that he hath given unto us eternal life, and this life is in his Son," 1 John v. 10. So John iii. 14—17. The words of this life, Acts v. 20. All the counsel of God, Acts xx. 27. Wherefore in the dispensation or preaching of the gospel, this way of salvation is proposed to sinners, as the great effect of divine wisdom and grace. Unbelief is the rejection, neglect, non admission, or disapprobation of it, on the terms whereon, and for the ends for which it is so proposed. The unbelief of the Pharisees upon the preparatory preaching of John the Baptist is called the "rejecting of the counsel of God against themselves," that is, to their own ruin, Luke vii. 30. "They would none of my counsel," is an expression to the same purpose, Prov. i. 30. So is the "neglecting of this great salvation," Heb. ii. 3, the not giving it that admission which the excellency of it requires. A disallowing of Christ; the Stone *ὃν ἀπεδοξίμασαν οἱ ἀικοδομοῦντες*, 1 Pet. ii. 7, "which the builders disapproved of," as not meet for that place and work whereto it was designed, Acts iv. 14. This is unbelief. To disapprove of Christ and the way of salvation by him, as not answering divine wisdom nor suited to the end designed. So is it described by the refusing or not receiving of him;—all to the same purpose.

What is intended will be more evident, if we consider the proposal of the gospel where it issued in unbelief, in the first preaching of it, and where it continues still so to do.

1. Most of those who rejected the gospel by their unbelief, did it under this notion, that the way of salvation and blessedness proposed therein, was not a way answering divine goodness and power, such as they might safely confide in and trust

to. This the apostle declares at large, 1 Cor. i; so he expresses it, ver. 23, 24. "We preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling block, and unto the Greeks foolishness. But unto them that are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God." That which they declared to them in the preaching of the gospel was, that "Christ died for our sins according to the Scripture," chap. xv. 3. Herein they proposed him as the ordinance of God, as the great effect of his wisdom and power for the salvation of sinners. But as to those who continued in their unbelief, they rejected it as any such way, esteeming it both weakness and folly. And therefore he describes the faith of them that are called, by their approbation of the wisdom and power of God herein. The want of a comprehension of the glory of God in this way of salvation, and rejecting it thereon, is that unbelief which ruins the souls of men, 2 Cor. iv. 3, 4.

So is it with all that continue unbelievers under the proposal of the object of faith in the preaching of the gospel. They may give an assent to the truth of it, so far as it is a mere act of the mind; at least they find not themselves concerned to reject it. Yea, they may assent to it with that temporary faith which we described before, and perform many duties of religion thereon. Yet they manifest that they are not sincere believers, that they do not "believe with the heart unto righteousness," by many things that are irreconcilable to, and inconsistent with justifying faith. The inquiry therefore is, wherein the unbelief of such persons, on account of which they perish, consists, and what is the formal nature of it. It is not as was said, in the want of an assent to the truths of the doctrine of the gospel; for from such an assent are they said in many places of the Scripture to believe, as has been proved. And this assent may be so firm, and by various means so rooted in their minds, that in testimony to it they may give their bodies to be burned; as men also may do in the confirmation of a false persuasion. Nor is it the want of an especial fiduciary application of the promises of the gospel to themselves, and the belief of the pardon of their own sins in particular. For this is not proposed to them in the first preaching of the gospel, as that which they are first to believe; and there may be a believing unto righteousness where this is not attained, Isa. l. 10. This will evidence faith not to be true, but it is not formal unbelief. Nor is it the want of obedience to the precepts of the gospel in duties of holiness and righteousness. For these commands as

formally given in and by the gospel, belong only to them that truly believe, and are justified thereon. That therefore which is required to evangelical faith, wherein the nature of it consists, as it is the foundation of all future obedience, is the *heart's approbation of the way of life and salvation* by Jesus Christ, proposed to it as the effect of the infinite wisdom, love, grace, and goodness of God; and as that which is suited to all the wants and whole design of guilty convinced sinners. This such persons have not, and in the want thereof consists the formal nature of unbelief. For without this, no man is, or can be influenced by the gospel to a relinquishment of sin, or encouraged to obedience, whatever they may do on other grounds and motives that are foreign to the grace of it. And wherever this cordial sincere approbation of the way of salvation by Jesus Christ proposed in the gospel prevails, it will infallibly produce both repentance and obedience.

If the mind and heart of a convinced sinner (for of such alone we treat) be able spiritually, to discern the wisdom, love, and grace of God in this way of salvation, and be under the power of that persuasion, he has the ground of repentance and obedience which is given by the gospel. The receiving of Christ mentioned in the Scripture, and whereby the nature of faith in its exercise is expressed, I refer to the latter part of the description given concerning the soul's acquiescence in God, by the way proposed.

Again, some there were at first, and such still continue to be, who rejected not this way absolutely, and in the notion of it, but comparatively, as reduced to practice, and so perished in their unbelief. They judged the way of their own righteousness to be better, as that which might be more safely trusted to, as more according to the mind of God and to his glory. So did the Jews generally, the frame of whose minds the apostle represents, Rom. x. 3, 4. And many of them assented to the doctrine of the gospel in general as true, howbeit they liked it not in their hearts as the best way of justification and salvation, but sought for them by the works of the law.

Wherefore unbelief in its formal nature consists in the want of a spiritual discerning, and approbation of the way of salvation by Jesus Christ, as an effect of the infinite wisdom, goodness and love of God. For where these are, the soul of a convinced sinner cannot but embrace it, and adhere to it. Hence also all acquiescence in this way, and trust and confidence in committing the soul to it, or to God in it, and by it,

without which whatever is pretended of believing, is but a shadow of faith, is impossible to such persons. For they want the foundation whercon alone they can be built. And the consideration of this sufficiently manifests wherein the nature of true evangelical faith consists.

2. The design of God in and by the gospel, with the work and office of faith with respect thereto, further confirms the description given of it. That which God designs herein in the first place, is not the justification and salvation of sinners. His utmost complete end in all his counsels is his own glory; he does "all things for himself," nor can he who is infinite do otherwise. But in an especial manner he expresses this concerning this way of salvation by Jesus Christ.

Particularly, He designed herein the glory of his righteousness. "To declare his righteousness;" Rom. iii. 25. Of his love; "God so loved the world," John iii. 16. "Herein we perceive the love of God that he laid down his life for us," 1 John iii. 16. Of his grace; "accepted to the praise of the glory of his grace," Ephes. i. 5, 6. Of his wisdom; "Christ crucified, the wisdom of God," 1 Cor. i. 24, "might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God," Ephes. iii. 10. Of his power; "it is the power of God unto salvation," Rom. i. 16. Of his faithfulness, Rom. iv. 16. For God designed herein, not only the reparation of all that glory, whose declaration was impeached and obscured by the entrance of sin, but also a further exaltation and more eminent manifestation of it, as to the degrees of its exaltation, and some especial instances before concealed, Ephes. iii. 9. And all this is called "the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ," whereof faith is the beholding, 2 Cor. iv. 6.

3. This being the principal design of God in the way of justification and salvation by Christ proposed in the gospel, that which on our part is required to a participation of the benefits of it, is the ascription of that glory to God which he designs so to exalt. The acknowledgment of all these glorious properties of the divine nature, as manifested in the provision and proposition of this way of life, righteousness and salvation, with an approbation of the way itself as an effect of them, and that which is safely to be trusted to, is that which is required of us; and this is *faith* or believing. "Being strong in faith he gave glory to God," Rom. iv. 22. And this is in the nature of the weakest degree of sincere faith. And no other grace, work or duty, is suited to this, or firstly and directly

of that tendency, but only consequentially and in the way of gratitude. And although I cannot wholly assent to him who affirms that faith, in the Epistles of Paul, is nothing but, "an exalted sentiment of the power, justice, goodness, and covenant-faithfulness of God," *existimatio magnifice sentiens de Dei potentia, justitia, bonitate, et si quid promiserit in eo prae-stando constantia*; because it is too general and not limited to the way of salvation by Christ, his "Elect in whom he will be glorified," yet has it much of the nature of faith in it. Wherefore I say, that hence we may both learn the nature of faith, and whence it is that faith alone is required to our justification. The reason of it is, because this *alone* is that grace or duty whereby we do or can give to God that glory which he desigus to manifest and exalt in and by Jesus Christ. Faith in the sense we inquire after, is the heart's approbation of, and consent to the way of life and salvation of sinners by Jesus Christ, as that, wherein the glory of the righteousness, wisdom, grace, love, and mercy of God is exalted, the praise whereof it ascribes to him, and rests in it, as to the ends of it, namely, justification, life and salvation. It is to give "glory to God." Rom. iv. 20, to "behold his glory as in a glass," or the gospel wherein it is represented to us, 2 Cor. iii. 18; to have in our hearts the "light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." 2 Cor. iv. 6. The contrary makes God a liar, and thereby despoils him of the glory of all those holy properties which he this way designed to manifest, 1 John v. 10.

And if I mistake not, this is that to which the experience of them that truly believe, when they are out of the heats of disputation, will give testimony.

4. To understand the nature of justifying faith aright, or the act and exercise of saving faith in order to our justification, which are properly inquired after, we must consider the order of it, first the things which are necessarily previous to it, and then what it is to believe with respect to them. As,

1. The state of a convinced sinner; who is the only proper subject of justification. This has been spoken to already; and the necessity of its precedency to the orderly proposal and receiving of evangelical righteousness for justification, demonstrated. If we lose a respect to this, we lose our best guide towards the discovery of the nature of faith. Let no man think to understand the gospel, who knows nothing of the law. God's constitution and the nature of the things themselves, have given the law the precedency with respect to sinners;

for "by the law is the knowledge of sin." And gospel faith is the soul's acting according to the mind of God for deliverance from that state and condition which it is cast under by the law. And all those descriptions of faith which abound in the writings of learned men, which do not at least include in them a virtual respect to this state and condition, or the work of the law on the consciences of sinners, are all of them vain speculations. There is nothing in this whole doctrine that I will more firmly adhere to, than the necessity of the convictions mentioned previous to true believing, without which not one line of it can be understood aright, and men do but beat the air in their contentions about it. See Rom. iii. 21—24.

2. We suppose herein a sincere assent to all divine revelations, whercof the promises of grace and mercy by Christ are an especial part. This Paul supposed in Agrippa when he would have won him over to faith in Christ Jesus. "King Agrippa, believest thou the prophets? I know that thou believest." Acts xxvi. 27. And this assent which respects the promises of the gospel, not as they contain, propose, and exhibit the Lord Christ and the benefits of his mediation to us, but as divine revelations of infallible truth, is true and sincere in its kind, as we described it before under the notion of temporary faith. But as it proceeds no further, as it includes no act of the will or heart, it is not that faith whercof we are justified. However it is required thereto, and is included therein.

3. The proposal of the gospel according to the mind of God is hereunto supposed: that is, that it be preached according to God's appointment. For not only the gospel itself, but the dispensation or preaching of it in the ministry of the church is ordinarily required to believing. This the Apostle asserts, and proves the necessity of it at large. Rom. x. 11—17. Herein the Lord Christ and his mediation with God, the only way and means for the justification and salvation of lost convinced sinners, as the product and effect of divine wisdom, love, grace and righteousness, is revealed, declared, proposed, and offered to such sinners. For therein is "the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith." Rom. i. 17. The glory of God is represented as "in a glass." 2 Cor. iii. 18, and life and immortality are brought to light through the gospel." 2 Tim. i. 10; Heb. ii. 3. Wherefore,

4. The persons who are required to believe, and whose im-

meritate duty it is so to do, are those who really in their own consciences are brought to make the inquiries mentioned in the Scripture; what shall we do? What shall we do to be saved? How shall we fly from the wrath to come? Wherewithal shall we appear before God? How shall we answer what is said to our charge? Or such as being sensible of the guilt of sin, seek for a righteousness in the sight of God, Acts ii. 38; xvi. 30, 31; Micah vi. 6, 7; Isa. xxxv. 4; Heb. vi. 18.

On these suppositions the command and direction given to men being "believe and you shall be saved," the inquiry is, what is that act or work of faith, whereby they may obtain a real interest or propriety in the promises of the gospel, and the things declared in them to their justification before God?

And 1. It is evident from what has been discoursed, that it does not consist in, that it is not to be fully expressed by, any one single habit or act of the mind or will distinctly whatever. For there are such descriptions given of it in the Scripture, such things are proposed as the object of it, and such is the experience of all that sincerely believe, as no one single act either of the mind or will, can answer to. Nor can an exact method of those acts of the soul which are concurrent therein be prescribed. Only what is essential to it is manifest.

2. That which in order of nature seems to have the pre-eminence is the assent of the mind to that which the Psalmist betakes himself to in the first place, for relief, under a sense of sin and trouble. Psal. cxxx. 3, 4. "If thou, Lord, shouldst mark iniquity, O Lord, who shall stand?" The sentence of the law and judgment of conscience lie against him as to any acceptance with God. Therefore he despairs in himself, of standing in judgment, or being acquitted before him. In this state that which the soul first fixes on as to its relief, is that there is *forgiveness* with God. This as declared in the gospel, is, that God in his love and grace will pardon and justify guilty sinners through the blood and mediation of Christ. So it is proposed, Rom. iii. 23, 24. The assent of the mind hereto as proposed in the promise of the gospel, is the root of faith, the foundation of all that the soul does in believing. Nor is there any evangelical faith without it. But yet consider it abstractedly as a mere act of the mind, the essence and nature of justifying faith does not consist solely therein, though it cannot be without it. But,

3. This is accompanied in sincere believing with an approbation of the way of deliverance and salvation proposed, as an

effect of divine grace, wisdom and love, whereon the heart rests in it, and applies itself to it according to the mind of God. This is that faith whereby we are justified; which I shall further evince by showing what is included in it, and inseparable from it.

1. It includes in it a sincere renunciation of all other ways and means for the attaining of righteousness, life and salvation. This is essential to faith, Acts iv. 12; Hos. xiv. 2, 3; Jerem. iii. 23; Psa. lxxi. 16. "I will make mention of thy righteousness, of thine only." When a person is in the condition before described, (and such alone are called immediately to believe, Matt. ix. 13; xi. 28; 1 Tim. i. 15;) many things will present themselves to him for his relief; particularly his own righteousness, Rom. x. 3. A renunciation of them all as to any hope or expectation of relief from them, belongs to sincere believing, Isa. l. 10, 11.

2. There is in it the will's consent, whereby the soul betakes itself cordially and sincerely, as to all its expectation of pardon of sin and righteousness before God, to the way of salvation proposed in the gospel. This is that which is called *coming* to Christ, and *receiving* of him, whereby true justifying faith is so often expressed in the Scripture; or as it is peculiarly called believing in him, or believing on his name. The whole is expressed, John xiv. 6. "Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, the truth and the life; no man cometh unto the Father but by me."

3. An acquiescence of the heart in God, as the author and principal cause of the way of salvation prepared; as acting in a way of sovereign grace and mercy towards sinners, "who by him do believe in God who raised him up from the dead, and gave him glory, that your faith and hope might be in God," 1 Pet. i. 21. The heart of a sinner herein gives to God the glory of all those holy properties of his nature which he designed to manifest in and by Jesus Christ. See Isa. xlii. 1; xlix. 3. And this acquiescence of the heart in God, is that which is the immediate root of that waiting, patience, long-suffering and hope, which are the proper acts and effects of justifying faith, Heb. vi. 12, 15, 18, 19.

4. Trust in God, or the grace and mercy of God in and through the Lord Christ as set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, belongs hereto, or necessarily ensues hereon. For the person called to believing, is (1) convinced of sin, and exposed to wrath. (2) Has nothing else to trust to for help and relief. (3) Actually renounces all other things that

tender themselves to that end ; and therefore without some act of trust the soul must lie under actual despair, which is utterly inconsistent with faith, or the choice and approbation of the way of salvation before described. 5. The most frequent declaration of the nature of faith in the Scripture, especially in the Old Testament, is by this trust, and that because it is that act of it which composes the soul, and brings it to all the rest it can attain. For all our rest in this world is from trust in God. And the especial object of this trust, so far as it belongs to the nature of that faith whereby we are justified, is *God in Christ* reconciling the world to himself. For this is respected where his goodness, his mercy, his grace, his name, his faithfulness, his power, are expressed, or any of them, as that which it immediately relies upon. For they are no way the object of our trust, nor can be, but on the account of the covenant which is confirmed and ratified in and by the blood of Christ alone.

Whether this trust or confidence shall be esteemed of the *essence* of faith, or as that which, on the first fruit and working of it, we are found exercising, we need not positively determine. I place it therefore as that which belongs to justifying faith, and is inseparable from it. For if all we have spoken before concerning faith may be comprised under the notion of a firm assent and persuasion, yet it cannot be so, if any such assent be conceivable exclusive of this *trust*.

This trust is that whereof many divines make special mercy to be the peculiar object; and that especial mercy to be such as to include in it the pardon of our own sins. This by their adversaries is fiercely opposed, and that on such grounds as manifest that they do not believe that there is any such state attainable in this life; and that if there were, it would not be of any use to us, but rather be a means of security and negligence in our duty; wherein they betray how great is the ignorance of these things in their own minds. But mercy may be said to be especial two ways. (1) In itself, and in opposition to common mercy. (2) With respect to him that believes. In the first sense especial mercy is the object of faith as justifying. For no more is intended by it, but the grace of God setting forth Christ to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, Rom. iii. 23, 24. And faith in this especial mercy, is that which the apostle calls our "receiving of the atonement," Rom. v. 11. That is our approbation of it, and adherence to it, as the great effect of Divine wisdom, goodness, faithfulness,

love and grace, which will therefore never fail them who put their trust in it. In the latter sense it is looked on as the pardon of our own sins in particular, the especial mercy of God to our souls. That this is the object of justifying faith, that a man is bound to believe this in order of nature antecedent to his justification I deny; nor yet do I know of any testimony or safe experience whereby it may be confirmed. But yet those who deny that an undeceiving belief hereof is to be attained in this life; or that it is our duty to believe the pardon of our own sins, and the especial love of God in Christ, in the order and method of our duty and privileges limited and determined in the gospel, so as to come to the full assurance of them, (though I will not deny but that peace with God which is inseparable from justification may be without them) seem not to be much acquainted with the design of God in the gospel, the efficacy of the sacrifice of Christ, the nature and work of faith or their own duty, nor the professed experience of believers recorded in the Scripture. See Rom. v. 1—5; Heb. x. 2, 10, 20, 21; Psa. xlvi. 1, 2; cxxxviii. 7, 8, &c. Yet it is granted that all these things are rather fruits or effects of faith, as under exercise and improvement, than of the essence of it, as it is the instrument in our justification.

And the trust before mentioned, which is either essential to justifying faith, or inseparable from it, is excellently expressed by Bernard,* “I look at three things, on which all my hope depends; the love which has adopted, the truth which has promised, and the power which fulfils. Let my foolish thoughts murmur as they will, saying, Who then art thou? and how great is that glory, and with what merits hopest thou to obtain it? With confidence I shall reply, ‘I know in whom I have believed,’ and am assured that in love he has adopted me; that he is true to his promises; that he is powerful in fulfilment; for he may do whatever he will. This is a three-fold cord, which cannot easily be broken. Let us firmly hold to it, when it is let down to us here on earth from our country

* *Tria considero in quibus tota mea spes consistit; charitatem adoptionis, veritatem promissionis, potestatem redditionis. Murmuret jam quantum voluerit insipiens cogitatio mea, dicens Quis enim es tu, et quanta est illa gloria, quibusve meritis hanc obtinere speras? et ego fiducialiter respondebo, Scio cui credidi, et certus sum quia in charitate adoptavit me, quia verax in promissione, quia potens in exhibitione; licet enim ei facere quod voluerit. Hic est funiculus triplex, qui difficulter rumpitur, quem nobis ex patria nostra in hanc terram usque demissum, firmiter obsecro teneamus, et ipse nos sublevet, ipse nos trahat et pertrahat usque ad conspectum gloriæ magni Dei, qui est benedictus in secula. De Evangel. Ser. 3.*

above, until it raise us and draw us up even to the presence of the glory of the great God, who is blessed for ever!"

Concerning this faith and trust it is earnestly pleaded by many, that obedience is included in it. But as to the way and manner thereof they variously express themselves. Socinus and those who follow him absolutely, make obedience to be the essential form of faith, which is denied by Episcopius. The Papists distinguish between faith informed, and faith formed by charity, which comes to the same purpose. For both are built on this supposition, that there may be true evangelical faith, that which is required as our duty, and consequently is accepted of God, that may contain all in it which is comprised in the name and duty of faith, that may be without charity or obedience, and so be useless. For the Socinians do not make obedience to be the essence of faith absolutely, but as it justifies. And so they plead to this purpose, that "faith without works is dead." But to suppose that a dead faith, or that faith which is dead, is that faith which is required of us in the gospel in the way of duty, is a monstrous imagination. Others plead for obedience, charity, the love of God, to be included in the nature of faith; but plead not directly that this obedience is the form of faith, but that which belongs to the perfection of it, as it is justifying. Nor yet do they say that by this obedience, a continued course of works and obedience, as though that were necessary to our first justification, is required; but only a sincere active purpose of obedience; and thereon, as the manner of our days is, load them with reproaches who are otherwise minded, if they knew who they were. For how impossible it is according to their principles who believe justification by faith alone, that justifying faith should be without a sincere purpose of heart to obey God in all things, I shall briefly declare. For (1) they believe that faith is not of ourselves, it is "the gift of God;" yea that it is a grace wrought in the hearts of men by the exceeding greatness of his power. And to suppose such a grace dead, inactive, unfruitful, not operative to the great end of the glory of God, and the transforming of the souls of them that receive it into his image, is a reflection on the wisdom, goodness and love of God himself. (2) That this grace is in them a principle of spiritual life; which in the habit of it as resident in the heart, is not really distinguished from that of all other grace whereby we live to God. So, that there should be faith habitually in the heart, (I mean that evangelical faith we inquire

after,) or actually exercised, where there is not a habit of all other graces, is utterly impossible. Neither is it possible that there should be any exercise of this faith to justification, but where the mind is prepared, disposed, and determined to universal obedience. And therefore (3) It is denied, that any faith, trust, or confidence which may be imagined, so as to be absolutely separable from, and have its whole nature consistent with the absence of, all other graces, is that faith which is the especial gift of God, and which in the gospel is required of us in a way of duty. And whereas some have said, that "men may believe, and place their firm trust in Christ for life and salvation, and yet not be justified;" it is a position so destructive of the gospel, and so full of scandal to all pious souls, and contains such an express denial of the record that God hath given concerning his Son Jesus Christ, that I wonder any person of sobriety and learning should be surprised into it. And whereas they plead the experience of multitudes who profess this firm faith and confidence in Christ, and yet are not justified; it is true indeed, but nothing to their purpose. For whatever they profess, not only, not one of them does so in the sight and judgment of God, where this matter is to be tried, but it is no difficult matter to convict them of the folly and falseness of this profession, by the light and rule of the gospel, even in their own consciences if they would attend to instruction.

Wherefore we say the faith whereby we are justified, is such as is not found in any but those who are made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and by him united to Christ, whose nature is renewed, and in whom there is a principle of all grace and purpose of obedience. Only we say it is not any other grace, as charity and the like, nor any obedience that gives life and form to this faith; but it is this faith that gives life and efficacy to all other graces, and form to all evangelical obedience. Neither does any thing hence accrue to our adversaries, who would have all those graces which are, in their root and principle at least, present in all that are to be justified, to have the same influence upon our justification as faith has; or who say that we are justified by faith alone, and in explication of it, in answer to the reproaches of the Romanists, say we are justified by faith alone, but not by that faith which is alone;—that we intend by faith all other graces and obedience also. For besides that the nature of no other grace is capable of that office which is assigned to faith in our justification, nor can be as-

sumed into a society in operation with it, namely, to receive Christ, and the promises of life by him, and to give glory to God on their account; so when they can give us any testimony of Scripture assigning our justification to any other grace, or all graces together, or all the fruits of them, as it is assigned to faith, they shall be attended to.

And this in particular is to be affirmed of *repentance*, concerning which it is most vehemently urged, that it is of the same necessity to our justification as faith is. For this they say is easily proved from testimonies of Scripture innumerable, which call all men to repentance that will be saved; especially those two eminent places are insisted on. Acts ii. 38, 39; iii. 16. But that which they have to prove, is not that it is of the same necessity with faith to them that are to be justified, but that it is of the same use with faith in their justification. Baptism in that place of the Apostle, Acts ii. 38, 39, is joined with faith no less than repentance. And in other places it is expressly put into the same condition. Hence most of the ancients concluded that it was no less necessary to salvation than faith or repentance itself. Yet never did any of them assign it the same use in justification with faith. But it is pleaded, whatever is a necessary condition of the new covenant, is also a necessary condition of justification. For otherwise a man might be justified, and continuing in his justified estate not be saved, for want of that necessary condition. For by a necessary condition of the new covenant they understand that without which a man cannot be saved. But of this nature is repentance as well as faith, and so it is equally a condition of our justification. The ambiguity of the signification of the word *condition* casts much disorder on the present inquiry, in the discourses of some men. But to pass it by at present, I say, final perseverance is a necessary condition of the new covenant; wherefore by this rule it is also, of justification. They say some things are conditions absolutely, such as are faith and repentance, and a purpose of obedience: some are so on some supposition only; namely, that a man's life be continued in this world; such is a course in obedience and good works, and perseverance to the end. Wherefore I say then, that on supposition that a man lives in this world, perseverance to the end is a necessary condition of his justification. And if so, no man can be justified whilst he is in this world. For a condition suspends that whereof it is a condition from existence, until it be accomplished. It is then to no purpose to dispute

any longer about justification, if indeed no man is nor can be justified in this life. But how contrary this is to Scripture and experience is known.

If it be said that final perseverance, which is so express a condition of salvation in the new covenant, is not indeed the condition of our first justification, but it is the condition of the continuation of our justification; then they yield up their grand position, that whatever is a necessary condition of the new covenant, is a necessary condition of justification; for it is that which they call the *first justification* alone which we treat about. And that the continuation of our justification depends solely on the same causes with our justification itself, shall be afterwards declared. But it is not yet proved, nor ever will be, that whatever is required in them that are to be justified, is a condition whereon their justification is immediately suspended. We allow that alone to be a condition of justification which has an influence of causality thereto, though it be but the causality of an instrument. This we ascribe to faith alone. And because we do so, it is pleaded that we ascribe more in our justification to ourselves than they do by whom we are opposed. For we ascribe the efficiency of an instrument herein to our own faith; when they say only that it is a condition, or *causa sine qua non*, of our justification. But I judge that grave and wise men ought not to give so much to the defence of the cause they have undertaken, seeing they cannot but know indeed the contrary. For after they have given the specious name of a *condition* and a *causa sine qua non*, to faith, they immediately take all other graces and works of obedience into the same state with it, and the same use in justification; and after this seeming gold has been cast for awhile into the fire of disputation, there comes out the calf of a personal inherent righteousness, whereby men are justified before God, *virtute fœderis Evangelici*; in virtue of the Gospel covenant; for as for the righteousness of Christ to be imputed to us, it is gone into heaven, and they know not what has become of it.

Having given this brief declaration of the nature of justifying faith, and the acts of it, (as I suppose sufficient to my present design) I shall not trouble myself to give an accurate definition of it. What are my thoughts concerning it, will be better understood by what has been spoken, than by any precise definition I can give. And the truth is, definitions of justifying faith have been so multiplied by learned men, and in so great variety, and such a manifest inconsistency among some

of them, that they have been of no advantage to the truth, but occasions of new controversies and divisions, whilst every one has laboured to defend the accuracy of his own definition, when yet it may be difficult for a true believer to find any thing corresponding with his own experience in them; which kind of definitions in these things, I have no esteem for. I know no man that has laboured in this argument about the nature of faith more than Doctor Jackson; yet when he has done all, he gives us a definition of justifying faith, which I know few that will subscribe to; yet is it in the main scope of it both pious and sound. For he tells us: "Here at length we may define the faith by which the just do live, to be a firm and constant adherence to the mercies and loving kindness of the Lord, or generally to the spiritual food exhibited in his sacred word, as much better than this life itself, and all the contentments it is capable of, grounded on a taste or relish of their sweetness, wrought in the soul or heart of a man by the Spirit of Christ." To which he adds, "The terms for the most part are the prophet David's, not metaphorical, as some may fancy, much less equivocal, but proper and homogeneal to the subject defined." Vol. i. book 4, chap. 9. For the lively Scriptural expressions of faith, by receiving of Christ, leaning on him, rolling ourselves or our burden on him, tasting how gracious the Lord is, and the like, which of late have been reproached, yea blasphemed by many, I may have occasion to speak of them afterwards; as also to manifest that they convey a better understanding of the nature, work, and object of justifying faith, to the minds of men spiritually enlightened, than the most accurate definitions that many pretend to; some whereof are destructive and exclusive of them all.

CHAPTER III.

THE USE OF FAITH IN JUSTIFICATION; ITS ESPECIAL OBJECT FURTHER CLEARED.

THE description before given of justifying faith sufficiently manifests of what use it is in justification. Nor shall I in general add much to what may be thence observed to that pur-

pose. But whereas this use of it has been expressed with some variety, and several ways of it asserted inconsistent with one another, they must be considered in our passage. And I shall do it with all brevity possible; for these things lead not in any part of the controversy about the nature of justification, but are merely subservient to other conceptions concerning it. When men have fixed their apprehensions about the principal matters in controversy, they express what concerns the use of faith in an accommodation thereto. Supposing such to be the nature of justification as they assert, it must be granted that the use of faith therein, must be what they plead for. And if what is peculiar to any in the substance of the doctrine be disproved, they cannot deny but that their notions about the use of faith fall to the ground. Thus it is with all who affirm faith to be either the instrument, or the condition, or the *causa sine qua non*, or the preparation and disposition of the subject, or a meritorious cause by way of condecency or congruity, in and of our justification. For all these notions of the use of faith are suited and accommodated to the opinions of men concerning the nature and principal causes of justification. Neither can any trial or determination be made, as to their truth and propriety, but upon a previous judgment concerning those causes, and the whole nature of justification itself. Whereas therefore it were vain and endless to plead the principal matter in controversy upon every thing that occasionally belongs to it; and so, by the title to the whole inheritance, on every cottage that is built on the premises, I shall briefly speak to these various conceptions about the use of faith in our justification, rather to find out and give an understanding of what is intended by them, than to argue about their truth and propriety, which depends on that wherein the substance of the controversy consists.

Protestant divines, until of late, have unanimously affirmed faith to be the *instrumental cause* of our justification. So it is expressed to be in many of the public confessions of their churches. This notion of theirs concerning the nature and use of faith, was from the first opposed by those of the Roman church. Afterwards it was denied also by the Socinians, as either false or improper. And of late this expression is disliked by some among ourselves; wherein they follow Episcopius, Curcellæus, and others of that way. Those who are sober and moderate rather decline this notion and expression as improper, than reject them as untrue. And our safest course in

these cases is to consider what is the thing or matter intended. If that be agreed upon, he deserves best of the truth who parts with strife about propriety of expressions, before it be meddled with. Tenacious pleading about them will surely render our contentions endless; and none will ever want an appearance of probability to give them countenance in what they pretend. If our design in teaching be the same with that of the Scripture, namely, to inform the minds of believers, and convey the light of the knowledge of God in Christ to them, we must be contented sometimes to make use of such expressions, as will scarce pass the ordeal of arbitrary rules and distinctions through the whole compass of notional and artificial sciences. And those who without more ado reject the instrumentality of faith in our justification as an unscriptural notion, as though it were easy for them with one breath to blow away the reasons and arguments of so many learned men as have pleaded for it, may not, I think, do amiss to review the grounds of their confidence. For the question being only concerning what is intended by it, it is not enough that the term or word itself of an *instrument* is not found to this purpose in the Scripture. For on the same ground we may reject a *Trinity* of persons in the Divine essence, without an acknowledgment whereof, not one line of the Scripture can be rightly understood.

Those who assert faith to be as the instrumental cause in our justification, do it with respect to two ends. For first they design thereby to declare the meaning of those expressions in the Scripture, wherein we are said to be justified πιστεν, absolutely; which must denote either *instrumentum*, *aut formam*, *aut modum actionis*. λογίζεσθαι ουν πιστεν δικαιοσύνην ανθρώπων; Rom. iii. 28. "Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith." So δια πιστεως, ver. 22. εν πιστεως; Rom. i. 17; Gal. iii. 8. δια της πιστεως. Ephes. ii. 8. εν πιστεως, και δια της πιστεως, Rom. iii. 22, 30. That is *fide*, *ex fide*, *per fidem*; which we can express only *by faith*, or *through faith*. *Propter fidem*, or *δια πιστεν*, *for* our faith, we are no where said to be justified. The inquiry is, what is the most proper, lightsome, and convenient way of declaring the meaning of these expressions. This the generality of Protestants judge to be by an instrumental cause. For some kind of causality they plainly intimate, whereof the lowest and meanest is that which is instrumental. For they are used of faith in our justification before God, and of no other grace or duty whatever. Wherefore the proper work or office of faith in our justification is intended by them. And δια is no where

used in the whole New Testament with a genitive case, (nor in any other good author) but it denotes an *instrumental* efficiency at least. In the Divine works of the holy Trinity, the operation of the second Person, who is in them a principal efficient, yet is sometimes expressed thereby; it may be to denote the order of operation in the holy Trinity answering the order of subsistence, though it be applied to God absolutely or the Father; Rom. xi. 35. δι' αὐτοῦ, "by him are all things." Again ἐξ ἔργων νομῶν; and ἐκ πίστεως are directly opposed, Gal. iii. 2. But when it is said that a man is "not justified, ἐξ ἔργων νομῶν, by the works of the law," it is acknowledged by all that the meaning of the expression is to exclude all *efficiency* in every kind of such works from our justification. It follows, therefore, that where in opposition hereto, we are said to be justified ἐκ πίστεως, "by faith;" an instrumental efficiency is intended. Yet will I not therefore make it my controversy with any, that faith is properly an instrument, or the instrumental cause in or of our justification; and so divert into an impertinent contest about the nature and kinds of instruments and instrumental causes, as they are metaphysically hunted with a confused cry of futile terms and distinctions. But this I judge, that among all those notions of things which may be taken from common use and understanding to represent to our minds the meaning and intention of the Scriptural expressions so often used, πίστει, ἐκ πίστεως, δια πίστεως, there is none so proper as this of an instrument or instrumental cause, seeing a causality is included in them, and that of any other kind certainly excluded; nor has it any of its own.

But it may be said, that if faith be the instrumental cause of justification, it is either the instrument of God, or the instrument of believers themselves. That it is not the instrument of God is plain, in that it is a duty which he prescribes to us; it is an act of our own; and it is we that believe, not God; nor can any act of ours be the instrument of his work. And if it be our instrument, seeing an efficiency is ascribed to it, then are we the efficient causes of our own justification in some sense, and may be said to justify ourselves; which is derogatory to the grace of God, and the blood of Christ.

I confess that I lay not much weight on exceptions of this nature. For (1) notwithstanding what is said herein, the Scripture is express, that "God justifieth us by faith." "It is one God which shall justify the circumcision ἐκ πίστεως, (by faith) and the uncircumcision, δια τῆς πίστεως, through or by faith,"

Rom. iii. 30. "The Scripture foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith," Gal. iii. 8. As he purifieth the hearts of men by faith, Acts xv. 9. Wherefore faith in some sense may be said to be the instrument of God in our justification; both as it is the means and way ordained and appointed by him on our part, whereby we shall be justified, as also because he bestows it on us, and works it in us to this end that we may be justified; for "by grace we are saved, through faith, and that not of ourselves, it is the gift of God," Ephes. iii. 8. If any one shall now say, that on these accounts, or with respect to Divine ordination and operation concurring to our justification, faith is the instrument of God in its place and way, (as the gospel also is, Rom. i. 16, and the ministers of it, 2 Cor. v. 18; 1 Tim. iv. 6, and the sacraments also, Rom. iv. 11; Tit. iii. 5, in their several places and kinds) to our justification, it may be he will contribute to a right conception of the work of God herein, as much as those shall by whom it is denied.

But that which is principally intended is, that it is the instrument of them that believe. Neither yet are they said hereon to justify themselves. For whereas it neither really produces the effect of justification by a physical operation, nor can do so, it being a pure sovereign act of God; nor is morally any way meritorious thereof, nor disposes the subject wherein it is to the introduction of an inherent formal cause of justification, there being no such thing *in rerum natura*, nor has any other physical or moral respect to the effect of justification, but what arises merely from the constitution and appointment of God, there is no colour of reason from the instrumentality of faith asserted, to ascribe the effect of justification to any, but to the principal efficient cause, which is God alone, and from whom it proceeds in a way of free and sovereign grace, disposing the order of things, and the relation of them one to another, as seems good to him. Δικαιοσύναι δωρεάν τῆ ἀντὸν χάριτι, Rom. iii. 24. διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν τῷ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀγαπῆ, ver. 25. It is therefore the ordinance of God prescribing our duty, that we may be justified freely by his grace, having its use and operation towards that end after the manner of an instrument, as we shall see further immediately. Wherefore so far as I can discern, they contribute nothing to the real understanding of this truth, who deny faith to be the instrumental cause of our justification, and on other grounds assert it to be the condition thereof, unless they can prove that this is a more natural ex-

position of those expressions πιστει, εκ πιστεως, δια της πιστεως, which is the first thing to be inquired after. For all that we do in this matter is but to endeavour a right understanding of Scripture propositions and expressions, unless we intend to wander *extra aleas*, and lose ourselves in a maze of uncertain conjectures.

Secondly, they designed to declare the use of faith in justification, expressed in the Scripture by apprehending and receiving of Christ, or his righteousness, and remission of sins thereby. The words whereby this use of faith in our justification is expressed are λαμβανω, παραλαμβανω, and καταλαμβανω. And the constant use of them in the Scripture is to *take* or *receive* what is offered, tendered, given or granted to us; or to *apprehend* and *lay hold of* any thing thereby to make it our own, as *ειλαμθανομαι* is also used in the same sense, Heb. ii. 16. So are we said by faith to receive Christ, John i. 12; Col. ii. 6. "The abundance of grace and the gift of righteousness," Rom. v. 17. "The word of promise," Acts ii. 41. "The word of God," Acts viii. 14; 1 Thess. i. 6; ii. 13. "The atonement" made by the blood of Christ, Rom. v. 11. "The forgiveness of sins," Acts x. 43; xxvi. 18. "The promise of the Spirit," Gal. iii. 14. "The promises," Heb. ix. 15. There is therefore nothing that concurs to our justification, but we receive it by faith. And unbelief is expressed by *not receiving*, John i. 11; iii. 11; xii. 48; xiv. 17. Wherefore the object of faith in our justification, that whereby we are justified, is tendered, granted, and given to us of God, the use of faith being to lay hold upon it, to receive it, so that it may be our own. What we receive of outward things that are so given to us, we do it by our hand, which is therefore the instrument of that reception, that whereby we apprehend or lay hold of any thing to appropriate it to ourselves; and that because this is the peculiar office which by nature it is assigned to among all the members of the body. Other uses it has, and other members on other accounts may be as useful to the body as it: but it alone is the instrument of receiving and apprehending that which being given, is to be made our own and to abide with us. Whereas therefore the righteousness wherewith we are justified is the gift of God, which is tendered to us in the promise of the gospel, the use and office of faith being to receive, apprehend, or lay hold of and appropriate this righteousness, I know not how it can be better expressed than by an *instrument*, nor by what notion of it, more light of understanding

may be conveyed to our minds. Some may suppose other notions are meet to express it by on other accounts; and it may be so with respect to other uses of it. But the sole present inquiry is, how it shall be declared, as that which receives Christ, the atonement, the gift of righteousness, which will prove its only use in our justification. He that can better express this than by an instrument, ordained of God to this end, all whose use depends on that ordination of God, will deserve well of the truth. It is true that all those who place the formal cause or reason of our justification in ourselves, or our inherent righteousness, and so either directly or by just consequence deny all imputation of the righteousness of Christ to our justification, are not capable of admitting faith to be an instrument in this work, nor are pressed with this consideration. For they acknowledge not that we receive a righteousness which is not our own by way of gift, whereby we are justified, and so cannot allow of any instrument whereby it should be received. The righteousness itself being as they phrase it putative, imaginary, a chimera, a fiction, it can have no real accidents, nothing that can be really predicated concerning it. Wherefore as was said at the entrance of this discourse, the truth and propriety of this declaration of the use of faith in our justification by an instrumental cause, depends on the substance of the doctrine itself concerning the nature and principal causes of it, with which they must stand or fall. If we are justified through the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, which faith alone apprehends and receives, it will not be denied but that it is rightly enough placed as the instrumental cause of our justification. And if we are justified by an inherent evangelical righteousness of our own, faith may be the condition of its imputation, or a disposition for its introduction, or a congruous merit of it, but an instrument it cannot be. But yet for the present it has this double advantage, (1) That it best and most appositely answers what is affirmed of the use of faith in our justification, in the Scripture, as the instances given manifest; (2) That no other notion of it can be so stated, but that it must be apprehended in order of time to be previous to justification, which justifying faith cannot be, unless a man may be a true believer with justifying faith, and yet not be justified.

Some plead that faith is the *condition* of our justification, and that otherwise it is not to be conceived of. As I said before, so I say again, I shall not contend with any man about

words, terms, or expressions, so long as what is intended by them, is agreed upon. And there is an obvious sense wherein faith may be called the condition of our justification. For no more may be intended thereby, but that it is the duty on our part which God requires, that we may be justified. And this the whole Scripture bears witness to. Yet this hindereth not, but that as to its use, it may be the instrument whereby we apprehend or receive Christ and his righteousness. But to assert it the condition of our justification, or that we are justified by it as the condition of the new covenant, so as from a pre-conceived signification of that word, to give it another use in justification exclusive of that pleaded for, as the instrumental cause thereof, is not easily to be admitted; because it supposes an alteration in the substance of the doctrine itself.

The word is nowhere used in the Scripture in this matter; which I argue no further, but that we have no certain rule or standard to try and measure its signification by. Wherefore it cannot first be introduced in what sense men please, and then that sense turned into argument for other ends. For thus on a supposed concession, that it is the condition of our justification, some heighten it into a subordinate righteousness, imputed to us, antecedently as I suppose, to the imputation of the righteousness of Christ in any sense, whereof it is the condition. And some who pretend to lessen its efficiency or dignity in the use of it in our justification say, it is only *causa sine qua non*, which leaves us at as great an uncertainty as to the nature and efficacy of this condition as we were before. Nor is the true sense of things at all illustrated, but rather darkened by such notions.

If we may introduce words into religion nowhere used in the Scripture (as we may and must, if we design to bring light, and communicate proper apprehensions of the things contained to the minds of men) yet are we not to take along with them arbitrary preconceived senses, forged either among lawyers, or in the peripatetical school. The use of them in the most approved authors of the language whereto they belong, and their common vulgar acceptation among ourselves, must determine their sense and meaning. It is known what confusion in the minds of men, the introduction of words into ecclesiastical doctrines, of whose signification there has not been a certain determinate rule agreed on, has produced. So the word *merit* was introduced by some of the ancients, (as is plain from the design of their discourses where they use it) for impetration or

acquisition *quovis modo*; by any means whatever. But there being no cogent reason to confine the word to that precise signification, it has given occasion to as great a corruption as has befallen the Christian religion. We must therefore make use of the best means we have to understand the meaning of this word, and what is intended by it, before we admit of its use in this case.

Conditio in the best Latin writers is variously used; answering *καταστασις, τυχη, ἀξια, ἀγια, συνθηκη* in the Greek: that is, *Status, fortuna, dignitas, causa, pactum initum*. In which of these significations it is here to be understood is not easy to be determined. In common use among us, it sometimes denotes the state and quality of men, that is, *καταστασις* and *ἀξια*; and sometimes a valuable consideration of what is to be done, that is *ἀγια* or *συνθηκη*. But herein it is applied to things in great variety; sometimes the principal procuring purchasing cause is so expressed. As the condition whereon a man lends another an hundred pounds, is that he be paid it again with interest. The condition whereon a man conveys his land to another, is, that he receive so much money for it. So a condition is a valuable consideration. And sometimes it signifies such things as are added to the principal cause whereon its operation is suspended. As a man bequeaths an hundred pounds to another, on condition that he come or go to such a place to demand it. This is no valuable consideration, yet is the effect of the principal cause, or the will of the testator, suspended thereon. And as to degrees of respect to that whereof any thing is a condition, as to purchase, procurement, valuable consideration, necessary presence, the variety is endless. We therefore cannot obtain a determinate sense of this word *condition*, but from a particular declaration of what is intended by it wherever it is used. And although this be not sufficient to exclude the use of it from the declaration of the way and manner how we are justified by faith, yet is it so to exclude the imposition of any precise signification of it, any other than is given it by the matter treated of. Without this every thing is left ambiguous and uncertain whereto it is applied.

For instance; it is commonly said that faith and new obedience are the condition of the new covenant. But yet because of the ambiguous signification and various use of that term *condition* we cannot certainly understand what is intended in the assertion. If no more be intended, but that God in

and by the new covenant indispensably requires these things of us, that is, the restipulation of a good conscience towards God by the resurrection of Christ from the dead, in order to his own glory, and our full enjoyment of all the benefits of it, it is unquestionably true. But if it be intended, that they are such a condition of the covenant, as to be by us performed antecedently to the participation of any grace, mercy, or privilege of it, so that they should be the consideration and procuring causes of them, that they should be all of them, as some speak, the reward of our faith and obedience, it is most false, and not only contrary to express testimonies of Scripture, but destructive of the nature of the covenant itself. If it be intended that these things, though promised in the covenant and wrought in us by the grace of God, are yet duties required of us in order to the participation and enjoyment of the full end of the covenant of glory, it is the truth which is asserted. But if it be said that faith and new obedience, that is the works of righteousness which we do, are so the condition of the covenant, as that whatever the one is ordained of God as a means of, and in order to such or such an end, as justification, that the other is likewise ordained to the same end, with the same kind of efficacy, or with the same respect to the effect, it is expressly contrary to the whole scope and express design of the Apostle on that subject. But it will be said that a condition in the sense intended, when faith is said to be the condition of our justification, is no more but that it is *causa sine qua non*; which is easy enough to be apprehended. But yet neither are we so delivered out of uncertainties, into a plain understanding of what is intended. For these *causa sine quibus non*, may be taken largely or more strictly and precisely. So are they commonly distinguished by the masters in these arts. Those so called in a larger sense, are all such causes in any kind of efficiency or merit, as are inferior to principal causes, and would operate nothing without them, but in conjunction with them have a real effective influence, physical or moral, upon the production of the effect. And if we take a condition to be a *causa sine qua non*, in this sense, we are still at a loss what may be its use, efficiency or merit, with respect to our justification. If it be taken more strictly for that which is necessarily present, but has no causality in any kind, not that of a receptive instrument, I cannot understand how it should be an ordinance of God. For every thing that he has appointed to any end moral or spiritual, has by virtue of that

appointment, either a symbolical instructive efficacy, or an active efficiency, or a rewardable condecency with respect to that end. Other things may be generally and remotely necessary to such an end, so far as it partakes of the order of natural beings, which are not ordinances of God with respect thereto, and so have no kind of causality with respect to it, as it is moral or spiritual. So the air we breathe is needful to the preaching of the word, and consequently a *causa sine qua non* thereof; but an ordinance of God with especial respect thereto it is not. But every thing that he appoints to an especial spiritual end, has an efficacy or operation in one or other of the ways mentioned. For they either concur with the principal cause in its internal efficiency, or they operate externally in the removal of obstacles and hinderances that oppose the principal cause in its efficiency. And this excludes all causes *sine quibus non* strictly so taken, from any place among divine ordinances. God appoints nothing for an end that shall do nothing. His sacraments are not *ἀργα σημεῖα*, unmeaning signs, but by virtue of his institution they *exhibit* that grace which they do not in themselves contain. The preaching of the word has a real efficiency to all the ends of it; so have all the graces and duties that he works in us, and requires of us; by them all are we “made meet for the inheritance of the saints in light;” and our whole obedience through his gracious appointment has a rewardable condecency with respect to eternal life. Wherefore as faith may be allowed to be the condition of our justification, if no more be intended thereby, but that it is what God requires of us that we may be justified; so to confine the declaration of its use in our justification to its being the condition of it, when so much as a determinate signification of it cannot be agreed upon, is subservient only to the interest of unprofitable strife and contention.

To close these discourses concerning faith and its use in our justification, some things must yet be added concerning its especial object. For although what has been spoken already thereon, in the description of its nature and object in general, be sufficient in general to state its especial object also; yet there having been an inquiry concerning it, and debate about it in a peculiar notion, and under some especial terms, that also must be considered. And this is whether justifying faith in our justification or its use therein, do respect Christ as a king and prophet, as well as a priest, with the satisfaction that as such he made for us, and *that* in the same manner, and to the same

ends and purposes. And I shall be brief in this inquiry, because it is but a late controversy, and it may be has more of curiosity in its disquisition, than of edification in its determination. However being not, that I know of, under these terms stated in any public confessions of the Reformed churches, it is free for any to express their apprehensions concerning it. And to this purpose I say :

1. Faith whereby we are justified in the receiving of Christ, principally respects his person for all those ends for which he is the ordinance of God. It does not in the first place, as it is faith in general, respect his person absolutely, seeing its formal object as such, is the truth of God in the proposition, and not the thing itself proposed. Wherefore it so respects and receives Christ as proposed in the promise; the promise itself being the formal object of its assent.

2. We cannot so receive Christ in the promise, as in that act of receiving him to exclude the consideration of any of his offices. For as he is not at any time to be considered by us, but as vested with all his offices, so a distinct conception of the mind to receive Christ as a priest, but not as a king or prophet, is not faith but unbelief, not the receiving but the rejecting of him.

3. In the receiving of Christ for justification formally, our distinct express design is to be justified thereby, and no more. Now to be justified is to be freed from the guilt of sin, or to have all our sins pardoned, and to have a righteousness wherewith to appear before God, so as to be accepted with him, and a right to the heavenly inheritance. Every believer has other designs also, wherein he is equally concerned with this; as namely, the renovation of his nature, the sanctification of his person, and ability to live to God in all holy obedience. But the things before mentioned are all that he aims at or designs in his applications to Christ, or his receiving of him to justification. Wherefore,

4. Justifying faith in that act or work of it whereby we are justified, respects Christ in his priestly office alone, as he was the surety of the covenant, with what he did in the discharge thereof. The consideration of his other offices is not excluded, but it is not formally comprised in the object of faith as justifying.

5. When we say that the sacerdotal office of Christ, or the blood of Christ, or the satisfaction of Christ, is that alone which faith respects in justification, we do not exclude, yea we do

really include and comprise in that assertion, all that depends thereon, or concurs to make them effectual to our justification. As (1) the free grace and favour of God in giving Christ for us and to us, whereby we are frequently said to be justified, Rom. iii. 24; Ephes. ii. 8; Tit. iii. 7. His wisdom, love, righteousness and power, are of the same consideration, as has been declared. (2) Whatever in Christ himself was necessary antecedently to his discharge of that office, or was consequential thereof, or necessarily accompanied it. Such was his incarnation, the whole course of his obedience, his resurrection, ascension, exaltation and intercession. For the consideration of all these things is inseparable from the discharge of his priestly office. And therefore is justification either expressly or virtually assigned to them also, Gen. iii. 15; 1 John iii. 8; Heb. ii. 13—16; Rom. iv. 25; Acts v. 31; Heb. vii. 27; Rom. viii. 34. But yet wherever our justification is so assigned to them, they are not absolutely considered, but with respect to their relation to his sacrifice and satisfaction. (3) All the means of the application of the sacrifice and righteousness of the Lord Christ to us are also included therein. Such is the principal efficient cause thereof, which is the Holy Ghost, whence we are said to be “justified in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by the Spirit of our God,” 1 Cor. vi. 11; and the instrumental cause thereof on the part of God, which is the promise of the gospel, Rom. i. 17; Gal. iii. 22, 23. It would therefore be unduly pretended, that by this assertion we narrow or straiten the object of justifying faith as it justifies. For indeed we assign a respect to the whole mediatory office of Christ, not excluding the kingly and prophetic parts thereof; but only such a notion of them, as would not bring in more of Christ, but much of ourselves into our justification. And the assertion as laid down may be proved,

1. From the experience of all that are justified, or who seek for justification according to the gospel. For under this notion of seeking for justification, or a righteousness for justification, they were all of them to be considered, and do consider themselves as *ἰποδικοί τῷ Θεῷ*, *guilty before God*, subject, obnoxious, liable to his wrath in the curse of the law; as we declared in the entrance of this discourse, Rom. iii. 19. They were all in the same state that Adam was in after the fall, to whom God proposed the relief of the incarnation and suffering of Christ, Gen. iii. 15. And to seek after justification, is to seek after a discharge from this woful state and condition. Such persons

have and ought to have other desigus and desires also. For whereas the state wherein they are, antecedent to their justification, is not only a state of guilt and wrath, but such also as wherein, through the depravity of their nature, the power of sin is prevalent in them, and their whole souls are defiled, they design and desire not only to be justified, but to be sanctified also. But as to the guilt of sin, and the want of a righteousness before God, from which justification is their relief, herein I say they have respect to Christ, as set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood. In their design for sanctification they have respect to the kingly and prophetic offices of Christ, in their especial exercise. But as to their freedom from the guilt of sin, and their acceptance with God, or their justification in his sight, that they may be freed from condemnation, that they may not come into judgment; it is Christ crucified, it is Christ lifted up as the brazen serpent in the wilderness, it is the blood of Christ, it is the propitiation that he was, and the atonement that he made, it is his bearing their sins, his being made sin and the curse for them, it is his obedience, the end which he put to sin, and the everlasting righteousness which he brought in, that alone their faith fixes upon and acquiesces in. If it be otherwise in the experience of any, I acknowledge I am not acquainted with it. I do not say that conviction of sin is the only antecedent condition of actual justification. But this it is that makes a sinner *subjectum capax justificationis*, a fit subject of justification. No man, therefore is to be considered as a person to be justified, but he who is actually under the power of the conviction of sin, with all the necessary consequents thereof. Suppose therefore any sinner in this condition, as it is described by the apostle, Rom. iii. guilty before God, with his mouth stopped as to any pleas, defences or excuses; suppose him to seek after a relief and deliverance out of this estate, that is, to be justified according to the gospel; he neither does, nor can wisely take any other course than what he is there directed to by the same apostle, ver. 20—25. "Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight; for by the law is the knowledge of sin. But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all, and upon all them that believe, for there is no difference; for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace, through the redemp-

tion that is in Jesus Christ; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God." Whence I argue :

That which a guilty condemned sinner, finding no hope, nor relief from the law of God, the sole rule of all his obedience, betakes himself to by faith that he may be delivered or justified, *that* is the especial object of faith as justifying. But this is the grace of God alone through the redemption that is in Christ, or Christ proposed as a propitiation through faith in his blood. Either this is so, or the Apostle does not aright guide the souls and consciences of men in that condition wherein he himself places them. It is the blood of Christ alone to which he directs the faith of all them that would be justified before God. Grace, redemption, propitiation, all through the blood of Christ, faith peculiarly respects and fixes upon. This is that, if I mistake not, which they will confirm by their experience, who have made any distinct observation of the actings of their faith in their justification before God.

2. The Scripture plainly declares that faith as justifying, respects the sacerdotal office and actings of Christ alone. In the great representation of the justification of the church of old in the expiatory sacrifice, when all their sins and iniquities were pardoned, and their persons accepted with God, the acting of their faith was limited to the imposition of all their sins on the head of the sacrifice by the high priest, Lev. xvi. "By his knowledge," that is faith in him, "shall my righteous servant justify many, for he shall bear their iniquities." Isa. liii. 11. That alone which faith respects in Christ as to the justification of sinners, is his bearing their iniquities. Guilty convicted sinners look to him by faith, as those who were stung with fiery serpents did to the brazen serpent; that is, as he was lifted up on the cross. John iii. 14, 15. So did he himself express the nature and actings of faith in our justification. Rom. iii. 24, 25. "Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood." As he is a propitiation, as he shed his blood for us, as we have redemption thereby, he is the peculiar object of our faith, with respect to our justification. See to the same purpose. Rom. v. 9, 10; viii. 3, 4; Ephes. i. 7; ii. 13—16; Col. i. 14. "He was made sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." 2 Cor. v. 21. That which we seek

after in justification is a participation of the righteousness of God ; to be made the righteousness of God, and that not in ourselves but in another, that is, in Christ Jesus. And that alone which is proposed to our faith as the means and cause of it, is, his being "made sin" for us, or a sacrifice for sin, wherein all the guilt of our sins was laid on him, and he bare all our iniquities. This therefore is its peculiar object herein. And wherever in the Scripture we are directed to seek for the forgiveness of sins by the blood of Christ, receive the atonement, to be justified through the faith of him as crucified, the object of faith in justification is limited and determined.

But it may be pleaded in exception to these testimonies, that no one of them affirms, that we are justified by faith in the blood of Christ alone ; so as to exclude the consideration of the other offices of Christ and their actings, from being the object of faith in the same manner, and to the same ends, with his sacerdotal office, and what belongs thereto, or is derived from it.

Answer. This exception is derived from that common objection against the doctrine of justification by faith alone ; namely, that that exclusive term *alone*, is not found in the Scripture, or in any of the testimonies that are produced for justification by faith. But it is replied with sufficient evidence of truth, that although the word be not found syllabically used to this purpose ; yet there are exceptive expressions equivalent to it, as we shall see afterwards. It is so in this particular instance also. For (1) whereas our justification is expressly ascribed to our faith in the blood of Christ, as the propitiation for our sins, to our believing in him as crucified for us, and it is nowhere ascribed to our receiving of him as king, lord, or prophet ; it is plain, that the former expressions are virtually exclusive of the latter consideration. (2) I do not say, that the consideration of the kingly and prophetic offices of Christ is excluded from our justification, as works are excluded in opposition to faith and grace. For *they* are so excluded, as that we are to exercise an act of our minds in their positive rejection, as saying, Get you hence, you have no lot nor portion in this matter. But as to these offices of Christ, as to the object of faith as justifying, we say only that they are not included therein. For so to believe to be justified by his blood, as to exercise a positive act of the mind, excluding a compliance with his other offices, is an impious imagination.

3. Neither the consideration of these offices themselves, nor

of any of the peculiar acts of them, is suited to give the souls and consciences of convinced sinners, that relief which they seek after in justification. We are not in this whole cause to lose sight of the state of the person who is to be justified and what it is he seeks after and ought to seek after, therein. Now this is pardon of sin, and righteousness before God alone. That therefore, which is no way suited to give or tender this relief to him, is not, nor can be the object of his faith, whereby he is justified in that exercise of it, whereon his justification depends. This relief, it will be said, is to be had in Christ alone. It is true, but under what consideration? for the sole design of the sinner is how he may be accepted with God, be at peace with him, have all his wrath turned away, by a propitiation or atonement. Now this can no otherwise be done, but by the acting of some one, towards God, and with God, on his behalf; for it is about the turning away of God's anger, and acceptance with him, that the inquiry is made. It is by the blood of Christ that we are made nigh, who were far off. Ephes. ii. 13. By the blood of Christ are we reconciled who were enemies; ii. 16. By the blood of Christ we have redemption. Rom. iii. 24, 25; Eph. i. 7, &c. This, therefore, is the object of faith.

All the actings of the kingly and prophetic offices of Christ, are *from God*, that is, in the name and authority of God towards us. Not any one of them is towards God on our behalf, so that by virtue of them, we should expect acceptance with God. They are all good, blessed, holy, in themselves, and of an eminent tendency to the glory of God in our salvation; yea, they are no less necessary to our salvation to the praise of God's grace, than are the atonement for sin and satisfaction which he made; for from them is the way of life revealed to us, grace communicated, our persons sanctified, and the reward bestowed. Yea, in the exercise of his kingly power does the Lord Christ pardon and justify sinners. Not that he did as a king constitute the law of justification, for it was given and established in the first promise, and he came to put it in execution. John iii. 16. But in the virtue of his atonement and righteousness imputed to them, he both pardons and justifies sinners. But they are the acts of his sacerdotal office alone, that respect God on our behalf. Whatever he did on earth with God for the church, in obedience, suffering, and offering up of himself, whatever he does in heaven in intercession, and appearance in the presence of God for us, it all entirely belongs to his priestly office. And in these things alone does the soul of a

convinced sinner find relief, when he seeks after deliverance from the state of sin and acceptance with God. In these therefore alone, the peculiar object of his faith, that which will give him rest and peace, must be comprised. And this last consideration is of itself sufficient to determine this difference.

Sundry things are objected against this assertion, which I shall not here at large discuss, because what is material in any of them, will occur on other occasions, where its consideration will be more proper. In general it may be pleaded, that justifying faith is the same with saving faith; nor is it said that we are justified by this or that part of faith, but by faith in general, that is, as taken essentially for the entire grace of faith. And as to faith in this sense, not only a respect to Christ in all his offices, but obedience itself also is included in it, as is evident in many places of the Scripture. Wherefore there is no reason why we should limit the object of it, to the person of Christ as acting in the discharge of his sacerdotal office, with the effects and fruits thereof.

Answer. 1. Saving faith, and justifying faith in any believer are one and the same, and the adjuncts of *saving* and *justifying* are but external denominations, from its distinct operations and effects. But yet saving faith acts in a peculiar manner, and is of peculiar use in justification, such as it is not of under any other consideration whatever. Wherefore (2) although saving faith as it is described in general, always includes obedience, not as its form or essence, but as the necessary effect is included in the cause, and the fruit in the fruit-bearing juice, and is often mentioned as to its being and exercise, where there is no express mention of Christ, his blood, and his righteousness, but is applied to all the acts, duties, and ends of the gospel; yet this proves not at all, but that as to its duty, place, and acting in our justification, it has a peculiar object. If it could be proved, that, where justification is ascribed to faith, there it has any other object assigned to it, as that which it rested in for the pardon of sin and acceptance with God, this objection were of some force. But this cannot be done. (3) This is not to say, that we are justified by a part of faith, and not by it as considered essentially; for we are justified by the entire grace of faith, acting in such a peculiar way and manner; as others have observed. But the truth is, we need not insist on the discussion of this inquiry. For the true meaning of it is, not whether any thing of Christ is to be excluded from being the object of justifying faith, or of faith in our justification, but

what, in and of ourselves, under the name of receiving Christ, as our Lord and King, is to be admitted to an efficiency or conditionality in that work. As it is granted, that justifying faith is the receiving of Christ, so whatever belongs to the person of Christ, or any office of his, or any acts in the discharge of any office, that may be reduced to any cause of our justification, the meritorious, procuring, material, formal, or manifesting cause of it, is so far as it does so, freely admitted to belong to the object of justifying faith. Neither will I contend with any upon this disadvantageous stating of the question, what of Christ is to be esteemed the object of justifying faith, and what is not so? For the thing intended is only this; whether our own obedience, distinct from faith, or included in it, and in like manner as faith, be the condition of our justification before God. This being that which is intended, which the other question is but invented to lead to a compliance with, by a more specious pretence than in itself it is capable of under those terms, it shall be examined and no otherwise.



CHAPTER IV.

OF JUSTIFICATION, THE NOTION, AND SIGNIFICATION OF THE WORD IN THE SCRIPTURE.

IN order to the right understanding of the nature of justification, the proper sense and signification of these words themselves, *justification* and to *justify*, is to be inquired into. For until that is agreed upon, it is impossible that our discourses concerning the thing itself should be freed from equivocation. Take words in various senses, and all may be true that is contradictorily affirmed or denied concerning what they are supposed to signify. And so it has actually fallen out in this case, as we shall see more fully afterwards. Some taking these words in one sense, some in another, have appeared to deliver contrary doctrines concerning the thing itself, or our justification before God; who yet have fully agreed in what the proper determinate sense or signification of the words imports. And therefore the true meaning of them has been declared and vindicated already by many. But whereas the right stating hereof, is of

more moment to the determination of what is principally controverted about the doctrine itself, or the thing signified, than most apprehend; and something at least remains to be added for the declaration and vindication of the import and only signification of these words in the Scripture, I shall give an account of my observations concerning it, with what diligence I can.

The Latin derivation and composition of the word *justificatio* would seem to denote an internal change from inherent unrighteousness, to righteousness likewise inherent; by a physical motion, and transmutation, as the schoolmen speak. For such is the signification of words of the same composition. So sanctification, mortification, vivification, and the like, all denote a real internal work on the subject spoken of. Hereon in the whole Roman school, justification is taken for the making of a man to be inherently righteous by the infusion of a principle or habit of grace, who was before inherently and habitually unjust and unrighteous. Whilst this is taken to be the proper signification of the word, we neither do nor can speak *ad idem* in our disputations with them about the cause and nature of that justification, which the Scripture teaches.

And this appearing sense of the word possibly deceived some of the ancients, as Austin in particular, to declare the doctrine of free gratuitous sanctification, without respect to any works of our own, under the name of justification. For neither he nor any of them, ever thought of a justification before God, consisting in the pardon of our sins and the acceptance of our person as righteous, by virtue of any inherent habit of grace infused into us, or acted by us. Wherefore the subject matter must be determined by the Scriptural use and signification of these words, before we can speak properly or intelligibly concerning it. For if to *justify* men in the Scripture, signify to make them subjectively and inherently righteous, we must acknowledge a mistake in what we teach concerning the nature and causes of justification. And if it signify no such thing, all their disputations about justification by the infusion of grace and inherent righteousness thereon fall to the ground. Wherefore all Protestants (and the Socinians all of them comply therein) affirm that the use and signification of these words, is forensic, denoting an act of jurisdiction. Only the Socinians, and some others, would have it to consist in the pardon of sin only, which indeed the word does not at all signify. But the sense of the word is to acquit, to declare and pronounce right-

eous upon a trial, which in this case, the pardon of sin necessarily accompanies.

Justificatio and *justifico* belong not indeed to the Latin tongue; nor can any good author be produced who ever used them, for the making of him inherently righteous by any means who was not so before. But whereas these words were coined and framed to signify such things as are intended, we have no way to determine the signification of them, but by the consideration of the nature of the things which they were invented to declare and signify. And whereas in this language these words are derived from *jus* and *justus*, they must respect an act of jurisdiction, rather than a physical operation or infusion. *Justificari* is *justus censeri, pro justo haberi*; to be esteemed, accounted or adjudged righteous. So a man was made *justus filius* in adoption to him, by whom he was adopted: what this is, is well declared by Budæus.* “Speaking of the form of adoption—He who adopts is asked whether he wishes him whom he designs to adopt, to be to him a *just son*. By *just*, I understand not true, as some think, but one who has all the attributes of filiation, who sustains the relation of a true son, who sits in the place of a lawfully-begotten child.” Wherefore, as by adoption, there is no internal inherent change made in the person adopted; but by virtue thereof he is esteemed and adjudged as a true son, and has all the rights of a legitimate son; so by justification, as to the import of the word, a man is only esteemed, declared and pronounced righteous, as if he were completely so. And in the present case, justification and gratuitous adoption are the same grace for the substance of them, John i. 12; only respect is had in their different denomination of the same grace, to different effects or privileges that ensue thereon.

But the true and genuine signification of these words is to be determined from those in the original languages of the Scripture which are expounded by them. In the Hebrew it is צַדִּיק. This the Lxx. render by δικαιος ἀποφαίρω, Job xxvii. 5. δικαιος ἀποφαινομαι, Job xiii. 18. δικαιος κρινω, Prov. xvii. 15, *to show or declare one righteous; to appear righteous; to judge any one righteous*. And the sense may be taken from any one of them, as Job xiii. 18. “Behold now I have ordered my

* Cajus lib. 2. F. de Adopt. De arrogatione loquens—; is qui adoptatur, id est, interrogatur, an velit eum quem adoptaturus sit, justum sibi filium esse. *Justum* intelligo non verum, ut aliqui censent, sed omnibus partibus ut ita dicam filiationis, veri filii vicem obtinentem, naturalis et legitimi filii loco sedentem.

cause, I know I shall be justified." The ordering of his cause, (his judgment) his cause to be judged on, is his preparation for a sentence, either of absolution or condemnation; and hereon his confidence was that he should be justified, that is, absolved, acquitted, pronounced righteous. And the sense is no less pregnant in the other places; commonly they render it by δικαιωω, whereof I shall speak afterwards.

Properly it denotes an action towards another, (as justification, and to justify do) in Hiphil only: and a reciprocal action of a man on himself in Hithpael הִתְיַצֵּוּ. Hereby alone is the true sense of these words determined. And I say that in no place, nor on any occasion, is it used in that conjugation wherein it denotes an action towards another, in any other sense, but to absolve, acquit, esteem, declare, pronounce righteous, or to impute righteousness, which is the forensic sense of the word we plead for; that is its constant use and signification, nor does it ever once signify to make inherently righteous; much less to pardon or forgive. So vain is the pretence of some that justification consists only in the pardon of sin, which is not signified by the word in any one place of Scripture. Almost in all places this sense is absolutely unquestionable; nor is there any more than one which will admit of any debate, and that on so faint a pretence as cannot prejudice its constant use and signification in all other places. Whatever therefore an infusion of inherent grace may be, or however it may be called, justification it is not, it cannot be; the word no where signifying any such thing. Wherefore those of the church of Rome do not so much oppose justification by faith through the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, as indeed deny that there is any such thing as justification. For that which they call the first justification, consisting in the infusion of a principle of inherent grace, is no such thing as justification. And their second justification which they place in the merit of works, wherein absolution or pardon of sin, has neither place nor consideration, is inconsistent with evangelical justification, as we shall show afterwards.

This word, therefore, whether the act of God towards men, or of men towards God, or of men among themselves, or of one towards another, be expressed thereby, is always used in a forensic sense, and does not denote a physical operation, transfusion or transmutation, 2 Sam. xv. 4 "If any man hath a suit or cause let him come to me, וְיִצְוֶנִי and I will do him justice;" I will justify him, judge in his cause and pronounce

for him. Deut. xxv. 1. "If there be a controversy among men, and they come to judgment, that the judges may judge them, they shall justify the righteous," pronounce sentence on his side, whereunto is opposed "and they shall condemn the wicked;" make him wicked, as the word signifies; that is, judge, declare and pronounce him wicked, whereby he becomes so judicially, and in the eye of the law; as the other is made righteous, by declaration and acquittal. He does not say this shall pardon the righteous, to suppose which would overthrow both the antithesis and design of the place. And לְרַחֵם is as much to infuse wickedness into a man, as לְרַחֵם is to infuse a principle of grace or righteousness into him. The same antithesis occurs, Prov. xvii. 15, $\text{לְרַחֵם הַיָּשָׁר וְלַעֲרֹב הַצָּדִיק}$, "He that justifieth the wicked and condemneth the righteous;" not he that maketh the wicked inherently righteous, nor he that changeth him inherently from unrighteous to righteousness: but he that without any ground, reason or foundation acquits him in judgment, or declares him to be righteous, is an abomination to the Lord. And although this be spoken of the judgment of men, yet the judgment of God also is according to this truth. For although he justifies the ungodly, those who are so in themselves, yet he does it on the ground and consideration of a perfect righteousness made theirs by imputation; and by another act of his grace, that they may be meet subjects of this righteous favour, really and inherently changes them from unrighteousness to holiness, by the renovation of their natures: and these things are singular in the actings of God, which nothing amongst men has any resemblance to or can represent. For the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, to a person in himself ungodly for his justification, or that he may be acquitted, absolved, and declared righteous, is built on such foundations, and proceeds on such principles of righteousness, wisdom and sovereignty, as have no place among the actions of men, nor can have, as shall afterwards be declared. And moreover, when God justifies the ungodly on account of the righteousness imputed to him, he does at the same instant, by the power of his grace, make him inherently and subjectively righteous or holy, which men cannot do one towards another. And therefore whereas man's justifying the wicked, is to justify them in their wicked ways, whereby they are constantly made worse and more obdurate in evil; when God justifies the ungodly, their change from

personal unrighteousness and unholiness, to righteousness and holiness, necessarily and infallibly accompanies it.

To the same purpose is the word used; Isa. v. 22, "which justify the wicked for reward." l. 8. כִּי־יִצְדַקוּ. "He is near that justifieth me; who shall contend with me? let us stand together; who is my adversary? let him come near to me; behold the Lord God will help me; who shall condemn me?" where we have a full declaration of the proper sense of the word, which is to acquit and pronounce righteous on a trial. And the same sense is fully expressed in the former antithesis. 1 Kings viii. 31, 32. "If any man trespass against his neighbour, and an oath be laid upon him to cause him to swear, and the oath come before thine altar in this house; then hear thou in Heaven and do, and judge thy servants to condemn the wicked," to charge his wickedness on him, to bring his way on his head, "and to justify the righteous." The same words are repeated 2 Chron. vi. 22, 23; Psa. lxxxii. 3. "Do justice to the afflicted and poor;" that is justify them in their cause against wrong and oppression. Exod. xxiii. 7. "I will not justify the wicked;" absolve, acquit, or pronounce him righteous. Job xxvii. 5. "Be it far from me that I should justify you," or pronounce sentence on your side, as if you were righteous. Isa. liii. 11. "By his knowledge my righteous servant shall justify many;" the reason whereof is added: "for he shall bear their iniquities," whereon they are absolved and justified.

Once it is used in Hithpael, wherein a reciprocal action is denoted, that whereby a man justifies himself. Gen. xlii. 16. "And Judah said, What shall we say unto my Lord? what shall we speak, and how shall we justify ourselves? God hath found out our iniquity." They could plead nothing why they should be absolved from guilt.

Once the participle is used to denote the outward instrumental cause of the justification of others, in which place alone there is any doubt of its sense; Dan. xii. 3; "and they that justify many;" namely, in the same sense that the preachers of the gospel are said to "save themselves and others." 1 Tim. iv. 16. For men may be no less the instrumental causes of the justification of others, than of their sanctification.

Wherefore, although צדק in Kal, signifies *justum esse*, and sometimes *juste agere*, which may relate to inherent righteousness; yet where any action towards another is denoted, this word signifies nothing, but to esteem, declare, pronounce, and

adjudge any one absolved, acquitted, cleared, justified: there is therefore no other kind of justification once mentioned in the Old Testament.

Δικαιῶ is the word used to the same purpose in the New Testament, and that alone. Neither is this word used in any good author whatever, to signify the making of a man righteous by any applications to produce internal righteousness in him; but either to absolve and acquit, to judge, esteem, and pronounce righteous, or on the contrary to condemn. So Suidas, Δικαίουν δυὸ δηλοῖ, τὸ τε κολάζειν, καὶ τὸ δικαίον νομίζειν. “Δικαιῶ has two significations, to punish, and to account righteous.” And he confirms this sense of the word by instances out of Herodotus, Appianus and Josephus. And again, δικαιοῦσαι αἰτιατικῆ, καταδικάσαι, κολάσαι, δικαίον νομίσαι; “with an accusative case,” that is, when it respects and affects a subject, a person, “it is either to condemn and punish, or to esteem and declare righteous;” and of this latter sense, he gives pregnant instances in the next words. Hesychius mentions only the first signification. Δικαιοῦμενον, κολάζομενον, δικαιοῦσαι, κολάσαι. They never thought of any sense of this word, but what is forensic. And in our language, to be justified, was commonly used formerly, for to be judged and sentenced; as it is still among the Scots. One of the articles of peace between the two nations at the surrender of Leith, in the days of Edward the Sixth, was; “that if any one committed a crime, he should be *justified* by the law, upon his trial.” And in general δικαιοῦσθαι, is *jus in judicio auferre*; and δικαιοῦσαι, is *justum censere, declarare, pronuntiare*; and how in the Scripture it is constantly opposed to *condemnare*, we shall see immediately.

But we may more distinctly consider the use of this word in the New Testament, as we have done that of צדק in the Old. And that which we inquire concerning is, whether this word be used in the New Testament, in a forensic sense to denote an act of jurisdiction, or in a physical sense to express an internal change or mutation, the infusion of a habit of righteousness, and the denomination of the person to be justified thereon; or whether it signifies not pardon of sin. But this we may lay aside; for surely no man was ever yet so fond as to pretend that δικαιοῦ signified to pardon sin; yet is it the only word applied to express our justification in the New Testament. For if it be taken only in the former sense, then that which is pleaded for by those of the Roman church, under the name of justification, whatever it be, however good,

useful and necessary, yet justification it is not, nor can be so called; seeing it is a thing quite of another nature than what alone is signified by that word. Matt. xi. 10, *ιδικαιωθη ἡ σοφία*; "wisdom is justified of her children," not made just, but approved and declared. chap. xii. 37, *ἐκ τῶν λόγων σου δικαιοθήσῃ*; "by thy words thou shalt be justified;" not made just by them, but judged according to them, as is manifest in the antithesis, *καὶ ἐκ τῶν λόγων σου καταδικασθήσῃ*; "and by thy words thou shalt be condemned." Luke vii. 29, *ιδικαιώσαν τον Θεον*; "they justified God;" not surely by making him righteous in himself, but by owning, avowing and declaring his righteousness; chap. x. 29, *ὁ δε θελων δικαιουν εἶαντον*; "he willing to justify himself," to declare and maintain his own righteousness. To the same purpose; chap. xvi. 15, *υμεις εἰστε οἱ δικαιοουντες εἰαντους ενωπιον των ανθρωπων*; "ye are they that justify yourselves before men;" they did not make themselves internally righteous, but approved of their own condition; as our Saviour declares in the place. Luke xviii. 14; the publican went down *δεδικαιωμενος*, "justified" to his house; that is, acquitted, absolved, pardoned, upon the confession of his sin, and supplication for remission. Acts xiii. 38, 39, with Rom. ii. 13, *οἱ ποιηται του νομου δικαιοθησονται*. "The doers of the law shall be justified." The place declares directly the nature of our justification before God, and puts the signification of the word out of question. For justification ensues, as the whole effect of inherent righteousness according to the law: and therefore it is not the making of us righteous; which is irrefragable. It is spoken of God; Rom. iii. 4, *ὅπως ἂν δικαιοθῃς ἐν τοῖς λόγοις σου*; "That thou mayest be justified in thy sayings;" where to ascribe any other sense to the word is blasphemy. In like manner the same word is used, and in the same signification; 1 Cor. iv. 4; 1 Tim. iii. 16; Rom. iii. 20, 26, 28, 30; iv. 2, 5; v. 1, 9; vi. 7; viii. 30; Gal. ii. 16, 17; iii. 11, 24; v. 4; Tit. iii. 7; Jam. ii. 22, 24, 25. And in no one of these instances can it admit of any other signification, or denote the making of any man righteous by the infusion of a habit, or principle of righteousness, or any internal mutation whatever.

It is not therefore in *many* places of Scripture, as Bellarmine grants, that the words we have insisted on, signify the declaration or judicial pronouncement of any one to be righteous, but in *all* places where they are used, they are capable of no other but a forensic sense; especially is this evident where mention is made of justification before God. And because in my

judgment this one consideration sufficiently defeats all the pretences of those of the Roman church about the nature of justification, I shall consider what is excepted against the observation insisted on, and remove it out of our way.

Lud. le Blanc, in his conciliatory endeavours on this article of justification (*Thes. de usu et acceptatione vocis, Justificandi,*) grants to the Papists, that the word *deixaiōs* in sundry places of the New Testament, signifies to renew, to sanctify, to infuse a habit of holiness or righteousness, according as they plead. And there is no reason to think but he has grounded that concession on those instances, which are most pertinent to that purpose. Neither is it to be expected that a better countenance will be given by any to this concession, than is given it by him. I shall therefore examine all the instances which he insists upon to this purpose, and leave the determination of the difference to the judgment of the reader. Only I shall premise that which I judge not an unreasonable demand; namely, That if the signification of the word in any, or all the places which he mentions, should seem doubtful to any, (as it does not to me,) the uncertainty of a very few places should not make us question the proper signification of a word, whose sense is determined in so many, wherein it is clear and unquestionable. The first place he mentions, is that of the Apostle Paul himself, Rom. viii. 30. "Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called; and whom he called, them he also justified, and whom he justified, them he also glorified." The reason whereby he pleads that by *justified* in this place, an internal work of inherent holiness in them that are predestinated is designed, is this and no other. He says, "It is not likely that the holy Apostle in this enumeration of gracious privileges, would omit the mention of our sanctification by which we are freed from the service of sin, and adorned with true internal holiness and righteousness: but this is utterly omitted, if it be not comprised under the name and title of being justified; for it is absurd with some, to refer it to the head of glorification."

Answ. (1.) The grace of sanctification, whereby our natures are spiritually washed, purified and endowed with a principle of life, holiness and obedience to God, is a privilege, unquestionably great and excellent, and without which none can be saved. Of the same nature also is our redemption by the blood of Christ. And both these does this Apostle in other places without number, declare, commend, and insist upon. But that he ought to have introduced the mention of them, or

either of them in this place seeing he has not done so, I dare not judge.

2. If our sanctification be included or intended in any of the privileges here expressed, there is none of them, predestination only excepted, but it is more probably to be reduced to, than to that of being justified. Indeed in vocation it seems to be included expressly. For whereas it is effectual vocation that is intended wherein a holy principle of spiritual life, or faith itself is communicated to us, our sanctification radically, and as the effect in its adequate immediate cause, is contained in it. Hence we are said to be "called to be saints;" Rom. i. 7, which is the same with being "sanctified in Christ Jesus." 1 Cor. i. 2. And in many other places is sanctification included in vocation.

3. Whereas our sanctification, in the infusion of a principle of spiritual life, and the actings of it to an increase in duties of holiness, righteousness and obedience, is that whereby we are made meet for glory, and is of the same nature essentially with glory itself, whence its advances in us are said to be "from glory to glory;" 2 Cor. iii. 18, and glory itself is called the "grace of life;" 1 Pet. iii. 7, it is much more properly expressed by our being glorified than by being justified, which is a privilege quite of another nature. However it is evident, that there is no reason why we should depart from the general use and signification of the word, no circumstance in the text compelling us so to do.

The next place that he gives up to this signification is, 1 Cor. vi. 11, "Such were some of you, but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of our Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God." That by justification here, the infusion of an inherent principle of grace making us inherently righteous, is intended, he endeavours to prove by three reasons: (1) "Because justification is here ascribed to the Holy Ghost, 'ye are justified by the Spirit of our God.' But to renew us is the proper work of the Holy Spirit. (2) It is manifest that by justification, the Apostle signifies some change in the Corinthians, whereby they ceased to be what they were before. For they were fornicators and drunkards, such as could not inherit the kingdom of God, but now were changed, which proves a real inherent work of grace, to be intended. (3) If justification here signify nothing, but to be absolved from the punishment of sin, then the reasoning of the Apostle will be infirm and frigid. For after he has said that which is greater, as heightening of it, he adds the less: for it is more to

be washed, than merely to be freed from the punishment of sin."

Ans. 1. All these reasons prove not, that it is the same to be sanctified and to be justified, which must be, if that be the sense of the latter, which is here pleaded for. But the Apostle makes an express distinction between them, and as this author observes, proceeds from one to another by an ascent from the lesser to the greater. And the infusion of a habit or principle of grace, or righteousness evangelical, whereby we are inherently righteous, by which he explains our being justified in this place, is our sanctification and nothing else. Yea, and sanctification is here distinguished from washing; "but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified;" so that it peculiarly in this place denotes positive habits of grace and holiness. Neither can he declare the nature of it, any way different from what he would have expressed by being justified.

2. Justification is ascribed to the Spirit of God, as the principal efficient cause of the application of the grace of God and blood of Christ, whereby we are justified, to our souls and consciences. And he is so also of the operation of that faith whereby we are justified; whence, although we are said to be justified by him, yet it does not follow that our justification consists in the renovation of our natures.

3. The change and mutation that was made in these Corinthians, so far as it was physical in effects inherent (as such there was) the Apostle expressly ascribes to their washing and sanctification; so that there is no need to suppose this change to be expressed by their being justified. And in the real change asserted, that is, in the renovation of our natures, consists the true entire work and nature of our sanctification. But whereas by reason of the vicious habits and practices mentioned, they were in a state of condemnation, and such as had no right to the kingdom of Heaven, they were by their justification changed and transferred out of that state into another, wherein they had peace with God, and right to life eternal.

4. The third reason proceeds upon a mistake; namely, that to be justified, is only to be freed from the punishment due to sin. For it comprises both the non-imputation of sin, and the imputation of righteousness, with the privilege of adoption, and right to the heavenly inheritance, which are inseparable from it. And although it does not appear that the Apostle in the enumeration of these privileges, intended a process from the less to the greater; nor is it safe for us to compare the un-

utterable effects of the grace of God by Christ Jesus, such as sanctification and justification are, and to determine which is greatest, and which is least; yet following the conduct of the Scripture, and the due consideration of the things themselves, we may say that in this life we can be made partakers of no greater mercy or privilege, than what consists in our justification. And the reader may see from hence, how impossible it is to produce any one place wherein the words, *justification* and to *justify*, signify a real internal work and physical operation; in that this learned man, a person of more than ordinary perspicacity, candour and judgment, designing to prove it insisted on such instances, as give so little countenance to what he pretended. He adds, Tit. iii. 5—7. “Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour; that being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life.” The argument which alone he insists upon to prove, that by justification here, an infusion of internal grace is intended, is this; that the Apostle affirming first, “that God saved us, according to his mercy by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost, and afterwards affirming that we are justified by his grace, he supposes it necessary, that we should be regenerate and renewed, that we may be justified; and if so then our justification contains and comprises our sanctification also.”

Answer. The plain truth is, the Apostle speaks not one word of the necessity of our sanctification, or regeneration, or renovation by the Holy Ghost, antecedently to our justification, a supposition whereof contains the whole force of this argument. Indeed he assigns our regeneration, renovation, and justification, all the means of our salvation, equally to grace and mercy, in opposition to any works of our own, which we shall afterwards make use of. Nor is there intimated by him, any order of precedency, or connexion between the things that he mentions, but only between justification and adoption, justification having the priority in order of nature; “that being justified by his grace, we should be heirs according to the hope of eternal life.” All the things he mentions are inseparable. No man is regenerate or renewed by the Holy Ghost, but withal he is justified. No man is justified, but withal he is renewed by the Holy Ghost. And they are all of them equally

of sovereign grace in God, in opposition to any works of righteousness, that we have wrought. And we plead for the freedom of God's grace in sanctification, no less than in justification. But that it is necessary that we should be sanctified that we may be justified before God, who justifieth the ungodly, the Apostle says not in this place, nor any thing to that purpose; neither yet if he did so, would it at all prove that the signification of that expression to be justified, is to be sanctified, or to have inherent holiness and righteousness wrought in us. And these testimonies would not have been produced to prove it, wherein these things are so expressly distinguished, but that there are none to be found of more force or evidence.

The last place wherein he grants this signification of the word *δικαιωσ* is Revel. xxii. 11, *ὁ δικαίος δικαιοῦνται ἔτι, qui justus est, justificetur adhuc*; which place is pleaded by all the Romanists. And our author says, there are but few among the Protestants who do not acknowledge that the word cannot be here used in a forensic sense, but that to be justified, is to go on and increase in piety and righteousness.

Answer. But (1) There is a great objection lies in the way of any argument from these words; namely, from the various reading of the place. For many ancient copies read not *ὁ δικαίος δικαιοῦνται ἔτι*; which the Vulgate renders *justificetur adhuc*; but *δικαιοσύνην ποιῶσιν ἔτι*; "let him that is righteous, work righteousness still," as does the printed copy which now lies before me. So it was the copy of the Complutensian edition which Stephens commends above all others; and in one more ancient copy that he used. So it is in the Syriac and Arabic published by Hutterus, and in our own Polyglot. So Cyprian reads the words *De Bono Patientiæ; justus autem adhuc justiora faciat, similiter et qui sanctus sanctiora*. And I doubt not but that it is the true reading of the place; *δικαιοῦνται* being supplied by some to correspond with *ἀγιάσθητω* that ensues. And this phrase of *δικαιοσύνην ποιεῖν* is peculiar to this Apostle, being no where used in the New Testament, (nor in any other author) but by him. And he uses it expressly; I John ii. 29; and iii. 7, where those words, *ὁ ποιῶν δικαιοσύνην δικαίος ἔσται*, plainly contain what is here expressed. (2) To be justified, as the word is rendered by the Vulgate, "let him be justified more" (as it must be rendered, if the word *δικαιοῦνται* be retained) respects an act of God, which neither in its beginning nor continuation is prescribed to us as a duty, nor is capable of increase in degrees as we shall show afterwards. (3) Men are

said to be *δίκαιοι* generally from inherent righteousness; and if the Apostle had intended justification in this place, he would not have said *ὁ δίκαιος* but *ὁ δικαιωθεὶς*. All which things prefer the Complutensian, Syriac, and Arabic, before the vulgar reading of this place. If the vulgar reading be retained, no more can be intended, but that he who is righteous, should so proceed in working righteousness, as to secure his justified estate to himself, and to manifest it before God and the world.

Now whereas the words *δικαιῶ* and *δικαιώματι* are used thirty-six times in the New Testament, these are all the places, whereto any exception is put in against their forensic signification; and how ineffectual these exceptions are, is evident to any impartial judge.

Some other considerations may yet be made use of and pleaded to the same purpose. Such is the opposition that is made between justification and condemnation; so is it, Isa. l. 8, 9; Prov. xvii. 15; Rom. v. 16, 18; viii. 33, 34, and in sundry other places, as may be observed in the preceding enumeration of them. Wherefore as condemnation is not the infusing of a habit of wickedness into him that is condemned, nor the making of him to be inherently wicked, who was before righteous, but the passing a sentence upon a man with respect to his wickedness; no more is justification the change of a person from inherent unrighteousness to righteousness, by the infusion of a principle of grace, but a sentential declaration of him to be righteous.

Moreover, the thing intended is frequently declared in the Scripture by other equivalent terms, which are absolutely exclusive of any such sense, as the infusion of a habit of righteousness; so the Apostle expresses it by the "imputation of righteousness without works;" Rom. iv. 6, 11; and calls it the *blessedness*, which we have by the pardon of sin, and the covering of iniquity in the same place. So it is called "reconciliation with God;" Rom. v. 9, 10. To be justified by the blood of Christ, is the same with being "reconciled by his death." "Being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath by him. For if when we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life." See 2 Cor. v. 20, 21. Reconciliation is not the infusion of a habit of grace, but the effecting of peace and love, by the removal of all enmity and causes of offence. To *save*, and *salvation*, are used to the

same purpose. "He shall save his people from their sins;" Matt. i. 21, is the same with, "by him all that believe are justified from all things from which they could not be justified by the law of Moses," Acts xiii. 39. That of Gal. ii. 16, "We have believed that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law," is the same with Acts xv. 11, "But we believe that through the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, we shall be saved even as they." Ephes. ii. 8, 9. "By grace ye are saved, through faith, and not of works;" is so to be justified. So it is expressed by pardon, or the remission of sins, which is the effect of it; Rom. iv. 5, 6. By receiving the atonement; Rom. v. 11, not coming into judgment or condemnation; John v. 24. "Blotting out sins and iniquities;" Isa. xliii. 25; xlv. 22; Psal. li. 9. Jer. xviii. 23. Acts iii. 19. Casting them into the bottom of the sea; Micah vii. 19, and sundry other expressions of a like import. The Apostle declaring it by its effects, says, *δικαιοὶ καταστήσονται ὅτι πολλοί*. "Many shall be made righteous," Rom. v. 19. He is *made righteous δικαίος καίνοσται*, who on a juridical trial in open court, is absolved and declared righteous.

And so it may be observed that all things concerning justification are proposed in the Scripture under a juridical scheme, or forensic trial and sentence. As (1) a judgment is supposed in it, concerning which, the Psalmist prays that it may not proceed on the terms of the law, Psal. cxliii. 2. (2.) The Judge is God himself; Isa. l. 7, 8. Rom. viii. 33. (3) The tribunal whereon God sits in judgment, is the throne of grace, Heb. iv. 16. "Therefore will the Lord wait, that he may be gracious unto you, and therefore will he be exalted, that he may have mercy upon you; for the Lord is a God of judgment," Isa. xxx. 18. (4) A guilty person. This is the sinner, who is *ὑποδίκος τῷ Θεῷ*, so guilty of sin, as to be obnoxious to the judgment of God; *τῷ δικαίωματι τοῦ Θεοῦ*. Rom. iii. 19; i. 32, whose mouth is stopped by conviction. (5) Accusers are ready to propose and promote the charge against the guilty person; these are the law, John v. 45; and conscience, Rom. ii. 15; and Satan also, Zec. iii. 2. Rev. xii. 10. (6) The charge is admitted and drawn up into a handwriting in form of law, and is laid before the tribunal of the Judge, in bar, to the deliverance of the offender, Col. ii. 14. (7) A plea is prepared in the gospel for the guilty person. And this is grace, through the blood of Christ, the ransom paid, the atonement made, the eternal righteousness brought in by the surety of

the covenant. Rom. iii. 23—25. Dan. ix. 24. Eph. i. 7. (8) Hereto alone the sinner betakes himself, renouncing all other apologies or defences whatever. *Psa.* cxxx. 2, 3; cxliii. 2. *Job* ix. 2, 3; xlii. 5—7. *Luke* xviii. 13. *Rom.* iii. 24, 25; v. 11—19; viii. 1—3, 32, 33. *Isa.* liii. 5, 6. *Heb.* ix. 13—15; x. 1—13. *1 Pet.* ii. 24. *1 John* i. 7. Other plea for a sinner before God there is none. He who knows God and himself, will not provide or betake himself to any other. Nor will he as I suppose trust to any other defence, were he sure of all the angels in Heaven to plead for him. (9) To make this plea effectual we have an advocate with the Father, and he pleads his own propitiation for us. *1 John* ii. 1, 2. (10) The sentence hereon is absolution, on account of the ransom, blood or sacrifice and righteousness of Christ; with acceptance into favour, as persons approved of God. *Job* xxxiii. 24. *Psa.* xxxii. 1, 2. *Rom.* iii. 23—25; viii. 1, 33, 34. *2 Cor.* v. 21. *Gal.* iii. 13, 14.

Of what use the declaration of this process in the justification of a sinner may be, has been in some measure before declared. And if many seriously considered, that all these things concur and are required to the justification of every one that shall be saved, it may be they would not have such slight thoughts of sin, and the way of deliverance from the guilt of it, as they seem to have. From this consideration did the apostle learn that "terror of the Lord," which made him so earnest with men to seek after reconciliation; *2 Cor.* v. 10, 11.

I had not so long insisted on the signification of the words in the Scripture, but that a right understanding of it, not only excludes the pretences of the Romanists about the infusion of a habit of charity, from being the formal cause of our justification before God, but may also give occasion to some to take advice, into what place or consideration they can dispose their own personal inherent righteousness in their justification before him.

CHAPTER V.

THE DISTINCTION OF A FIRST AND SECOND JUSTIFICATION EXAMINED. THE CONTINUATION OF JUSTIFICATION, WHEREON IT DEPENDS.

BEFORE we inquire immediately into the nature and causes of justification, there are some things yet previously to be considered, that we may prevent all ambiguity and misunderstanding, about the subject to be treated of. I say, therefore, that the evangelical justification which alone we plead about, is but one, and is at once completed. About any other justification before God but one, we will not contend with any. Those who can find out another, may as they please ascribe what they will to it, or ascribe it to what they will. Let us therefore consider what is offered of this nature.

Those of the Roman Church ground their whole doctrine of justification upon a distinction of a double justification, which they call the first and second. The first justification, they say, is the infusion or the communication to us of an inherent principle or habit of grace or charity. Hereby they say original sin is extinguished, and all the habits of sin are expelled. This justification they say is by faith, the obedience and satisfaction of Christ being the only meritorious cause thereof. Only they dispute many things about preparations for it, and dispositions to it. Under those terms the Council of Trent included the doctrine of the schoolmen about *meritum de congruo*, as both Hosius and Andradius confess in the defence of that council. And as they are explained, they come much to one; however the council warily avoided the name of *merit*, with respect to this their first justification. And the use of faith herein, (which with them is no more but a general assent to divine revelation) is to bear the principal part in these preparations. So that to be justified by faith according to them, is to have the mind prepared by this kind of believing to receive *gratiam gratum facientem*, a habit of grace expelling sin, and making us acceptable to God. For upon this believing with those other duties of contrition and repentance, which must accompany it, it is meet and congruous to divine wisdom, goodness, and faithfulness to give us that grace whereby we are justified. And this according to them is that justification, whereof the Apostle Paul treats in his Epistles, from the procurement whereof he

excludes all the works of the law. The second justification is an effect or consequent hereof. And the proper formal cause thereof is good works, proceeding from this principle of grace and love. Hence are they the righteousness wherewith believers are righteous before God, whereby they merit eternal life. The righteousness of works they call it, and suppose it taught by the Apostle James. This they constantly affirm to make us *justos ex injustis*, (from being unrighteous to be righteous) wherein they are followed by others. For this is the way that most of them take to salve the seeming repugnancy between the Apostle Paul and James. Paul they say treats of the first justification only, whence he excludes all works, for it is by faith in the manner before described. But James treats of the second justification, which is by good works. So Bellarmine lib. 2, cap. 16, and lib. 4, cap. 18. And it is the express determination of those at Trent. Sess. 6, cap. 10. This distinction was coined for no other end, but to bring in confusion into the whole doctrine of the gospel. Justification through the free grace of God by faith in the blood of Christ is evacuated by it. Sanctification is turned into a justification, and corrupted by making the fruits of it meritorious. The whole nature of evangelical justification, consisting in the gratuitous pardon of sin and the imputation of righteousness, as the Apostle expressly affirms, and the declaration of a believing sinner to be righteous thereon, as the word alone signifies, is utterly defeated by it.

Howbeit others have embraced this distinction also, though not absolutely in their sense. So do the Socinians. Yea it must be allowed in some sense by all that hold our inherent righteousness to be the cause of or to have any influence upon our justification before God. For they allow of a justification which in order of nature is antecedent to works truly gracious and evangelical. But consequential to such works, there is a justification differing at least in degree, if not in nature and kind, upon the difference of its formal cause, which is our new obedience, from the former. But they mostly say, it is only the continuation of our justification and the increase of it as to degrees, that they intend by it. And if they may be allowed to turn sanctification into justification, and to make a progress therein, or an increase thereof, either in the root or fruit, to be a new justification, they may make twenty justifications as well as two for aught I know. For therein "the inward man is renewed day by day," 2 Cor. iv. 16; and believers "go from

strength to strength," are "changed from glory to glory;" 2 Cor. iii. 18, by the addition of one grace to another in their exercise, 2 Pet. i. 5-8, and increasing with the increase of God, Col. ii. 19, do in all things grow up into him who is the head, Ephes. iv. 15. And if their justification consist herein, they are justified anew every day. I shall therefore do these two things: (1) Show that this distinction is both unscriptural and irrational. (2) Declare what is the continuation of our justification, and whereon it depends.

Justification by faith in the blood of Christ, may be considered either as to the nature and essence of it, or as to its manifestation and declaration. The manifestation of it is twofold. (1) Initial in this life. (2) Solemn and complete at the day of judgment, whereof we shall treat afterwards. The manifestation of it in this life respects either the souls and consciences of them that are justified, or others, that is, the church and the world. And each of these have the name of justification assigned to them, though our real justification before God be always one and the same. But a man may be really justified before God, and yet not have the evidence or assurance of it in his own mind. Wherefore that evidence or assurance is not of the nature or essence of that faith whereby we are justified, nor does it necessarily accompany our justification. But this manifestation of a man's own justification to himself, although it depend on many especial causes, which are not necessary to his justification absolutely before God, is not a second justification when it is attained; but only the application of the former to his conscience by the Holy Ghost. There is also a manifestation of it with respect to others, which in like manner depends on other causes than does our justification before God absolutely; yet is it not a second justification. For it depends wholly on the visible effects of that faith whereby we are justified, as the Apostle James instructs us; yet is it only our single justification before God, evidenced and declared to his glory, the benefit of others, and increase of our own reward.

There is also a two-fold justification before God mentioned in the Scripture. (1) By the works of the law, Rom. ii. 13; x. 5. Matt. xix. 15-19. Hereto is required an absolute conformity to the whole law of God in our natures, all the faculties of our souls, all the principles of our moral operations, with perfect actual obedience to all its commands, in all instances of duty, both for matter and manner. For he is "cursed who continueth not in all things that are written in the law to do

them." And he that breaks any one commandment is guilty of the breach of the whole law. Hence the Apostle concludes, that none can be justified by the law, because all have sinned. (2) There is a justification by grace through faith in the blood of Christ, whereof we treat. And these ways of justification are contrary, proceeding on terms directly contradictory, and cannot be made consistent with, or subservient one to the other. But as we shall manifest afterwards, the confounding of them both, by mixing them together, is that which is aimed at in this distinction of a first and second justification. But whatever respects it may have, that justification which we have before God, in his sight through Jesus Christ, is but one, and at once full and complete, and this distinction is a vain and fond invention: for

I. As it is explained by the Papists it is exceedingly derogatory to the merit of Christ. For it leaves it no effect towards us, but only the infusion of a habit of charity. When that is done, all that remains with respect to our salvation is to be wrought by ourselves. Christ has only merited the first grace for us, that we therewith and thereby may merit life eternal. The merit of Christ being confined in its effect to the first justification, it has no immediate influence upon any grace, privilege, mercy, or glory that follows thereon; but they are all effects of that second justification which is purely by works. But this is openly contrary to the whole tenor of the Scripture. For although there be an order of God's appointment, wherein we are to be made partakers of evangelical privileges in grace and glory, one before another, yet are they all of them the immediate effects of the death and obedience of Christ; who "hath obtained for us eternal redemption," Heb. ix. 12, and is "the author of eternal salvation to all that do obey him," Heb. v. 9. "Having by one offering for ever perfected them that are sanctified." And those who allow of a secondary, if not of a second justification by our own inherent personal righteousness, are also guilty hereof, though not in the same degree with them. For whereas they ascribe to it, our acquittal from all charge of sin after the first justification, and a righteousness accepted in judgment, in the judgment of God, as if it were complete and perfect, whereon depends our final absolution and reward, it is evident that the immediate efficacy of the satisfaction and merit of Christ, has its bounds assigned to it in the first justification; which whether it be taught in the Scripture or no, we shall afterwards inquire.

2. More by this distinction is ascribed to ourselves working by virtue of inherent grace, as to the merit and procurement of spiritual and eternal good, than to the blood of Christ. For that only procures the first grace and justification for us. Thereof alone it is the meritorious cause; or as others express it, we are made partakers of the effects of it in the pardon of sins past. But by virtue of this grace, we do ourselves obtain, procure or merit another, a second, a complete justification, the continuance of the favour of God, and all the fruits of it, with life eternal and glory. So do our works at least perfect and complete the merit of Christ, without which it is imperfect. And those who assign the continuation of our justification wherein all the effects of divine favour and grace are contained to our own personal righteousness, as also final justification before God as the pleadable cause of it, do follow their steps to the best of my understanding. But such things as these, may be disputed; in debates of which kind it is incredible almost what influence on the minds of men, traditions, prejudices, subtlety of invention and arguing obtain, to divert them from real thoughts of the things about which they contend, with respect to themselves and their own condition. If by any means such persons can be called home to themselves, and find leisure to think how, and by what means they shall come to appear before the high God, to be freed from the sentence of the law, and the curse due to sin, to have a pleadable righteousness at the judgment seat of God before which they stand, especially if a real sense of these things be implanted in their minds by the convincing power of the Holy Ghost, all their subtile arguments and pleas for the mighty efficacy of their own personal righteousness, will sink in their minds like water at the return of the tide, and leave nothing but mud and defilement behind them.

3. This distinction of two justifications as used and improved by those of the Roman church, leaves us indeed no justification at all. Something there is, in the branches of it, of sanctification, but of justification nothing at all. Their first justification in the infusion of a habit or principle of grace, to the expulsion of all habits of sin, is sanctification, and nothing else. And we never contended that our justification in such a sense, if any will take it in such a sense, consists in the imputation of the righteousness of Christ. And this justification, if any will needs call it so, is capable of degrees, both of increase in itself, and of exercise in its fruits, as was newly

declared. But not only to call this our own justification, with a general respect to the notion of the word, as a making of us personally and inherently righteous, but to plead that this is the justification through faith in the blood of Christ, declared in the Scripture, is to exclude the only true evangelical justification from any place in religion. The second branch of the distinction has much in it like justification by the law, but nothing of that which is declared in the gospel. So that this distinction instead of coining us two justifications, according to the gospel, has left us none at all. For

1. There is no countenance given to this distinction in the Scripture. There is indeed mention therein, as we observed before, of a double justification; the one by the law, the other according to the gospel. But that either of these should on any account be sub-distinguished into a first and second of the same kind, that is either according to the law or the gospel, there is nothing in the Scripture to intimate. For this second justification is no way applicable to what the Apostle James discourses on that subject. He treats of justification; but speaks not one word of an increase of it, or addition to it, of a first or second. Besides he speaks expressly of him that boasts of faith, which being without works is a dead faith. But he who has the first justification, by the confession of our adversaries, has a true living faith, formed and enlivened by charity. And he uses the same testimony concerning the justification of Abraham that Paul does, and therefore does not intend another but the same, though in a diverse respect. Nor does any believer learn the least of it in his own experience; nor without a design to serve a further turn, would it ever have entered the minds of sober men on the reading of the Scripture. And it is the bane of spiritual truth, for men in the pretended declaration of it, to coin arbitrary distinctions without Scripture ground for them, and obtrude them as belonging to the doctrine they treat of. They serve to no other end or purpose, but only to lead the minds of men from the substance of what they ought to attend to, and to engage all sorts of persons in endless strifes and contentions. If the authors of this distinction would but go over the places in the Scripture, where mention is made of our justification before God, and make a distribution of them into the respective parts of their distinction, they would quickly find themselves at an utter loss.

5. There is that in the Scripture ascribed to our first justification, if they will needs call it so, which leaves no room for

their second feigned justification. For the sole foundation and pretence of this distinction, is a denial of those things to belong to our justification by the blood of Christ, which the Scripture expressly assigns to it. Let us take out some instances of what belongs to the first, and we shall quickly see how little it is, yea, that there is nothing left for the pretended second justification. For (1) therein do we receive the complete pardon and forgiveness of our sins, Rom. iv. 4, 6, 7; Ephes. i. 7; iv. 32; Acts xxvi. 18. (2) Thereby are we "made righteous," Rom. v. 19; x. 4. And (3) are freed from "condemnation, judgment, and death." John iii. 16, 19; v. 25; Rom. viii. 1. (4) Are reconciled to God. Rom. v. 9, 10; 2 Cor. v. 21, 22. And (5) have peace with him, and access into the favour wherein we stand by grace, with the advantages and consolations that depend thereon in a sense of his love. Rom. v. 1—5. And (6) we have adoption therewith and all its privileges. John i. 12. And in particular (7) a right and title to the whole inheritance of glory. Acts xxvi. 18; Rom. viii. 17. And (8) hereon eternal life follows. Rom. viii. 30; vi. 23. Which things will be again immediately spoken to upon another occasion. And if there be any thing now left for their second justification to do as such, let them take it as their own; these things are all of them ours, or belong to that one justification which we assert. Wherefore it is evident that either the first justification overthrows the second, rendering it needless; or the second destroys the first, by taking away what essentially belongs to it; we must therefore part with the one or the other, for consistent they are not. But that which gives countenance to the fiction and artifice of this distinction, and a great many more, is a dislike of the doctrine of the grace of God, and justification from thence by faith in the blood of Christ, which some endeavour hereby to send out of the way upon a pretended sleeveless errand, whilst they dress up their own righteousness in its robes, and exalt it into the room and dignity thereof.

But there seems to be more of reality and difficulty in what is pleaded concerning the continuation of our justification. For those that are freely justified, are continued in that state until they are glorified. By justification they are really changed into a new spiritual state and condition, and have a new relation given them to God and Christ, to the law and the gospel. And it is inquired what it is whereon their continuation in this state, on their part, depends; or what is required of them

that they may be justified to the end. And this as some say is not faith alone, but also the works of sincere obedience. And none can deny but that they are required of all them that are justified, whilst they continue in a state of justification on this side glory, which next and immediately ensues thereto. But whether upon our justification at first before God, faith be immediately dismissed from its place and office, and its work be given over to works, so as that the continuation of our justification should depend on our own personal obedience, and not on the renewed application of faith to Christ and his righteousness, is worth our inquiry. Only I desire the reader to observe that whereas the necessity of owning a personal obedience in justified persons, is on all hands absolutely agreed, the seeming difference that is herein, concerns not the substance of the doctrine of justification, but the manner of expressing our conceptions concerning the order of the disposition of God's grace, and our own duty, to edification, wherein I shall use my own liberty, as it is meet others should do theirs. And I shall offer my thoughts hereon in the ensuing observations.

1. Justification is such a work as is at once completed in all the causes, and the whole effect of it, though not as to the full possession of all that it gives right and title to. For (1) All our sins past, present, and to come, were at once imputed to and laid upon Jesus Christ; in what sense, we shall afterwards inquire. "He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities, the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes are we healed. All we like sheep have gone astray, we have turned every one to his own way, and the Lord hath made to meet on him the iniquities of us all," Isa. liii. 6, 7. "Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree." 1 Pet. ii. 24. The assertions being indefinite without exception or limitation, are equivalent to universals. *All* our sins were on him, he bare them all at once, and therefore once died for all. (2) He did therefore at once "finish transgression, made an end of sin, made reconciliation for iniquity, and brought in everlasting righteousness." Dan. ix. 24. At once he expiated all our sins; for "by himself he purged our sins, and then sat down at the right hand of the majesty on high." Heb. i. 3. And we are sanctified or dedicated to God through the "offering of the body of Christ once for all; for by one offering he has perfected" (consummated, completed as to their spiritual state) "them that are sanctified," Heb. x. 10, 14. He never will do more than he has actually

done already for the expiation of all our sins from first to last; for "there remaineth no more sacrifice for sin." I do not say that hereupon our justification is complete, but only that the meritorious procuring cause of it was at once completed, and is never to be renewed or repeated any more; all the inquiry is concerning the renewed application of it to our souls and consciences, whether that be by faith alone, or by the works of righteousness which we do. (3) By our actual believing with justifying faith, believing on Christ, or his name, we do receive him, and thereby on our first justification become the sons of God, John i. 12. That is, joint heirs with Christ, and heirs of God, Rom. viii. 17. Hereby we have a right to, and an interest in all the benefits of his mediation; which is to be at once completely justified. "For in him we are complete," Col. ii. 10. "For by the faith that is in him we receive the forgiveness of sins, and a lot or inheritance among all them that are sanctified," Acts xxvi. 18, being immediately "justified from all things from which we could not be justified by the law," Acts xiii. 39; yea God thereon "blesseth us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly things in Christ," Ephes. i. 3. All these things are absolutely inseparable from our first believing in him, and therefore our justification is at once complete. In particular (4) on our believing, all our sins are forgiven. "He hath quickened you together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses," Col. ii. 13—15. "For in him we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace," Ephes. i. 7; which one place obviates all the petulant exceptions of some against the consistency of the free grace of God in the pardon of sins, and the satisfaction of Christ in the procurement thereof. (5) There is hereon nothing to be laid to the charge of them that are so justified. For "he that believeth hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life," John v. 24. And "who shall lay any thing unto the charge of God's elect? it is God that justifieth, it is Christ that died," Rom. viii. 33, 34; and there "is no condemnation unto them that are in Christ Jesus." For "being justified by faith we have peace with God," Rom. v. 1. And (6) we have that blessedness hereon whereof in this life we are capable, Rom. iv. 5, 6. From all which it appears that our justification is at once complete. And (7) it must be so or no man can be justified in this world. For no time can be assigned, nor measure of obedience be limited, whereon it may be sup-

posed that any one comes to be justified before God, who is not so on his first believing. For the Scripture no where assigns any such time or measure. And to say that no man is completely justified in the sight of God in this life, is at once to overthrow all that is taught in the Scriptures concerning justification, and therewith all peace with God and comfort of believers. But a man acquitted upon his legal trial, is at once discharged of all that the law has against him.

2. Upon this complete justification, believers are obliged to universal obedience to God. The law is not abolished but established by faith. It is neither abrogated nor dispensed with by such an interpretation as should take off its obligation in any thing that it requires, nor as to the degree and manner wherein it requires it. Nor is it possible it should be so. For it is nothing but the rule of that obedience which the nature of God and man makes necessary from the one to the other. And that is an antinomianism of the worst sort, and most derogatory to the law of God, which affirms it to be divested of its power, to oblige to perfect obedience, so that what is not so, shall (as it were in despite of the law) be accepted as if it were so, to the end for which the law requires it. There is no medium, but that either the law is utterly abolished, and so there is no sin, for "where there is no law, there is no transgression;" or it must be allowed to require the same obedience that it did at its first institution; and to the same degree. Neither is it in the power of any man living to keep his conscience from judging and condemning that, whatever it be, wherein he is convinced that he comes short of the perfection of the law. Wherefore,

3. The commanding power of the law in positive precepts and prohibitions which justified persons are subject to, makes and constitutes all their inconformities to it to be no less truly and properly sins in their own nature, than they would be if their persons were obnoxious to the curse of it. This they are not, nor can be; for to be obnoxious to the curse of the law, and to be justified, are contradictory; but to be subject to the commands of the law, and to be justified are not so. But it is a subjection to the commanding power of the law, and not an obnoxiousness to the curse of the law, that constitutes the nature of sin in its transgression. Wherefore that complete justification which is at once, though it dissolve the obligation on the sinner to punishment by the curse of the law, yet does it not annihilate the commanding authority of the law,

to them that are justified, that what is sin in others, should not be so in them. See Rom. viii. 1, 33, 34.

Hence in the first justification of believing sinners, all future sins are remitted as to any actual obligation to the curse of the law, unless they should fall into such sins as should *ipso facto*, forfeit their justified estate, and transfer them from the covenant of grace, to the covenant of works, which we believe that God in his faithfulness will preserve them from. And although sin cannot be actually pardoned before it be actually committed; yet may the obligation to the curse of the law be virtually taken away from such sins in justified persons as are consistent with a justified estate, or the terms of the covenant of grace, antecedently to their actual commission. God at once in this sense "forgiveth all their iniquities, and healeth all their diseases, redeemeth their life from destruction, and crowneth them with loving-kindness and tender mercies," Psa. ciii. 2, 3. Future sins are not so pardoned as that when they are committed, they should be no sins, which cannot be, unless the commanding power of the law be abrogated. But their respect to the curse of the law, or their power to oblige the justified person thereto, is taken away.

Still there abides the true nature of sin in every inconformity to or transgression of the law in justified persons, which stands in need of daily actual pardon, for "there is no man that liveth and sinneth not," "and if we say that we have no sin, we do but deceive ourselves." None are more sensible of the guilt of sin, none are more troubled for it, none are more earnest in supplications for the pardon of it, than justified persons. For this is the effect of the sacrifice of Christ applied to the souls of believers, as the Apostle declares, Heb. x. 1-4, 10, 14, that it takes away conscience, condemning the sinner for sin, with respect to the curse of the law; but it does not take away conscience, condemning sin in the sinner, which on all considerations of God and themselves, of the law and the gospel, requires repentance on the part of the sinner, and actual pardon on the part of God.

Whereas therefore one essential part of justification consists in the pardon of our sins, and sins cannot be actually pardoned before they are actually committed, our present inquiry is, whereon the continuation of our justification depends, notwithstanding the intervention of sin after we are justified, whereby such sins are actually pardoned, and our persons are continued in a state of acceptance with God, and have their right to life

and glory uninterrupted. Justification is at once complete, in the imputation of a perfect righteousness, the grant of a right and title to the heavenly inheritance, the actual pardon of all past sins, and the virtual pardon of future sins, but how or by what means, on what terms and conditions this state is continued to those who are once justified, whereby their righteousness is everlasting, their title to life and glory indefeasible, and all their sins are actually pardoned, is to be inquired.

For answer to this inquiry, I say (1) "it is God that justifieth," and therefore the continuation of our justification is his act also. And this on his part depends on "the immutability of his counsel," the unchangeableness of the everlasting covenant, which is "ordered in all things and sure," the faithfulness of his promises, the efficacy of his grace, his complacency in the propitiation of Christ, with the power of his intercession, and the irrevocable grant of the Holy Ghost to them that believe; which things are not of our present inquiry.

2. Some say that on our part the continuation of this state of our justification, depends on the condition of good works, that is, that they are of the same consideration and use with faith itself herein. In our justification itself there is, they will grant, somewhat peculiar to faith; but as to the continuation of our justification, faith and works have the same influence upon it. Yea, some seem to ascribe it distinctly to works in an especial manner, with this only proviso, that they be done in faith. For my part I cannot understand that the continuation of our justification has any other dependencies, than has our justification itself. As faith alone is required to the one, so faith alone is required to the other, although its operations and effects in the discharge of its duty and office in justification, and the continuation of it are diverse, nor can it otherwise be. To clear this assertion, two things are to be observed.

1. That the continuation of our justification is the continuation of the imputation of righteousness and the pardon of sins. I do still suppose the imputation of righteousness to concur to our justification, although we have not yet examined what righteousness it is that is imputed. But that God in our justification imputes righteousness to us, is so expressly affirmed by the Apostle, that it must not be called in question. Now the first act of God in the imputation of righteousness cannot be repeated. And the actual pardon of sin after justification, is an effect and consequence of that imputation of righteousness. If any man sin, there is a propitiation; deliver him, I have

found a ransom. Wherefore unto this actual pardon, there is nothing required, but the application of that righteousness which is the cause of it; and this is done by faith only.

2. The continuation of our justification, is before God or in the sight of God, no less than our absolute justification is. We speak not of the sense and evidence of it to our own souls to peace with God; nor of the evidencing and manifestation of it to others by its effects; but of the continuance of it in the sight of God. Whatever therefore is the means, condition, or cause hereof, is pleadable before God, and ought to be pleaded to that purpose. So then the inquiry is,

What it is, that, when a justified person is guilty of sin (as guilty he is more or less every day) and his conscience is pressed with a sense thereof, as that only thing which can endanger or intercept his justified estate, his favour with God, and title to glory, he betakes himself to, or ought so to do, for the continuance of his state, and pardon of his sins; what he pleads to that purpose, and what is available thereto. That this is not his own obedience, his personal righteousness, or fulfilling the condition of the new covenant, is evident from (1) the experience of believers themselves; (2) the testimony of Scripture, and (3) the example of those whose cases are recorded therein.

1. Let the experience of those that believe be inquired into; for their consciences are continually exercised herein. What is it that they betake themselves to, what is it that they plead with God, for the continuance of the pardon of their sins, and the acceptance of their persons before him? Is it any thing but sovereign grace and mercy, through the blood of Christ? Are not all the arguments which they plead to this end, taken from the topics of the name of God, his mercy, grace, faithfulness, tender compassion, covenant and promises, all manifested, and exercised in and through the Lord Christ and his mediation alone? Do they not herein place their only trust and confidence for this end, that their sins may be pardoned, and their persons, though every way unworthy in themselves, be accepted with God? Does any other thought enter into their hearts? Do they plead their own righteousness, obedience, and duties to this purpose? Do they leave the prayer of the Publican, and betake themselves to that of the Pharisee? And is it not of faith alone, which is that grace whereby they apply themselves to the mercy or grace of God through the mediation of Christ? It is true that faith herein, works and acts itself in

and by godly sorrow, repentance, humiliation, self-judging, and abhorrence, fervency in prayer and supplications, with an humble waiting for an answer of peace from God, with engagements to renewed obedience. But it is faith alone that makes applications to grace in the blood of Christ, for the continuation of our justified estate, expressing itself in those other ways and effects mentioned, from none of which a believing soul expects the mercy aimed at.

2. The Scripture expressly declares this to be the only way of the continuation of our justification. 1 John ii. 1, 2. "These things write I unto you, that ye sin not. And if any man sin we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; and he is the propitiation for our sins." It is required of those that are justified, that they sin not; it is their duty not to sin; but yet it is not so required of them, as that if in any thing they fail of their duty, they should immediately lose the privilege of their justification. Wherefore on a supposition of sin, "if any man sin," as "there is no man that liveth and sinneth not," what way is prescribed for such persons to take, what are they to apply themselves to, that their sin may be pardoned, and their acceptance with God continued; that is, for the continuation of their justification? The course in this case directed to by the apostle, is none other but the application of our souls by faith to the Lord Christ, as our advocate with the Father, on the account of the propitiation that he has made for our sins. Under the consideration of this double act of his sacerdotal office, his oblation and intercession, he is the object of our faith in our absolute justification, and so he is as to the continuation of it. So our whole progress in our justified estate in all the degrees of it is ascribed to faith alone.

It is no part of our inquiry, what God requires of them that are justified. There is no grace, no duty, for the substance of them, nor for the manner of their performance, that are required either by the law or the gospel, but they are obliged to them. Where they are omitted, we acknowledge that the guilt of sin is contracted, and that attended with such aggravations, as some will not own or allow to be confessed to God himself. Hence in particular, the faith and grace of believers constantly and deeply exercise themselves in godly sorrow, repentance, humiliation for sin, and confession of it before God, upon their apprehensions of its guilt. And these duties are so far necessary to the continuation of our justification, as that a

justified estate cannot consist with the sins and vices that are opposite to them. So the apostle affirms, that "if we live after the flesh we shall die." Rom. viii. 13. He that does not carefully avoid falling into the fire or water, or other things immediately destructive of life natural, cannot live. But these are not the things whereon life depends. Nor have the best of our duties any other respect to the continuation of our justification, but only as in them we are preserved from those things which are contrary to it, and destructive of it. But the sole question is upon what the continuation of our justification depends, not concerning what duties are required of us, in the way of our obedience. If this be that which is intended in this position, the continuation of our justification depends on our own obedience and good works, or that our own obedience and good works are the condition of the continuation of our justification, namely, that God indispensably requires good works and obedience in all that are justified, so that a justified estate is inconsistent with the neglect of them; it is readily granted, and I shall never contend with any about the way whereby they choose to express the conceptions of their minds. But if it be inquired what it is whereby we immediately concur in a way of duty to the continuation of our justified estate, that is, the pardon of our sins and acceptance with God, we say it is faith alone. For "the just shall live by faith." Rom. i. 17. And as the apostle applies this divine testimony to prove our first or absolute justification to be by faith alone; so does he also apply it to the continuation of our justification, as that which is by the same means only. Heb. x. 38, 39. "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 unto perdition: but of them that believe to the saving of the soul." The drawing back to perdition includes the loss of a justified estate really so or in profession. In opposition thereto the apostle places believing to the saving of the soul; that is, to the continuation of justification to the end. And herein it is, that "the just live by faith," and the loss of this life can only be by unbelief. So "the life which we now live in the flesh, is by the faith of the Son of God, who loved us and gave himself for us." Gal. ii. 20. The life which we now lead in the flesh, is the continuation of our justification, a life of righteousness and acceptance with God, in opposition to a life by the works of the law, as the next

words declare, verse 21. "I do not frustrate the grace of God; for if righteousness came by the law, then is Christ dead in vain;" and this life is by faith in Christ, as he "loved us and gave himself for us," that is, as he was a propitiation for our sins. This then is the only way, means, and cause on our part of the preservation of this life, of the continuance of our justification; and herein are we "kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation." Again, if the continuation of our justification depends on our own works of obedience, then is the righteousness of Christ imputed to us only with respect to our justification at first, or our first justification as some speak. And this indeed is the doctrine of the Roman school. They teach that the righteousness of Christ is so far imputed to us, that on the account thereof God gives us justifying grace, and thereby the remission of sin in their sense, whence they allow it the meritorious cause of our justification. But on a supposition thereof, or the reception of that grace, we are continued to be justified before God by the works we perform by virtue of that grace received. And though some of them, as Vasquez, rise so high as to affirm, that this grace and the works of it, need no further respect to the righteousness of Christ, to deserve our second justification and life eternal; yet many of them affirm that it is still from the consideration of the merit of Christ that they are so meritorious. And the same, for the substance of it, is the judgment of some of them, who affirm the continuation of our justification to depend on our own works, setting aside that ambiguous term of *merit*. For it is on the account of the righteousness of Christ, they say, that our own works, or imperfect obedience, are so accepted with God, as that the continuation of our justification depends thereon. But the apostle gives us another account hereof. Rom. v. 1—3. For he distinguishes three things; (1) Our access into the grace of God. (2) Our standing in that grace. (3) Our glorying in that station against all opposition. By the first he expresses our absolute justification; by the second our continuation in the state whereinto we are admitted by it; and by the third, the assurance of that continuation, notwithstanding all the oppositions we meet with. And all these he ascribes equally to faith, without the intermixture of any other cause or condition. And other places, expressly to the same purpose might be pleaded.

3. The examples of them that believed and were justified

which are recorded in the Scripture, all bear witness to the same truth. The continuation of the justification of Abraham before God, is declared to have been by faith only; Rom. iv. 3. For the instance of his justification given by the Apostle from Gen. xv. 6, was long after he was justified absolutely. And if our first justification and the continuation of it, did not depend absolutely on the same cause, the instance of the one could not be produced for a proof of the way and means of the other, as here they are. And David, when a justified believer, not only places the blessedness of man in the free remission of sins, in opposition to his own works in general; Rom. iv. 6, 7, but in his own particular case ascribes the continuation of his justification and acceptance before God, to grace, mercy, and forgiveness alone, which are no otherwise received but by faith. Psa. cxxx. 3—5; cxliii. 2. All other works and duties of obedience accompany faith in the continuation of our justified estate, as necessary effects and fruits of it, but not as causes, means, or conditions whereon that effect is suspended. It is patient waiting by faith, that brings in the full accomplishment of the promises, Heb. vi. 12, 16. Wherefore there is but one justification, and that of one kind only, wherein we are concerned in this disputation, the Scripture makes mention of no more; and that is the justification of an ungodly person by faith. Nor shall we admit of the consideration of any other. For if there be a second justification, it must be of the same kind with the first, or of another; if it be of the same kind, then the same person is often justified with the same kind of justification, or at least more than once; and so on just reason ought to be often baptized. If it be not of the same kind, then the same person is justified before God with two sorts of justification, of both of which the Scripture is utterly silent. And the continuation of our justification depends solely on the same causes with our justification itself.

CHAPTER VI.

EVANGELICAL PERSONAL RIGHTEOUSNESS, THE NATURE AND USE OF IT. FINAL JUDGMENT, AND ITS RESPECT TO JUSTIFICATION.

THE things which we have discoursed concerning the first and second justification, and concerning the continuation of justification, have no other design but only to clear the principal subject whereof we treat, from what does not necessarily belong unto it. For until all things that are either really heterogeneous or otherwise superfluous, are separated from it, we cannot understand aright the true state of the question about the nature and causes of our justification before God. For we intend one only justification, namely, that whereby God at once freely by his grace justifies a convinced sinner through faith in the blood of Christ. Whatever else any will be pleased to call justification, we are not concerned in it, nor are the consciences of them that believe. To the same purpose we must therefore briefly also consider what is usually disputed about our own personal righteousness, with a justification thereon, as also what is called sentential justification at the day of judgment. And I shall treat no further of them in this place, but only as it is necessary to free the principal subject under consideration, from being intermixed with them, as really it is not concerned in them. For what influence our own personal righteousness hath upon our justification before God, will be afterwards particularly examined. Here we shall only consider such a notion of it, as seems to interfere with it, and disturb the right understanding of it. But yet I say concerning this also, that it rather belongs to the difference that will be among us in the expression of our conceptions about spiritual things, whilst we know but in part, than to the substance of the doctrine itself. And on such differences no breach of charity can ensue, whilst there is a mutual grant of that liberty of mind, without which it will not be preserved one moment.

It is therefore by some apprehended that there is an evangelical justification, upon our evangelical personal righteousness. This they distinguish from that justification which is by faith through the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, in the sense wherein they allow it. For the righteousness of Christ is our legal righteousness, whereby we have pardon of

sin, and acquittal from the sentence of the law, on the account of his satisfaction and merit. But moreover they say, that as there is a personal inherent righteousness required of us, so there is a justification by the gospel thereon. For by our faith and the plea of it, we are justified from the charge of unbelief; by our sincerity and the plea of it, we are justified from the charge of hypocrisy; and so by all other graces and duties from the charge of the contrary sins in commission or omission, so far as such sins are inconsistent with the terms of the covenant of grace. How this differs from the second justification before God, which some say we have by works on the supposition of the pardon of sin for the satisfaction of Christ, and the infusion of an habit of grace enabling us to perform those works, is declared by those who so express themselves.

Some add, that this inherent personal evangelical righteousness, is the condition on our part of our legal righteousness, or of the imputation of the righteousness of Christ unto our justification, or the pardon of sin. And those by whom the satisfaction and merit of Christ are denied, make it the only and whole condition of our absolute justification before God. So speak all the Socinians constantly. For they deny our obedience to Christ to be either the meritorious or efficient cause of our justification; only they say it is the condition of it, without which God has decreed that we shall not be made partakers of the benefit thereof. So does Socinus himself: "Our works, that is, the obedience we render to Christ, though neither the efficient nor meritorious cause, are yet the indispensable cause of our justification in the sight of God and of our eternal [life] * * We must beware of supposing that holiness and innocence of life is the effect of our justification before God; or of affirming that it is the efficient or impelling cause of our justification before God; it is only a cause, without which God has decreed that we shall not obtain that justification."* And in all their discourses to this purpose, they assert our personal righteousness and holiness, or our obedience to the commands of Christ, which they make to be the form and essence of faith, to be the condition whereon we obtain justification or

* *Sunt opera nostra, id est, ut dictum fuit, obedientia quam Christo præstamus, licet nec efficiens, nec meritoria, tamen causa est (ut vocant) sine qua non, Justificationis coram Deo atque æternæ nostræ. * * * Ut cavendum est ne vitæ sanctitatem atque innocentiam effectum justificationis nostræ coram Deo esse credamus, neque illam nostræ coram Deo justificationis causam efficientem aut impulsivam esse affirmemus: sed tantummodo causam sine qua eam justificationem nobis non contingere decrevit Deus.*

the remission of sins. And indeed, considering what their opinion is concerning the person of Christ, with their denial of his satisfaction and merit, it is impossible they should frame any other idea of justification in their minds. But what some among ourselves intend by a compliance with them herein, who are not necessitated thereto by a prepossession with their opinions about the person and mediation of Christ, I know not. For as for the Socinians, all their notions about grace, conversion to God, justification, and the like articles of our religion, are nothing but what they are necessarily cast upon, by their hypothesis about the person of Christ.

At present I shall only inquire into that peculiar evangelical justification which is asserted to be the effect of our own personal righteousness, or to be granted us thereon. And here we may observe,

1. That God requires in and by the gospel a sincere obedience of all who believe, to be performed in and by their own persons, though through the aids of grace supplied to them by Jesus Christ. He requires indeed obedience, duties, and works of righteousness in and of all persons whatever. But the consideration of the works which are performed before believing, is excluded by all from any causality or interest in our justification before God. At least whatever any may discourse of the necessity of such works in a way of preparation to believing (whereto we have spoken before) none bring them into the verge of works evangelical, or obedience of faith, which would imply a contradiction. But that the works inquired after are necessary to all believers, is granted by all; on what grounds and to what ends, we shall inquire afterwards; they are declared, Ephes. ii. 10.

2. It is likewise granted that believers, from the performance of this obedience, or these works of righteousness, are denominated righteous in the Scripture, and are personally and internally righteous, Luke i. 6. 1 John iii. 7. But yet this denomination is no where given to them, with respect to grace habitually inherent, but to the effects of it in duties of obedience, as in the places mentioned. "They were both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless." The latter words give the reason of the former, or their being esteemed righteous before God. And "he that doth righteousness is righteous;" the denomination is from doing. And Bellarmine endeavouring to prove that it is habitual, not actual righteousness, which is as he speaks, the

formal cause of our justification before God, could not produce one testimony of Scripture wherein any one is denominated righteous from habitual righteousness, but is forced to attempt the proof of it with this absurd argument, namely, that we "are justified by the sacraments, which do not work in us actual but habitual righteousness." And this is sufficient to discover the insufficiency of a pretence for any interest of our own righteousness from this denomination of being righteous thereby, seeing it has not respect to that which is the principal part thereof.

3. This inherent righteousness, taking it for that which is habitual and actual, is the same with our sanctification; neither is there any difference between them, only they are divers names of the same thing. For our sanctification is the inherent renovation of our natures, exerting and acting itself in newness of life, or obedience to God in Christ, and works of righteousness. But sanctification and justification are in the Scripture perpetually distinguished, whatever respect of causality the one of them may have to the other. And those who confound them, as the Papists do, do not so much dispute about the nature of justification, as endeavour to prove that indeed there is no such thing as justification at all. For that which would serve most to enforce it, namely, the pardon of sin, they place in the exclusion and extinction of it, by the infusion of inherent grace, which does not belong to justification.

4. By this inherent personal righteousness, we may be said several ways to be justified. As (1) In our own consciences, in as much as it is an evidence in us and to us, of our participation of the grace of God in Christ Jesus, and of our acceptance with him, which has no small influence upon our peace. So speaks the Apostle; "our rejoicing is this, the testimony of our conscience, that in simplicity and godly sincerity, not with fleshly wisdom, but by the grace of God, we have had our conversation in the world," 2 Cor. i. 12, who yet disclaims any confidence therein as to his justification before God. For, saith he, "although I know nothing by myself, yet am I not thereby justified." 1 Cor. iv. 4. (2) Hereby may we be said to be justified before men; that is, acquitted of evils laid to our charge, and approved as righteous and unblamable. For the state of things is so in the world, that the professors of the gospel ever were and ever will be evil spoken of as evil doers. The rule given them to acquit themselves, so that at length they may be acquitted and justified by all that are not absolutely blinded

and hardened in wickedness, is that of a holy and fruitful walking, in abounding in good works. 1 Pet. ii. 12; iii. 16. And so is it with respect to the Church, that we be not judged dead, barren professors, but such as have been made "partakers of the like precious faith" with others. "Show me thy faith by thy works." James ii. Wherefore (3) this righteousness is pleadable to our justification against all the charges of Satan, who is the great accuser of the brethren, of all that believe. Whether he manage his charge privately in our consciences, which is as it were before God, as he charged Job; or by his instruments in all manner of reproaches and calumnies, whereof some in this age have had experience in an eminent manner, this righteousness is pleadable to our justification.

On a supposition of these things, wherein our personal righteousness is allowed its proper place and use (as shall afterwards be more fully declared) I do not understand that there is an evangelical justification whereby believers are by and on the account of this personal inherent righteousness justified in the sight of God; nor does the imputation of the righteousness of Christ to our absolute justification before him depend thereon. For,

1. None have this personal righteousness but they are antecedently justified in the sight of God. It is wholly the obedience of faith, proceeding from true and saving faith in God by Jesus Christ. For as it was said before, works before faith, are as by general consent excluded from any interest in our justification, and we have proved that they are neither conditions of it, dispositions to it, nor preparations for it, properly so called. But every true believer is immediately justified on his believing. Nor is there any moment of time wherein a man is a true believer, according as faith is required in the gospel, and yet not justified. For as he is thereby united to Christ, which is the foundation of our justification by him, so the whole Scripture testifies, that he that believes is justified; or that there is an infallible connexion in the ordination of God between true faith and justification. Wherefore this personal righteousness cannot be the condition of our justification before God, seeing it is consequential thereon. What may be pleaded in exception hereto from the supposition of a second justification, or differing causes of the beginning and continuation of justification, has been already disproved.

2. Justification before God is a freedom and absolution from a charge before God, at least it is contained therein. And the

instrument of this charge must either be the law or the gospel. But neither the law nor the gospel, before God, or in the sight of God, charges true believers with unbelief, hypocrisy or the like. For "who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect," who are once justified before him? Such a charge may be laid against them by Satan, by the Church sometimes on mistake, by the world, as it was in the case of Job, against which this righteousness is pleadable. But what is charged immediately before God, is charged by God himself, either by the law or the gospel; and the judgment of God is according to truth. If this charge be by the law, by the law we must be justified. But the plea of sincere obedience will not justify us by the law. That admits of nothing in satisfaction to its demands, but that which is complete and perfect. And where the gospel lays any thing to the charge of any persons before God, there can be no justification before God, unless we shall allow the gospel to be the instrument of a false charge. For what should justify him whom the gospel condemns? And if it be a justification, by the gospel from the charge of the law, it renders the death of Christ of no effect. And a justification without a charge, is not to be supposed.

3. Such a justification as that pretended, is altogether needless and useless. This may easily be evinced from what the Scripture asserts respecting our justification in the sight of God by faith in the blood of Christ. But this has been spoken to before on another occasion. Let that be considered, and it will quickly appear, that there is no place nor use for this new justification upon our personal righteousness, whether it be supposed antecedent and subordinate thereto, or consequential and perfective thereof.

4. This pretended evangelical justification has not the nature of any justification that is mentioned in the Scripture; that is, neither that by the law, nor that provided in the gospel. Justification by the law is this: "The man that doth the works of it shall live in them." This it does not pretend to. And as to evangelical justification, it is every way contrary to it. For therein the charge against the person to be justified, is true; namely, that he has sinned, and has come short of the glory of God. In this it is false, namely, that a believer is an unbeliever; a sincere person, a hypocrite; one fruitful in good works, altogether barren. And this false charge is supposed to be exhibited in the name of God, and before him. Our acquittal in true evangelical justification is by absolution or pardon of sin;

here by a vindication of our own righteousness. There the plea of the person to be justified is, "guilty," all the world is become guilty before God; but here the plea of the person on his trial is, "not guilty," whereon the proofs and evidences of innocency and righteousness ensue; but this is a plea which the law will not admit, and which the gospel disclaims.

5. If we are justified before God on our own personal righteousness, and pronounced righteous by him on account thereof, then God enters into judgment with us on something in ourselves and acquits us thereon. For justification is a juridical act in and of that judgment of God which is according to truth. But that God should enter into judgment with us, and justify us with respect to what he judges on, or our personal righteousness, the Psalmist does not believe, *Psa. cxxx. 2, 3; cxliii. 2*; nor did the publican, *Luke xviii.*

6. This personal righteousness of ours cannot be said to be a subordinate righteousness, and subservient to our justification by faith in the blood of Christ. For therein God justifies the ungodly, and imputes righteousness to him that worketh not. And besides it is expressly excluded from any consideration in our justification. *Ephes. ii. 7, 8.*

7. This personal inherent righteousness wherewith we are said to be justified with this evangelical justification, is our own righteousness. Personal righteousness and our own righteousness, are expressions equivalent. But our own righteousness is not the material cause of any justification before God. For (1) It is unmeet so to be. *Isa. liv. 6.* (2) It is directly opposed to that righteousness whereby we are justified, as inconsistent with it to that end, *Phil. iii. 9; Rom. x. 3, 4.*

It will be said that our own righteousness is the righteousness of the law; but this personal righteousness is evangelical. But (1) It will be hard to prove, that our personal righteousness is any other but our own righteousness; and our own righteousness is expressly rejected from any interest in our justification, in the places quoted. (2) That righteousness which is evangelical in respect of its efficient cause, its motives and some especial ends, is legal in respect of the formal reason of it, and our obligation to it. For there is no instance of duty belonging to it, but in general we are obliged to its performance by virtue of the first commandment, to take the Lord for our God. Acknowledging therein his essential verity and sovereign authority, we are obliged to believe all that he shall reveal, and to obey in all that he shall command. (3) The good works re-

jected from any interest in our justification, are those whereto we are "created in Christ Jesus," Ephes. ii. 8, 9, the "works of righteousness which we have done," Tit. iii. 5, wherein the Gentiles are concerned, who never sought for righteousness by the works of the law, Rom. ix. 30. But it will yet be said that these things are evident in themselves. God requires an evangelical righteousness in all that believe. This Christ is not, nor is it the righteousness of Christ. He may be said to be our legal righteousness, but our evangelical righteousness he is not. And so far as we are righteous with any righteousness, so far we are justified by it. For according to this evangelical righteousness, we must be tried; if we have it we shall be acquitted, and if we have it not, we shall be condemned. There is therefore a justification according to it.

I answer. (1) According to some authors or maintainers of this opinion, I see not but that the Lord Christ is as much our evangelical righteousness as he is our legal. For our legal righteousness he is not in their judgment, by a proper imputation of his righteousness to us, but by the communication of the fruits of what he did and suffered for us. And so he is our evangelical righteousness also. For our sanctification is an effect or fruit of what he did and suffered for us. Eph. v. 25, 26. Tit. ii. 14.

2. None have this evangelical righteousness, but those who are in order of nature at least, justified before they actually have it. For it is that which is required of all that believe, and are justified thereon. And we need not much inquire how a man is justified, after he is justified.

3. God has not appointed this personal righteousness in order to our justification before him in this life, though he has appointed it, to evidence our justification before others, and even in his sight, as shall be declared. He accepts of it, approves of it, upon the account of the free justification of the person, in and by whom it is wrought. So he had "respect unto Abel and his offering." But we are not acquitted by it from any real charge in the sight of God, nor do we receive remission of sins on the account of it. And those who place the whole of justification in the remission of sins, making this personal righteousness the condition of it, as the Socinians do, leave not any place for the righteousness of Christ in our justification.

4. If we are in any sense justified hereby in the sight of God, we have whereof to boast before him. We may not have

so absolutely and with respect to merit, yet we have so comparatively, and in respect of others, who cannot make the same plea for their justification. But all boasting is excluded. And it will not relieve to say, that this personal righteousness, is of the free grace and gift of God to some, and not to others; for we must plead it as our duty, and not as God's grace.

5. Suppose a person freely justified by the grace of God through faith in the blood of Christ, without respect to any works, obedience, or righteousness of his own; we freely grant; (1) That God indispensably requires personal obedience of him, which may be called his evangelical righteousness; (2) That God approves of, and accepts in Christ this righteousness so performed; (3) That hereby that faith whereby we are justified is evidenced, proved, manifested, in the sight of God and men. (4) That this righteousness is pleadable to an acquittal against any charge from Satan, the world, or our own consciences; (5) That upon it, we shall be declared righteous at the last day, and without it none shall so be. And if any shall think meet from hence to conclude upon an evangelical justification, or call God's acceptance of our righteousness by that name, I shall by no means contend with them. And wherever this inquiry is made, not how a sinner guilty of death and obnoxious to the curse, shall be pardoned, acquitted and justified, which is by the righteousness of Christ alone imputed to him; but how a man that professes evangelical faith, or faith in Christ, shall be tried, judged, and whereon as such he shall be justified, we grant that it is and must be by his own personal sincere obedience.

And these things are spoken, not with a design to contend with any, or to oppose the opinions of any; but only to remove from the principal question in hand, those things which do not belong to it.

A very few words will also free our inquiry from any concernment, in that which is called sentential justification, at the day of judgment. For of what nature soever it be, the person concerning whom that sentence is pronounced, was (1) actually and completely justified before God in this world; (2) made partaker of all the benefits of that justification, even to a blessed resurrection in glory; "it is raised in glory;" 1 Cor. xv., (3) The souls of the most will long before have enjoyed a blessed rest with God, absolutely discharged and acquitted from all their labours, and all their sins; there remains nothing but an actual admission of the whole person into eternal

glory. Wherefore this judgment can be no more but declaratory to the glory of God, and the everlasting refreshment of them that have believed. And without reducing it to a new justification, as it is no where called in the Scripture; the ends of that solemn judgment, in the manifestation of the wisdom and righteousness of God, in appointing the way of salvation by Christ, as well as in giving of the law; the public conviction of them by whom the law has been transgressed and the gospel despised; the vindication of the righteousness, power and wisdom of God in the rule of the world by his providence, wherein for the most part, his paths to all in this life, "are in the deep, and his footsteps are not known;" the glory and honour of Jesus Christ, triumphing over all his enemies, then fully made "his footstool;" and the glorious exaltation of grace in all that believe, with sundry other things of a like tendency to the ultimate manifestation of divine glory in the creation and guidance of all things, are sufficiently manifest.

And hence it appears, how little force there is in that argument which some pretend to be of so great weight in this cause. "As every one (they say) shall be judged of God at the last day, in the same way and manner, or on the same grounds is he justified of God in this life. But by works and not by faith alone, every one shall be judged at the last day; wherefore by works and not by faith alone every one is justified before God in this life." For,

1. It is no where said that we shall be judged at the last day, *ex operibus*, by our works; but, only that God will render unto men *secundum opera*, according to their works. But God does not justify any in this life *secundum opera*; being justified "freely by his grace, and, not according to the works of righteousness which we have done." And we are every where said to be justified in this life, *ex fide, per fidem*, by faith; but no where *propter fidem*, for our faith; or that God justifies us *secundum fidem*, according to our faith. And we are not to depart from the expressions of the Scripture where such a difference is constantly observed.

2. It is somewhat strange that a man should be judged at the last day, and justified in this life, just in the same way and manner, that is with respect to faith and works, when the Scripture constantly ascribes our justification before God to faith without works; and the judgment at the last day is said to be according to works, without any mention of faith.

3. If justification and eternal judgment proceed absolutely

on the same grounds, reasons, and causes, then if men had not done what they shall be condemned for doing at the last day, they should have been justified in this life. But many shall be condemned only for sins against the light of nature, Rom. ii. 12, as never having the written law or gospel made known to them. Wherefore to such persons, to abstain from sins against the light of nature, would be sufficient to their justification, without any knowledge of Christ or the gospel.

4. This proposition, that God pardons men their sins, gives them the adoption of children with a right to the heavenly inheritance according to their works, is not only foreign to the gospel, but contradictory to it, and destructive of it, as contrary to all express testimonies of the Scripture both in the Old Testament and the New, where these things are spoken of. But that God judges all men, and renders to all men at the last judgment according to their works, is true and affirmed in the Scripture.

5. In our justification in this life by faith, Christ is considered as our propitiation and advocate, as he who has made atonement for sin, and brought in everlasting righteousness. But at the last day, and in the last judgment, he is considered only as the judge.

6. The end of God in our justification is the glory of his grace; Eph. i. 6. But the end of God in the last judgment is the glory of his remunerative righteousness, 2 Tim. iv. 8.

7. The representation that is made of the final judgment, Matt. vii. and xxv. is only of the visible church. And therein the plea of faith as to the profession of it is common to all, and is equally made by all. Upon that plea of faith, it is put to the trial whether it were sincere true faith or no, or only that which was dead and barren. And this trial is made solely by the fruits and effects of it, and otherwise in the public declaration of things to all, it cannot be made. Otherwise the faith whereby we are justified comes not into judgment at the last day. See John v. 24, with Mark xvi. 16.

CHAPTER VII.

IMPUTATION, AND THE NATURE OF IT; WITH THE IMPUTATION OF THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF CHRIST IN PARTICULAR.

THE first express record of the justification of any sinner is of Abraham. Others were justified before him from the beginning, and there is that affirmed of them, which sufficiently evidences them so to have been. But this prerogative was reserved for the father of the faithful, that his justification and the express way and manner of it, should be first entered on the sacred record. So it is Gen. xv. 6. "He believed in the Lord, and it was counted unto him for righteousness." חשבה It was *accounted* to him, or *imputed* to him for righteousness. *λογισθη*—it was *counted, reckoned, imputed*. "And it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed unto him, but for us also unto whom it shall be imputed if we believe." Rom. iv. 23, 24. Wherefore the first express declaration of the nature of justification in the Scripture, affirms it to be by *imputation*; the imputation of somewhat to righteousness; and this done in that place and instance, which is recorded on purpose, as the precedent and example of all those that shall be justified. As he was justified, so are we, and no otherwise.

Under the New Testament there was a necessity of a more full and clear declaration of the doctrine of it. For it is among the first and principal parts of that heavenly mystery of truth which was to be "brought to light by the gospel." And besides there was from the first a strong and dangerous opposition made to it. For this matter of justification, the doctrine of it, and what necessarily belongs thereto, was that whereon the Jewish church broke off from God, refused Christ and the gospel, perishing in their sins; as is expressly declared. Rom. ix. 31; x. 3, 4. And in like manner a dislike of it, an opposition to it, ever was and ever will be a principle and cause of the apostasy of any professing church, from Christ and the gospel, that falls under the power and deceit of them; as it fell out afterwards in the churches of the Galatians. But in this state the doctrine of justification was fully declared, stated, and vindicated by the apostle Paul in a peculiar manner. And he does it especially by affirming and proving that we have the righteousness whereby and wherewith we are justified, by im-

putation; or that our justification consists in the non-imputation of sin, and the imputation of righteousness.

But yet, although the first recorded instance of justification, and which was so recorded, that it might be an example, and represent the justification of all that should be justified to the end of the world, is expressed by imputation, and righteousness imputed, and the doctrine of it in that great case, wherein the eternal welfare of the church of the Jews, or their ruin, was concerned, is so expressed by the Apostle; yet is it so fallen out in our days that nothing in religion is more maligned, more reproached, more despised, than the imputation of righteousness to us, or an imputed righteousness—a putative righteousness, the shadow of a dream, a fancy, a mummery, an imagination, say some among us—An opinion, *fada, execranda, perniciosa, detestanda*, saith Socinus. and opposition arises to it every day from great variety of principles. For those by whom it is opposed and rejected can by no means agree what to set up in the place of it.

However, the weight and importance of this doctrine is on all hands acknowledged, whether it be true or false. It is not a dispute about notions, terms, and speculations, wherein Christian practice is little or not at all concerned, (of which nature many are needlessly contended about) but such as has an immediate influence upon our whole present duty, with our eternal welfare or ruin. Those by whom this imputation of righteousness is rejected, affirm that the faith and doctrine of it, overthrow the necessity of gospel obedience, of personal righteousness, and good works, bringing in antinomianism and libertinism in life. Hereon it must of necessity be destructive of salvation, in those who believe it, and conform their practice thereto. And those on the other hand by whom it is believed, seeing they judge it impossible that any man should be justified before God any other way, but by the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, accordingly judge, that without it none can be saved. Hence a learned man of late concludes his discourse concerning it; *hactenus de imputatione Justitiæ Christi, sine qua nemo unquam aut salvatus est, aut salvatur queat. Justificat. Paulin. cap. 8.* “Thus far of the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, without which no man was ever saved, or can be.” They do not think nor judge, that all those are excluded from salvation, who cannot apprehend, or who deny the doctrine of the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, as by them declared. But they judge that they are so,

to whom that righteousness is not *really imputed*; nor can they do otherwise, whilst they make it the foundation of all their own acceptance with God and eternal salvation. These things greatly differ. To believe the doctrine of it, or not to believe it, as thus or thus explained, is one thing; and to enjoy the thing, or not enjoy it, is another. I no way doubt, but that many men receive more grace from God, than they understand or will own; and have a greater efficacy of it in them, than they will believe. Men may be really saved, by that grace which doctrinally they deny; and they may be justified by the imputation of that righteousness which in opinion they deny to be imputed. For the faith of it, is included in that general assent which they give to the truth of the gospel, and such an adherence to Christ may ensue thereon, as that their mistake of the way whereby they are saved by him, shall not defraud them of a real interest therein. And for my part, I must say, that notwithstanding all the disputes that I see and read about justification (some whereof are full of offence and scandal) I do not believe but that the authors of them, (if they be not Socinians throughout, denying the whole merit and satisfaction of Christ) do really trust to the mediation of Christ for the pardon of their sins, and acceptance with God, and not to their own works or obedience. Nor will I believe the contrary, until they expressly declare it. Of the objection on the other hand, concerning the danger of the doctrine of the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, in reference to the necessity of holiness, and works of righteousness, we must treat afterwards.

The judgment of the reformed churches herein is known to all, and must be confessed, unless we intend by vain cavils to increase and perpetuate contentions. Especially the Church of England is in her doctrine express as to the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, both active and passive, as it is usually distinguished. This has been of late so fully manifested out of her authentic writings, that is, the "Articles of Religion," and "Books of Homilies," and other writings publicly authorized, that it is altogether needless to give any further demonstration of it. Those who pretend themselves to be otherwise minded, are such as I will not contend with. For to what purpose is it to dispute with men who will deny the sun to shine, when they cannot bear the heat of its beams. Wherefore in what I have to offer on this subject, I shall not in the least depart from the ancient doctrine of the Church of England; yea I have no design but to declare and vindicate it, as God shall enable.

There are indeed sundry differences among persons learned, sober, and orthodox (if that term displease not) in the way and manner of the explication of the doctrine of justification by the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, who yet all of them agree in the substance of it, in all those things wherein the grace of God, the honour of Christ, and the peace of the souls of men are principally concerned. As far as it is possible for me, I shall avoid the concerning myself at present, in these differences. For to what purpose is it to contend about them, whilst the substance of the doctrine itself is openly opposed and rejected? Why should we debate about the order and beautifying of the rooms of a house, whilst fire is set to the whole? When that is well quenched, we may return to the consideration of the best means for the disposal and use of the several parts of it.

There are two grand parties by whom the doctrine of justification by the imputation of the righteousness of Christ is opposed, namely, the Papists and the Socinians. But they proceed on different principles, and to different ends. The design of the one is to exalt their own merits, of the other to destroy the merit of Christ. But besides these who trade in company, we have many interlopers, who coming in on their hand, make bold to borrow from both, as they see occasion. We shall have to do with them all in our progress; not with the persons of any, nor the way and manner of their expressing themselves, but the opinions of all of them so far as they are opposite to the truth. For it is that which wise men despise and good men bewail, to see persons pretending to religion and piety, to cavil at expressions, to contend about words, to endeavour the fastening of opinions on men which they own not, and thereon mutually to revile one another, publishing all to the world, as some great achievement or victory. This is not the way to teach the truths of the gospel, nor to promote the edification of the church. But in general, the importance of the cause to be pleaded, the greatness of the opposition that is made to the truth, and the high concernment of the souls of believers, to be rightly instructed in it, call for a renewed declaration and vindication of it. And what I shall attempt to this purpose, I do it under this persuasion, that the life and continuance of any church on the one hand, and its apostasy or ruin on the other, do depend in an eminent manner on the preservation or rejection of the truth in this article of religion; and I shall add, as it has been professed, received, and believed in the Church of England in former days.

The first thing we are to consider is the meaning of these words to *impute* and *imputation*. For from a mere plain declaration hereof, it will appear that sundry things charged on a supposition of the imputation we plead for, are vain and groundless, or the charge itself is so.

οὐκ the word first used to this purpose, signifies to *think*, to *esteem*, to *judge*, or to *refer* a thing or matter to any; to *impute*, or to *be imputed* for good or evil:—see Levit. vii. 18; xvii. 4; and Psa. cvi. 31; “and it was counted, [reckoned, imputed] unto him for righteousness:”—to judge or esteem this or that, good or evil, to belong to him, to be his. The Lxx. express it by λογίζω and λογίζομαι; as do the writers of the New Testament also. And these are rendered by *reputare*, *imputare*, *acceptum ferre*, *tribuere*, *assignare*, *ascribere*. But there is a different signification among these words; in particular, to be “reputed righteous,” and to have “righteousness imputed,” differ, as cause and effect. For, that any may be *reputed righteous*, that is, be judged or esteemed so to be, there must be a real foundation of that reputation, or it is a mistake, and not a right judgment; as a man may be reputed to be wise, who is a fool, or reputed to be rich, who is a beggar. Wherefore he that is reputed righteous, must either have a righteousness of his own, or another antecedently imputed to him, as the foundation of that reputation. Wherefore to impute righteousness to one that hath none of his own, is not to repute him to be righteous, who is indeed unrighteous, but it is to communicate a righteousness to him, that he may rightly and justly be esteemed, judged, or reputed righteous.

Imputare is a word that the Latin tongue owns in the sense wherein it is used by divines. *Optime de posteris meruisti, ad quos pervenerit incorrupta rerum fides, magno auctori suo imputata*. “You have deserved well of posterity, to whom [by the publication of your father’s works] you will have furnished an authentic history of past events, accredited to its great author.” Senec. ad Mart. And Pliny, lib. 18, cap. i., in his apology for the earth, our common parent, *nostris eam criminibus urgemus, culpamque nostram illi imputamus*. “We load her with our crimes, and impute our own faults to her.”

In their sense, to *impute* any thing to another, is, if it be evil, to *charge* it on him, to burden him with it; so saith Pliny, “we impute our own faults to the earth,” or charge them upon it. If it be good, it is to ascribe it to him as his own, whether originally it were so or no; *magno auctori imputata*. Vas-

quez, in Thom. 22. Tom. 2. Disp. 132, attempts the sense of the word, but confounds it with *reputare*. *Imputare aut reputare quidquam alicui, est idem atque inter ea quæ sunt ipsius, et ad eum pertinent, connumerare et recensere.* "To impute a thing to a person, is to reckon it among those things which are his and belong to him." This is *reputare* properly; *imputare* includes an act antecedent to this accounting or esteeming a thing to belong to any person.

But whereas that may be imputed to us which is really our own antecedently to that imputation, the word must needs have a double sense, as it has in the instances given out of Latin authors now mentioned. And,

1. To impute to us that which was really ours, antecedently to that imputation, includes two things in it. (1) An acknowledgment or judgment, that the thing so imputed is really and truly ours, or in us. He that imputes wisdom or learning to any man, does in the first place acknowledge him to be wise or learned. (2) A dealing with them according to it, whether it be good or evil. So when upon trial a man is acquitted because he is found righteous; first he is judged and esteemed righteous, and then dealt with as a righteous person; his righteousness is imputed to him. See this exemplified, Gen. xxx. 33.

2. To impute to us that which is not our own antecedently to that imputation, includes also in it two things. (1) A grant or donation of the thing itself to us to be ours, on some just ground and foundation. For a thing must be made ours, before we can justly be dealt with according to what is required on the account of it. (2) A will of dealing with us, or an actual dealing with us according to that which is so made ours. For in this matter whereof we treat, the most holy and righteous God does not justify any, that is, absolve them from sin, pronounce them righteous, and thereon grant them right and title to eternal life, but upon the interveniency of a true and complete righteousness, truly and completely made the righteousness of them that are to be justified, in order of nature antecedently to their justification. But these things will be yet made more clear by instances, and it is necessary they should be so.

1. There is an imputation to us of that which is really our own, inherent in us, performed by us, antecedently to that imputation, and this whether it be evil or good. The rule and nature hereof is given and expressed, Ezek. xviii. 20. "The righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, the wicked-

ness of the wicked shall be upon him." Instances we have of both sorts. (1) In the imputation of sin, when the person guilty of it, is so judged and reckoned a sinner, as to be dealt with accordingly. This imputation Shimei deprecated, 2 Sam. xix, 19. He said to the king, "Let not my Lord impute iniquity unto me," אָשָׁם (the word used in the expression of the imputation of righteousness, Gen. xv. 6.) "neither do thou remember what thy servant did perversely; for thy servant doth know that I have sinned." He was guilty, and acknowledged his guilt, but deprecates the imputation of it, in such a sentence concerning him, as his sin deserved. So Stephen deprecated the imputation of sin to them that stoned him, whereof they were really guilty, Acts vii. 60. "Lay not this sin to their charge;" *impute* it not to them. As on the other side Zechariah the son of Jehoiada, who died in the same cause, and the same kind of death with Stephen, prayed that the sin of those who slew him might be charged on them, 2 Chron. xxiv. 22. Wherefore to impute sin, is to lay it to the charge of any, and to deal with them according to its desert.

To impute that which is good to any, is to judge and acknowledge it so to be theirs, and thereon to deal with them in whom it is, according to its respect to the law of God. "The righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him." So Jacob provided that his righteousness should answer for him, Gen. xxx. 33. And we have an instance of it in God's dealing with men, Psa. cvi. 31. "Then stood up Phineas and executed judgment, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness." Notwithstanding it seemed that he had not sufficient warrant for what he did, yet God that knew his heart, and what guidance of his own Spirit he was under, approved his act as righteous, and gave him a reward testifying that approbation.

Concerning this imputation it must be observed, that whatever is our own antecedently thereto, which is an act of God thereon, can never be imputed to us for any thing more or less than what it is really in itself. For this imputation consists of two parts, or two things concur thereto. (1) A judgment of the thing to be ours, to be in us, or to belong to us. (2) A will of dealing with us, or an actual dealing with us, according to it. Wherefore in the imputation of any thing to us, which is ours, God esteems it not to be other than it is. He does not esteem that to be a perfect righteousness which is imperfect; so to do might argue either a mistake of the thing judged on, or perverseness in the judgment itself upon it. Wherefore if, as some

say, our own faith and obedience are imputed to us for righteousness, seeing they are imperfect, they must be imputed to us for an imperfect righteousness, and not for that which is perfect. For that judgment of God which is according to truth, is in this imputation. And the imputation of an imperfect righteousness to us, esteeming it only as such, will stand us in little stead in this matter. And the *acceptilation* which some plead, (trading a fiction in human laws, to interpret the mystery of the gospel) not only overthrows all imputation, but the satisfaction and merit of Christ also. And it must be observed, that this imputation is a mere act of justice, without any mixture of grace as the Apostle declares, Rom. xi. 6. For it consists of these two parts, (1) An acknowledging and judging that to be in us which is truly so. (2) A will of dealing with us according to it; both which are acts of justice.

The imputation to us of that which is not our own antecedently to that imputation, at least not in the same manner as it is afterwards, is various also, as to the grounds and causes that it proceeds upon. Only it must be observed, that no imputation of this kind, is to account them, to whom any thing is imputed, to have done the things themselves which are imputed to them. That were not to impute but to err in judgment, and indeed utterly to overthrow the whole nature of gracious imputation. But it is to make that to be ours by imputation, which was not ours before, to all ends and purposes whereto it would have served, if it had been our own, without any such imputation.

It is therefore a manifest mistake of their own which some make the ground of a charge on the doctrine of imputation. For they say, if our sins were imputed to Christ, then must he be esteemed to have done what we have done amiss, and so be the greatest sinner that ever was; and on the other side, if his righteousness be imputed to us, then are we esteemed to have done what he did, and so to stand in no need of the pardon of sin. But this is contrary to the nature of imputation, which proceeds on no such judgment, but on the contrary, that we ourselves have done nothing of what is imputed to us; nor Christ any thing of what was imputed to him.

To declare more distinctly the nature of this imputation, I shall consider the several kinds of it, or rather the several grounds whence it proceeds. For this imputation to us, of what is not our own antecedent to that imputation, may be either, (1) *Ex justitia*, or (2) *Ex voluntaria sponsione*, or (3) *Ex in-*

juris, or (4) *Ex gratia*; all which shall be exemplified. I do not place them thus distinctly, as if they might not some of them concur in the same imputation, which I shall manifest that they do. But I shall refer the several kinds of imputation, to that which is the next cause of every one.

1. Things that are not our own originally, personally, inherently, may yet be imputed to us *ex justitia*, by the rule of righteousness. And this may be done upon a double relation to those whose they are; (1) federal, (2) natural. (1) Things done by one may be imputed to others, *propter relationem federalem*, because of a covenant relation between them. So the sin of Adam was, and is imputed to all his posterity, as we shall afterwards more fully declare. And the ground hereof is, that we stood all in the same covenant with him, who was our head and representative therein. The corruption and depravation of nature which we derive from Adam is imputed to us, with the first kind of imputation, namely, of that which is ours antecedently to that imputation. But his actual sin is imputed to us, as that which becomes ours by that imputation, which before it was not. Hence says Bellarmine himself; *peccatum Adami ita posteris omnibus imputatur, ac si omnes idem peccatum patravissent. De Amis. Grat. lib. 4. cap 10.* "The sin of Adam is so imputed to all his posterity, as if they had all committed the same sin." And he gives us herein the true nature of imputation, which he fiercely disputes against in his books of justification. For the imputation of that sin to us, as if we had committed it, which he acknowledges, includes both a transcription of that sin to us, and a dealing with us, as if we had committed it; which is the doctrine of the Apostle, Rom. 5.

2. There is an imputation of sin to others, *ex justitia propter relationem naturalem*, on account of a *natural relation* between them, and those who had actually contracted the guilt of it. But this is only with respect to some outward temporary effects of it. So God speaks concerning the children of the rebellious Israelites in the wilderness. "Your children shall wander in the wilderness forty years, and bear your whoredoms." Numb. xiv. 33. Your sin shall be so far imputed to your children, because of their relation to you, and your interest in them, as that they shall suffer for them in an afflictive condition in the wilderness. And this was just, because of the relation between them; as the same procedure of divine justice is frequently declared in other places of the Scripture. So where there is a due foundation of it, imputation is an act of justice.

3. Imputation may justly ensue, *ex voluntaria sponsione* when one freely and willingly undertakes to answer for another. An illustrious instance hereof we have in that passage of the Apostle to Philemon, in the behalf of Onesimus; ver. 18. "If he hath wronged thee, or oweth thee ought, *τοῦτο μοι ἄλλογιον*, impute it to me," put it on my account. He supposes that Philemon might have a double action against Onesimus; (1) *Injuriarum* of wrongs; *εἰ δὲ τι ἥδικησῃ σε*, if he has dealt unjustly with thee or by thee, if he has so wronged thee as to render himself obnoxious to punishment; (2) *Damni*, or of loss; *ἢ ὀφείλῃ*, if he owes thee ought, be a debtor to thee, which made him liable to payment or restitution. In this state the Apostle interposes himself by a voluntary sponson, to undertake for Onesimus. "I Paul have written it with my own hand, *ἐγὼ ἀποκρίσω*, I will answer for the whole." And this he did by the transcription of both the debts of Onesimus to himself; for the crime was of that nature as might be taken away by compurgation, being not capital. And the imputation of them to him, was made just, by his voluntary undertaking of them. Account me, says he, the person that has done these things; and I will make satisfaction, so that nothing be charged on Onesimus. So Judah voluntarily undertook to Jacob, for the safety of Benjamin, and obliged himself to perpetual guilt in case of failure; Gen. xliii. 9. "I will be surety for him, of my hands shalt thou require him, if I bring him not to thee, and set him before thee, *ἢ ἥμαρ* I will sin, or be a sinner before thee always;" be guilty, and as we say, bear the blame. So he expresses himself again to Joseph, Gen. xlv. 32. It seems this is the nature and office of a surety; what he undertakes for, is justly to be required at his hand, as if he had been originally and personally concerned in it. And this voluntary sponson was one ground of the imputation of our sin to Christ. He took on him the person of the whole church that had sinned, to answer for what they had done against God and the law. Hence that imputation was *fundamentaliter ex compacto, ex voluntaria sponsione*, it has its foundation in his voluntary undertaking. But on supposition hereof; it was actually *ex justitia*, it being righteous that he should answer for it, and make good what he had so undertaken; the glory of God's righteousness and holiness being greatly concerned herein.

4- There is an imputation, *ex injuria*; when that is laid on the charge of any, whereof he is not guilty: so Bathsheba says to David; "it shall come to pass that when my Lord the King

shall sleep with his fathers, that I and my son Solomon shall be ~~our~~ sinners;" 1 Kings i. 21, shall be dealt with as offenders, as guilty persons, have sin imputed to us, on one pretence or other to our destruction. We shall be sinners; be esteemed so, and be dealt withal accordingly. And we may see that in the phrase of the Scripture, the denomination of sinners follows the imputation, as well as the inhesion of sin; which will give light to that place of the Apostle, "he was made sin for us." 2 Cor. v. 21. This kind of imputation has no place in the judgment of God. It is far from him, that the righteous should be as the wicked.

5. There is an imputation, *ex mera gratia*, of mere grace and favour. And this is, when that which antecedently to this imputation was no way ours, not inherent in us, not performed by us, which we had no right or title to, is granted to us, made ours, so as that we are judged of, and dealt with according to it. This is that imputation in both branches of it, negative in the non-imputation of sin, and positive in the imputation of righteousness, which the Apostle so vehemently pleads for, and so frequently asserts. Rom. iv. For he both affirms the thing itself, and declares that it is of mere grace, without respect to any thing within ourselves. And if this kind of imputation cannot be fully exemplified in any other instance, but this alone, whereof we treat, it is because the foundation of it in the mediation of Christ is singular, and that which there is nothing to parallel in any other case among men.

From what has been discoursed concerning the nature and grounds of imputation, sundry things are made evident, which contribute much light to the truth which we plead for, at least to the right understanding and stating of the matter under debate. As

1. The difference is plain between the imputation of any works of our own to us, and the imputation of the righteousness of faith without works. For the imputation of works to us, be they what they will, be it faith itself as a work of obedience in us, is the imputation of that which was ours, before such imputation. But the imputation of the righteousness of faith, or the righteousness of God which is by faith, is the imputation of that which is made ours by virtue of that imputation. And these two imputations differ in their whole kind. The one is a judging of that to be in us, which indeed is so, and is ours, before that judgment be passed concerning it; the other is a communication of that to us, which before was

not ours. And no man can make sense of the Apostle's discourse, that is, he cannot understand any thing of it, if he acknowledge not that the righteousness he treats of is made ours by imputation, and was not ours, antecedently thereto.

2. The imputation of works, of what sort soever they be, of faith itself as a work, and all the obedience of faith, is *ex justitia*, and not *ex gratia*; of right and not of grace. However the bestowing of faith on us, and the working of obedience in us, may be of grace, yet the imputation of them to us, as in us, and as ours, is an act of justice. For this imputation as was shown, is nothing but a judgment that such and such things are in us, or are ours, which truly and really are so, with a treating of us according to them. This is an act of justice, as it appears in the description given of that imputation. But the imputation of righteousness mentioned by the Apostle is as to us *ex mera gratia*, of mere grace, as he fully declares, *δωρεαν τη χαριτι αυτου*. And moreover he declares, that these two sorts of imputation are inconsistent and not capable of any composition, so that any thing should be partly of the one, and partly of the other. Rom. xi. 6. "If by grace, then it is no more of works, otherwise grace is no more grace; but if it be of works, then it is no more grace; otherwise work is no more work." For instance, if faith itself as a work of ours be imputed to us, it being ours antecedently to that imputation, it is but an acknowledgment of it to be in us and ours, with an ascription of it to us for what it is. For the ascription of any thing to us for what it is not, is not imputation but mistake. But this is an imputation *ex justitia*, of works; and so that which is of mere grace, can have no place, by the Apostle's rule. So the imputation to us of what is in us, is exclusive of grace, in the Apostle's sense. And on the other hand if the righteousness of Christ be imputed to us, it must be *ex mera gratia*; of mere grace; for that is imputed to us, which was not ours, antecedently to that imputation, and so is communicated to us thereby. And here is no place for works, nor for any pretence of them. In the one way the foundation of imputation is in ourselves, in the other it is in another, which are irreconcilable.

3. Herein both these kinds of imputation agree. Namely, in that whatever is imputed to us, it is imputed for what it is, and not for what it is not. If it be a perfect righteousness that is imputed to us, so it is esteemed and judged to be, and accordingly are we to be dealt with, even as those who have a

perfect righteousness. And if that which is imputed as righteousness to us be imperfect, or imperfectly so, then as such must it be judged when it is imputed; and we must be dealt with as those which have such an imperfect righteousness, and no otherwise. And therefore whereas our inherent righteousness is imperfect, (they are to be pitied or despised, not to be contended with, that are otherwise minded) if that be imputed to us, we cannot be accepted on the account thereof as perfectly righteous, without an error in judgment.

4. Hence the true nature of that imputation which we plead for (which so many cannot or will not understand) is manifest, and that both negatively and positively. For (1) negatively; (1) It is not a judging or esteeming of them to be righteous who truly and really are not so. Such a judgment is not reducible to any of the grounds of imputation before mentioned. It has the nature of that which is *ex injuria*, or a false charge, only it differs materially from it. For that respects evil, this that which is good. And therefore the clamours of the Papists and others are mere effects of ignorance or malice, that we affirm God to esteem them to be righteous, who are wicked, sinful and polluted. But this falls heavily on them who maintain that we are justified before God by our own inherent righteousness; for then a man is judged righteous, who indeed is not so. For he who is not perfectly righteous, cannot be righteous in the sight of God unto justification. (2) It is not a naked pronouncement or declaration of any one to be righteous, without a just and sufficient foundation for the judgment of God declared therein. God declares no man to be righteous but him who is so; the whole question being how he comes so to be. (3) It is not the transmission or transfusion of the righteousness of another into them that are to be justified, that they should become perfectly and inherently righteous thereby. For it is impossible that the righteousness of one should be transfused into another, to become his subjectively and inherently. But it is a great mistake on the other hand, to say that therefore the righteousness of one can in no way be made the righteousness of another, which is to deny all imputation.

Wherefore (2) positively; This imputation is an act of God *ex mera gratia*, of his mere love and grace, whereby on the consideration of the mediation of Christ, he makes an effectual grant and donation of a true, real, perfect righteousness, even that of Christ himself to all that believe, and accounting it as theirs, on his own gracious act, both absolves them from sin and grants them right and title to eternal life. Hence,

(4) In this imputation, the thing itself is first imputed to us, and not any of the effects of it, but they are made ours by virtue of that imputation. To say that the righteousness of Christ, that is, his obedience and sufferings are imputed to us only as to their effects, is to say that we have the benefit of them, and no more; but imputation itself is denied. So say the Socinians, but they know well enough, and ingenuously grant, that they overthrow all true real imputation thereby. Schlictingius, says,* “In order that we be justified by the righteousness of Christ, it is not necessary that his righteousness be made ours. It is sufficient that the righteousness of Christ be the cause of our justification. We grant you that the righteousness of Christ is our righteousness, in as far as it redounds to our benefit and righteousness; but you understand it to be properly ours, that is, attributed and ascribed to us.” And it is not pleasing to see some among ourselves with so great confidence take up the sense and words of these men in their disputations against the Protestant doctrine in this cause, that is, the doctrine of the Church of England.

That the righteousness of Christ is imputed to us, as to its effects, has this sound sense in it; namely, that the effects of it are made ours, by reason of that imputation. It is so imputed, so reckoned to us of God, as that he really communicates all the effects of it to us. But to say the righteousness of Christ is not imputed to us, only its effects are so, is really to overthrow all imputation. For (as we shall see) the effects of the righteousness of Christ cannot be said properly to be imputed to us; and if his righteousness itself be not so, imputation has no place herein, nor can it be understood why the Apostle should so frequently assert it as he does, Rom. iv. And therefore the Socinians who expressly oppose the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, and plead for a participation of its effects or benefits only, wisely deny any such kind of righteousness of Christ, namely, of satisfaction and merit, (or that the righteousness of Christ as wrought by him, was either satisfactory or meritorious) as alone may be imputed to us. For it will readily be granted, that what alone they allow the righteousness of Christ to consist in, cannot be imputed to us, whatever benefit we may have

* *Nec enim ut per Christi justitiam justificemur, opus est ut illius justitia nostra fiat justitia; sed sufficit ut Christi justitia sit causa nostra: Justificationis; et hactenus possumus tibi concedere, Christi justitiam esse nostram justitiam, quatenus nostrum in bonum justitiamque redundat; verum tu proprie nostram, id est, nobis attributam ascriptamque intelligis. Disp. pro. Socin. ad Meisner. pag. 250.*

by it. But I do not understand how those who grant the righteousness of Christ to consist principally in his satisfaction for us or in our stead, can conceive of an imputation of the effects of it to us, without an imputation of the thing itself; seeing it is for that as made ours, that we partake of the benefits of it. But from the description of imputation and the instances of it, it appears that there can be no imputation of any thing, unless the thing itself be imputed, nor any participation of the effects of any thing, but what is grounded on the imputation of the thing itself. Wherefore in our particular case, no imputation of the righteousness of Christ is allowed, unless we grant itself to be imputed; nor can we have any participation of the effects of it, but on the supposition and foundation of that imputation. The impertinent cavils that some of late have collected from the Papists and Socinians, that if it be so, then are we as righteous as Christ himself, that we have redeemed the world, and satisfied for the sins of others, that the pardon of sin is impossible, and personal righteousness needless, shall afterwards be spoken to, so far as they deserve.

All that we now aim to demonstrate, is only, that either the righteousness of Christ itself is imputed to us, or there is no imputation in the matter of our justification, which whether there be or no, is another question afterwards to be spoken to. For as was said, the effects of the righteousness of Christ, cannot be said properly to be imputed to us. For instance, pardon of sin is a great effect of the righteousness of Christ. Our sins are pardoned on the account thereof. God for Christ's sake forgives us all our sins. But the pardon of sin cannot be said to be imputed to us, nor is so. Adoption, justification, peace with God, all grace and glory, are effects of the righteousness of Christ. But that these things are not imputed to us, nor can be so, is evident from their nature. But we are made partakers of them all, upon the account of the imputation of the righteousness of Christ to us, and no otherwise.

Thus much may suffice to be spoken of the nature of imputation of the righteousness of Christ; the grounds, reasons, and causes whereof, we shall in the next place inquire into. And I doubt not but we shall find in our inquiry, that it is no such figment, as some ignorant of these things imagine, but on the contrary, an important truth closely connected with the most fundamental principles of the mystery of the gospel, and inseparable from the grace of God in Christ Jesus.

CHAPTER VIII.

IMPUTATION OF THE SINS OF THE CHURCH TO CHRIST. GROUNDS OF IT. THE NATURE OF HIS SURETYSHIP. CAUSES OF THE NEW COVENANT. CHRIST AND THE CHURCH ONE MYSTICAL PERSON. CONSEQUENCES THEREOF.

Those who believe the imputation of the righteousness of Christ to believers, for the justification of life, also unanimously profess, that the sins of all believers were imputed to Christ. And this they do on many testimonies of the Scripture directly witnessing thereto, some whereof shall be pleaded and vindicated afterwards. At present we are only on the consideration of the general notion of these things, and the declaration of the nature of what shall be proved afterwards. And in the first place we shall inquire into the foundation of this dispensation of God, and the equity of it, or the grounds whereinto it is resolved, without an understanding whereof, the thing itself cannot be well apprehended.

The principal foundation hereof is, that Christ and the Church, in this design, were one mystical person, which state they actually coalesce in, through the uniting efficacy of the Holy Spirit. He is the head, and believers are the members of that one person, as the Apostle declares, 1 Cor. xii. 12, 13. Hence as what he did is imputed to them, as if done by them, so what they deserved on the account of sin was charged upon him. So is it expressed by a learned prelate; "He sustained our cause, who had united our flesh to himself, and thus, being joined to us by the closest bond, and made one with us, what was ours, he made to be his own."* And again, "what wonder, if constituted in our person, and clothed with our flesh," &c.† The ancients speak to the same purpose. "For this reason, the divine power united itself with human weakness, that while God makes these things which are ours to be his own, he might make those things which are his to be ours."‡ And also, "The Lord Jesus Christ, our head, transforming into himself all the mem-

* *Nostram causam sustinebat, qui nostram sibi carnem aduniverat, et ita nobis arctissimo vinculo conjunctus, et *in* nostra, quæ erant nostra fecit sua.*

† *Quid mirum si in nostra persona constitutus, nostram carnem indutus, &c.*—Montacut. *Origin. Ecclesiast.*

‡ *Leo. Serm. 17. Ideo se humanæ infirmitati virtus divina conseruit, ut dum Deus sua facit esse quæ nostra sunt, nostra faceret esse quæ sua sunt.*

bers of his body, uttered that exclamation, in his agony on the cross, in the voice of his redeemed, which he had formerly used in the Psalm.* And so speaks Augustine to the same purpose,† “We hear the voice of the body from the mouth of the head. The church suffered in him, when he suffered for the church; as he suffers in the church, when the church suffers for him. For as we have heard the voice of the church in Christ suffering, ‘My God, my Lord, why hast thou forsaken me? look upon me!’ so we have heard the voice of Christ in the church suffering, ‘Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me!’” But we may yet look a little backward and further into the sense of the ancient church herein. *Christus*, saith Irenæus, *omnes Gentes exinde ab Adam dispersas, et generationem hominum in semet ipso recapitulatus est; unde a Paulo typus futuri dictus est ipse Adam*; lib. 3. cap. 33. And again, *Recapitulans universum hominum genus in se ab initio usque ad finem, recapitulatus est et mortem ejus*. In this of *Recapitulation* there is no doubt but he had respect to the ἀνακεφαλαιωσις, mentioned Ephes. i. 10. And it may be this was that which Origen intended enigmatically, by saying “the soul of the first Adam was the soul of Christ,” as it is charged on him. And Cyprian, Epist. 63, on bearing about the administration of the sacred eucharist; *nos omnes portabat Christus; qui et peccata nostra portabat*. “He bare us,” or suffered in our person, “when he bare our sins.” Whence Athanasius affirms of the voice he used on the cross, οὐκ αὐτός ὁ κυριός; ἀλλὰ ἡμεῖς ἐν ἐκείνῳ πασχόντες ἡμεν, “we suffered in him.” Eusebius speaks many things to this purpose. Demonstrat. Évangél. lib. 10. cap. 1. Expounding those words of the Psalmist, “heal my soul, for,” or as he would read them, *if* “I have sinned against thee;” and applying them to our Saviour in his sufferings, he says thus, ἐκείδαν τὰς ἡμετέρας κοινοποιεῖ εἰς ἑαυτὸν ἁμαρτίας; “because he took of our sins to himself; communicated our sins to himself,” making them his own; for so he adds, ὅτι τὰς ἡμετέρας ἁμαρτίας ἐξοικειούμενος, “making our sins his own.” And because in his following words he fully expresses what I design to prove, I shall transcribe them at large.‡ “How then did he make our

* Sermo. 16. Caput nostrum Dominus Jesus Christus omnia in se corporis sui membra transformans, quod olim in Psalmo eructaverat, id in supplicio crucis sub redemptorum suorum voce clamavit.

† Epist. 120. ad Honoratum; Audimus vocem corporis, ex ore capitis; Ecclesia in illo patiebatur, quando pro Ecclesia patiebatur, &c.

‡ Πῶς δὲ τὰς ἡμετέρας ἁμαρτίας ἐξοικειοῦται; καὶ πῶς ψάλλει λέγειν τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν,

sins to be his own, and how did he bear our iniquities? Is it not from thence, that we are said to be his body, as the Apostle speaks, ‘Ye are the body of Christ, and members, for your part, or of one another;’ and as when one member suffers, all the members suffer; so the many members sinning and suffering, he according to the laws of sympathy in the same body, (seeing that being the word of God, he would take the form of a servant, and be joined to the common habitation of us all) took the sorrows or labours of the suffering members on him, and made all their infirmities his own, and according to the laws of humanity, bare our sorrow and labour for us. And the Lamb of God did not only these things for us, but he underwent torments, and was punished for us; that which he was no ways exposed to for himself, but we were so by the multitude of our sins; and thereby he became the cause of the pardon of our sins; namely, because he underwent death, stripes, reproaches, transferring the thing which we had deserved to himself; and was made a curse for us, taking to himself the curse that was due to us; for what was he, but a price of redemption for our souls? In our person therefore the oracle speaks,—whilst freely uniting himself to us, and us to himself, and making our (sins or) passions his own, he says, ‘I have said, ‘Lord be merciful to me, heal my soul, for I have sinned against thee.’”

That our sins were transferred to Christ and made his; that thereon he underwent the punishment that was due to us for them; and that the ground hereof, whereinto its equity is resolved, is the union between him and us, is fully declared in this discourse. So says the learned and pathetic author of the Homilies on Matthew v. in the works of Chrysostom, Hom. 54, which is the last of them. *In carne sua omnem*

η καθ' ὃ, σωμα αὐτοῦ εἶναι λεγομένη; κατὰ τὸν ἀποστόλου φησὶν τα, ἕνικ ἐστὶ σωμα Χριστοῦ, καὶ μέλη ἐκ μεμικ, καὶ καθ' ὃ πάσχοντος ἑνὸς μέλους, συμπάσχει πάντα τὰ μέλη, οὕτω πολλῶν μέλων πάσχοντων καὶ ἀμαρτανούντων, καὶ αὐτοὺς κατὰ τοὺς τοῦ συμπαθείας λόγους, ἐπειδήτις ἐνδοκῆσε Θεοῦ λόγους ἢ μὴρῶν ὄντου λαβεῖν, καὶ τῷ κοινῷ πάντων ἡμῶν σκηνωμῆτι σὺνᾶδῆσαι; τῶν τῶν πάσχοντων μελῶν ποῖος εἰς ἑαυτὸν ἀναλαμβάνει, καὶ τὰς ἡμετέρας νοσοῦσι ἰδιοποιεῖται, καὶ πάντων ἡμῶν ὑπεράγει καὶ ὑπερποιεῖ κατὰ τοὺς τὰς φιλανθρωπίας νόμους; ἂν μόνον δὲ ταῦτα πράξαι ὁ ἀμὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑπερ ἡμῶν κολαθεῖς καὶ τιμῶν ὑποσχῶν ἢ αὐτοὺς μὴ οὐκ ὠρεῖται, ἀλλ' ἡμῶν τοῦ πληθῶς ἐνεκεν πεπλημελῆμενων, ἡμεῖς αἰτιοί, τῶν τῶν ἀμαρτημάτων αἰτίας, ὡς καὶ ἰσθη, ἅτε τὸν ὑπερ ἡμῶν ἀναδείξαντος θανάτου, μαστιγῶς τε καὶ ὕβρις, καὶ αἰτίαν ἡμῶν ἐποφειλομένης εἰς αὐτὸν μεταθείς, καὶ τὴν ἡμῶν προστατιμῆμενην κατάραν ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν ἔλκεσας, γενόμενος ὑπερ ἡμῶν κατὰ, καὶ τὶ γὰρ ἄλλο ἀντιψυχῶν; ἢ οὐ φησὶ ἐξ ἡμετέρου προσηκόν το λόγιον — ὥστε ἐκκοτῶς ἕνων ἑαυτῶν ἡμῶν, ἡμῶς τε αὐτῶ καὶ τὰ ἡμέτερα παθῶ ἰδιοποιούμενος φησὶ, ἐγὼ εἶπα, κυρί, ἐλίσσον με, ἵωαι τὴν ψυχὴν μου, ὅτι ἤμαρτον σοι.

carnem suscepit; crucifixus, omnem carnem crucifixit in se. He speaks of the church. So they speak often others of them; that "he bare us," that "he took us with him on the cross," that "we were all crucified in him;" as Prosper: "He is not saved by the cross of Christ, who is not crucified in Christ!" Resp. ad cap. Gal. cap. 9.

This then I say is the foundation of the imputation of the sins of the church to Christ, namely, that he and it are one person, the grounds whereof we must inquire into.

But hereon sundry discourses ensue, and various inquiries are made. What a *person* is, in what sense, and how many senses that word may be used; what is the true notion of it, what is a natural person, what a legal, civil, or political person; in the explication whereof some have fallen into mistakes. And if we should enter into this field, we need not fear matter enough of debate and altercation. But I must needs say, that these things belong not to our present occasion; nor is the union of Christ and the church illustrated, but obscured by them. For Christ and believers are neither one natural person, nor a legal or political person, nor any such person as the laws, customs, or usages of men know or allow of. They are one mystical person, whereof although there may be some imperfect resemblances found in natural or political unions, yet the union from whence that denomination is taken between him and us, is of that nature, and arises from such reasons and causes, as no personal union among men, (or the union of many persons) has any concern in. And therefore as to the representation of it to our weak understandings unable to comprehend the depth of heavenly mysteries, it is compared to unions of divers kinds and natures. So is it represented by that of man and wife; not to those mutual affections which give them only a moral union, but from the extraction of the first woman, from the flesh and bone of the first man, and the institution of God for the individual society of life thereon. This the Apostle at large declares, Ephes. v. 25—32. Whence he concludes, that from the union thus represented, "we are members of his body, of his flesh and of his bones," or have such a relation to him, as Eve had to Adam, when she was made of his flesh and bone; and so was one flesh with him. So also it is compared to the union of the head and members of the same natural body, 1 Cor. xii. 12, and to a political union also between a ruling or political head, and its political members; but never exclusively to the union of a natural head, and its members comprised in the same

expression, Ephes. iv. 15; Col. ii. 19. And so also to sundry things in nature, as a vine and its branches. John xv. 1—3. And it is declared by the relation that was between Adam and his posterity, by God's institution and the law of creation. Rom. v. 12, &c. And the Holy Ghost by representing the union that is between Christ and believers, by such a variety of resemblances, in things agreeing only in the common or general notion of union on various grounds, sufficiently manifests that it is not of, nor can be reduced to any one kind of them. And this will yet be made more evident by the consideration of the causes of it, and the grounds whereto it is resolved. But whereas it would require much time and diligence to handle them at large, which the occasional mention of them here will not admit, I shall only briefly refer to the heads of them.

1. The first spring or cause of this union, and of all the other causes of it, lies in that eternal compact that was between the Father and the Son, concerning the recovery and salvation of fallen mankind. Herein among other things as the effects thereof, the assumption of our nature, (the foundation of this union) was designed. The nature and terms of this compact, counsel, and agreement, I have declared elsewhere, and therefore must not here again insist upon it. But the relation between Christ and the church proceeding from hence, and so being an effect of infinite wisdom, in the counsel of the Father and Son, to be made effectual by the Holy Spirit must be distinguished from all other unions or relations whatever.

2. The Lord Christ as to the nature which he was to assume, was hereof predestinated to grace and glory. He was *προορισμένος* "fore-ordained," predestinated, "before the foundation of the world." 1 Pet. i. 20. That is, he was so as to his office, so to all the grace and glory required thereto, and consequent thereon. All the grace and glory of the human nature of Christ, was an effect of free divine pro-ordination. God chose it from all eternity, to a participation of all which it received in time. Neither can any other cause of the glorious exaltation of that portion of our nature, be assigned.

3. This grace and glory whereto he was pre-ordained, was twofold. (1) That which was peculiar to himself; (2) That which was to be communicated by and through him to the Church. Of the first sort was the *χαρις ἐνωσεως*, "the grace of personal union," that single effect of divine wisdom, (whereof there is no shadow nor resemblance in any other works of God, either of creation, providence, or grace) which his nature was

filled with. "Full of grace and truth." And all his personal glory, power, authority, and majesty in his exaltation as Mediator at the right hand of God, which is expressive of them all, belong hereto. These things were peculiar to him, and all of them effects of his eternal predestination. But (2) He was not thus predestinated absolutely, but also with respect to that grace and glory which in him and by him, was to be communicated to the church. And he was so,

1. As the pattern and exemplary cause of our predestination; for we are "predestinated to be conformed to the image of the Son of God, that he might be the first-born among many brethren." Rom. viii. 29. Hence he shall even "change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body;" Phil. iii. 21; that "when he appears," we may be every way "like him." 1 John iii. 2.

2. As the means and cause of communicating all grace and glory to us. For we are "chosen in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy, and predestinated to the adoption of children by him." Ephes. i. 3—5. He was designed as the only procuring cause of all spiritual blessings in heavenly things to those who are chosen in him. Wherefore,

3. He was thus fore-ordained as the head of the Church, it being the design of God to gather all things into a head in him. Ephes. i. 10.

4. All the elect of God were in his eternal purpose and design, and in the everlasting covenant between the Father and the Son, committed to him to be delivered from sin, the law, and death, and to be brought to the enjoyment of God. "Thine they were, and thou gavest them to me." John xvii. 6. Hence was that love of his to them, wherewith he loved them and gave himself for them, antecedently to any good or love in them. Ephes. v. 25, 26; Gal. ii. 20; Rev. i. 5, 6.

5. In the prosecution of this design of God, and in the accomplishment of the everlasting covenant, "in the fulness of time he took upon him our nature," or took it into personal subsistence with himself. The especial relation that ensued hereon between him and the elect children, the Apostle declares at large. Heb. ii. 10—17. And I refer the reader to our exposition of that place.

6. On these foundations he undertook to be "the surety of the new covenant." Heb. vii. 22. "Jesus was made a surety of a better testament." This alone of all the fundamental considerations of the imputation of our sins to Christ, I shall insist

upon, on purpose to obviate or remove some mistakes about the nature of his suretyship, and the respect of it to the covenant, whereof he was the surety. And I shall borrow what I shall offer hereon, from our exposition of this passage of the Apostle on the seventh chapter of this Epistle not yet published with very little variation from what I have discoursed on that occasion, without the least respect to, or prospect of any treating on our present subject.

The word *εγγυος*, is no where found in the Scripture, but in this place only. But the advantage which some would make from thence, namely, that it being but one place wherein the Lord Christ is called a surety, it is not of much force, or much to be insisted on, is both unreasonabable and absurd. For (1) this one place is of divine revelation, and therefore is of the same authority with twenty testimonies to the same purpose. One divine testimony makes our faith no less necessary, and no less secures it from being deceived, than a hundred.

The signification of the word is known, from the use of it, and what it signifies among men, that no question can be made of its sense and importance, though it be but once used; and this on any occasion removes the difficulty and danger, *των ἀπαξ λεγόμενων*, of expressions but once used in Scripture. (3) The thing itself intended is so fully declared by the Apostle in this place, and so plentifully taught in other places of the Scripture, that the single use of this word may add light, but can be no prejudice to it.

Something may be spoken to the signification of the word *εγγυος*, which will give light to the thing intended by it. *Γυαλον* is *vola manus*, the palm of the hand; thence is *εγγυος* or *εις το γυαλον*, to *deliver into the hand*. *Εγγυετης* is of the same signification. Hence being a surety is interpreted by striking the hand. Prov. vi. 1. "My son, if thou be surety for thy friend, if thou hast stricken thy hand, with a stranger." So it answers the Hebrew *כר* which the Lxx render *εγγυωσω*. Prov. vi. 1; xvii. 18; xx. 19; and by *δεγγυωσω*. Nehem. v. 3, *כר* originally signifies to *minge*, or a *mixture* of any things or persons. And thence from the conjunction and mixture that is between a surety and him for whom he is a surety, where by they coalesce into one person, as to the ends of that suretyship, it is used for a surety, or to give surety. And he that was, or did *כר* a surety, or become a surety, was to answer for him for whom he was so, whatsoever befell him. So is it described, Gen. xliii. 9, in the words of Judah to his father Jacob, con-

cerning Benjamin. "I will be surety for him; of my hand shalt thou require him." In undertaking to be surety for him, as to his safety and preservation, he engages himself to answer for all that should befall him, for so he adds; "if I bring him not to thee, and set him before thee, let me be guilty for ever." And on this ground he entreats Joseph, that he might be a servant and a bondman in Benjamin's stead, that he might go free and return to his father. Gen. xlv. 32, 33. This is required to such a surety, that he undergo and answer all that he for whom he is a surety is liable to, whether in things criminal or civil, so far as the suretyship extends. A surety is an undertaker for another, or others, who thereon is justly and legally to answer what is due to them, or from them. Nor is the word otherwise used. See Job xvii. 3; Prov. vi. 1; xi. 15; xvii. 11; xx. 16; xxvii. 13. So Paul became a surety to Philemon for Onesimus. *εγγυη* is *sponsio, expromissio, fidejussio*; an undertaking or giving security for any thing or person to another, whereon an agreement ensued. This in some cases was by pledges, or an earnest. Isa. xxxvi. 8. "Give pledges," surety, hostages, for the true performance of conditions. Hence is *πῶς ἀπαιτῶν* a pledge or earnest. Eph. i. 14. Wherefore *εγγυος* is *sponsor, fidejussor, præs*, one that voluntarily takes on himself the cause or condition of another, to answer, undergo, or pay what he is liable to, or to see it done, whereon he becomes justly and legally obnoxious to performance; in this sense is the word here used by the Apostle, for it has no other.

In our present inquiry into the nature of this suretyship of Christ, the whole will be resolved into this one question, namely, whether the Lord Christ was made a surety only on the part of God to us, to assure us, that the promise of the covenant on his part should be accomplished; or also and principally an undertaker on our part, for the performance of what is required, if not of us, yet with respect to us, that the promise may be accomplished. The first of these is vehemently asserted by the Socinians, who are followed by Grotius and Hammond in their annotations on this place.

The words of Schlichtingius are, "Jesus is called the surety of the covenant, because, on the part of God, he has given us an assurance that God will fulfil the promises of the covenant; not because he became surety for us to God, or took upon himself the payment of our debts. For Christ was not sent by us, but by God, in whose name he has come to us, made a covenant with us and engaged that its promises shall be fulfilled

And therefore he is not called simply a surety, but a surety of the covenant. Now Christ became a surety for the truth of the Divine covenant, not only inasmuch as he constantly testified by his words that it should be firm and stable, but inasmuch as he proved the truth of his mission by the indubitable evidence of facts—by the spotless innocence and holiness of his life, by the evidently Divine works, which he performed, and by the endurance of a cruel death, to which he submitted in attestation of the truth of his doctrine.* After which he subjoins a long discourse about the evidences which we have of the veracity of Christ. And herein we have a brief account of their whole opinion concerning the mediation of Christ. The words of Grotius are: "Christ became a surety; that is, he has given us an assurance of the promise, not only by his words but by the perpetual sanctity of his life, by the death which he endured for that end, and by numerous miracles;†" which are an abridgement of the discourse of Schlichtingius. To the same purpose Dr. Hammond expounds it, that he was a "sponsor or surety for God, to the confirmation of the promises of the covenant."

On the other hand the generality of expositors, ancient and modern, of the Roman and Protestant churches, on the place affirm, that the Lord Christ as the surety of the covenant, was properly a surety or undertaker to God for us, and not a surety and undertaker to us for God. And because this is a matter of great importance, wherein the faith and consolation of the church is highly concerned, I shall insist a little upon it.

And first, we may consider the argument that is produced to prove that Christ was only a surety for God to us. Now this is taken neither from the name nor nature of the office or work of a surety, nor from the nature of the covenant, whereof he was a surety, nor of the office wherein he was so. But the sole

* Sponsor fœderis appellatur Jesus, quod nomine Dei nobis sponderit, id est fidem fecerit. Deum fœderis promissiones servaturum. Non vero quasi pro nobis sponderit Deo, nostrorumve debitorum solutionem in se receperit. Nec enim nos misimus Christum sed Deus, cujus nomine Christus ad nos venit, fœdus nobiscum paravit, ejusque promissiones ratas fore spondit et in se recepit; ideoque nec sponsor simpliciter, sed fœderis sponsor nominatur; spondit autem Christus pro fœderis divini veritate, non tantum quatenus id firmum ratumque fore verbis perpetuo testatus est; sed etiam quatenus muneris sui fidem, maximis rerum ipsarum comprobavit documentis, cum perfecta vitæ innocentia et sanctitate, cum divinis plane quæ patravit operibus; cum mortis adeo truculentæ, quam pro doctrinæ suæ veritate subiit, percussione.

† Spondit Christus, i. e., Nos certos promissi fecit, non solis verbis, sed perpetua vitæ sanctitate, morte ob id tolerata et miraculis plurimis.

argument insisted on is, that we do not give Christ as a surety of the covenant to God, but he gives him to us, and therefore he is a surety for God and the accomplishment of his promises, and not for us to pay our debts, or to answer what is required of us.

But there is no force in this argument. For it belongs not to the nature of a surety, by whom he is or may be designed to his office and work therein. His own voluntary susception of the office and work, is all that is required, however he may be designed or induced to undertake it. He who of his own accord voluntarily undertakes for another, on what grounds, reasons, or considerations soever he does so, is his surety. And this the Lord Christ did in the behalf of the church. For when it was said, "sacrifice and burnt-offering and whole burnt-offerings for sin, God would not have," or accept as sufficient to make the atonement that he required, so that the covenant might be established and made effectual to us, then said he, "Lo, I come to do thy will, O God." Heb. x. 5, 6. He willingly and voluntarily out of his own abundant goodness and love, took upon him to make atonement for us, wherein he was our surety. And accordingly this undertaking is ascribed to that love which he exercised herein. Gal. ii. 20; 1 John iii. 16; Rom. i. 5. And there was this in it moreover, that he took upon him our nature or the seed of Abraham, wherein he was our surety. So that although we neither did nor could appoint him so to be, yet he took from us, that wherein and whereby he was so, which is as much as if we had designed him to his work, as to the true reason of his being our surety. Wherefore notwithstanding those antecedent transactions that were between the Father and him in this matter, it was the voluntary engagement of himself to be our surety, and his taking our nature upon him for that end, which was the formal reason of his being instated in that office.

It is indeed weak and contrary to all common experience, that none can be a surety for others, unless those others design him and appoint him so to be. The principal instances of suretyship in the world, have been by the voluntary undertaking of such as were no way procured so to do by them, for whom they undertook; and in such undertakings he to whom it is made, is no less considered, than they for whom it is made. As when Judah of his own accord became a surety for Benjamin, he had as much respect to the satisfaction of his father, as the safety of his brother. And so the Lord Christ, in his

undertaking to be a surety for us, had respect to the glory of God before our safety.

1. We may consider the arguments whence it is evident that he neither was, nor could be a surety to us for God, but was so for us to God. For

1. *Eγγυος* or *εγγυητης* a surety, is one that undertakes for another wherein he is defective really or in reputation. Whatever that undertaking be, whether in words of promise, or in depositing of real security in the hands of an arbitrator, or by any other personal engagement of life and body, it respects the defect of the person for whom any one becomes a surety. Such a one is *sponsor* or *fidejussor*, in all good authors and common use of speech. And if any one be of absolute credit himself, and of a reputation every way unquestionable, there is no need of a surety, unless in case of mortality. The words of a surety in the behalf of another whose ability or reputation is dubious, are, *ad me recipio, faciet, aut faciam*. "I engage that either he shall do it, or I will." And when *εγγυος* is taken adjectively, as sometimes, it signifies *satisfactionibus obnoxius*; liable to payments for others that are insolvent.

2. God can therefore have no surety properly, because there can be no imagination of any defect on his part. There may be indeed a question whether any word or promise, be a word or promise of God. To assure us hereof is not the work of a surety, but of any one, or any means, that may give evidence that so it is, that is, of a witness. But upon a supposition that what is proposed is his word or promise, there can be no imagination or fear of any defect on his part, so that there should be any need of a surety for the performance of it. He therefore makes use of witnesses to confirm his word: that is, to testify that such promises he has made, and so he will do. So the Lord Christ was his witness. Isa. xliii. 10. "Ye are my witnesses, saith the Lord, and my servant whom I have chosen." But they were not all his *sureties*. So he affirms, that he "came into the world to bear witness to the truth;" John xviii. 37; that is, the truth of the promises of God; for he was "the minister of the circumcision for the truth of the promises of God to the fathers." Rom. xv. 8. But a surety for God, properly so called, he was not, nor could be. The distance and difference is wide enough between a witness and a surety. For a surety must be of more ability, or more credit and reputation than he or those for whom he is a surety, or there is no need of his suretyship; or at least he must add to their credit, and

make it better than without him. This none can be for God, no not the Lord Christ himself, who in his whole work was the servant of the Father. And the Apostle does not use this word in a general improper sense for any one that by any means give assurance of any other thing, else he had ascribed nothing peculiar to Christ. For in such a sense all the prophets and apostles were sureties for God, and many of them confirmed the truth of his word and promises, with the laying down of their lives. But such a surety he intends as undertakes to do that for others which they cannot do for themselves; or at least are not reputed to be able to do what is required of them.

3. The Apostle had before at large declared, who, and what was God's surety in this matter of the covenant, and how impossible it was that he should have any other. And this was himself alone, interposing himself by his oath. For in this cause, "because he had none greater to swear by, he swore by himself," Heb. vi. 13, 14. Wherefore if God would give any other surety besides himself, it must be one greater than he. This being every way impossible, he swears by himself only. Many ways he may and does use for the declaring and testifying of his truth to us, that we may know and believe it to be his word; and so the Lord Christ in his ministry was the principal witness of the truth of God. But other surety than himself he can have none. And therefore,

4. When he would have us in this matter not only come to the full assurance of faith concerning his promises, but also to have strong consolation therein, he resolves it wholly into the immutability of his counsel, as declared by his promise and oath, Heb. vi. 18, 19. So that neither is God capable of having any surety properly so called, nor do we stand in need of any on his part, for the confirmation of our faith in the highest degree.

5. We on all accounts stand in need of a surety for us, or on our behalf. Nor without the interposition of such a surety, could any covenant between God and us be firm and stable, or "an everlasting covenant, ordered in all things and sure." In the first covenant made with Adam there was no surety, but God and men were the immediate covenanters. And although we were then in a state and condition able to perform and answer all the terms of the covenant, yet was it broken and annulled. If this came to pass by the failure of the promise of God, it was necessary that on the making of a new covenant he should have a surety to undertake for him, that the cove-

nant might be stable and everlasting. But this is false and blasphemous to imagine. It was man alone who failed and broke that covenant. Wherefore it was necessary that, upon the making of the new covenant, and that with a design and purpose that it should never be disannulled as the former was, we should have a surety and undertaker for us. For if that first covenant was not firm and stable, because there was no surety to undertake for us, notwithstanding all that ability which we had to answer the terms of it; how much less can any other be so, now our natures are become depraved and sinful! Wherefore we alone were capable of a surety, properly so called, for us; we alone stood in need of him, and without him the covenant could not be firm, and inviolate on our parts. The surety therefore of this covenant is so with God for us.

6. It is the priesthood of Christ that the Apostle treats of in this place, and that alone. Wherefore he is a surety as he is a priest, and in the discharge of that office, and therefore is so with God on our behalf. This Schlichtingius observes, and is aware what will ensue against his pretensions, which he endeavours to obviate.* “Some may think it strange that the inspired writer, when treating of the priesthood of Christ, in what precedes and what follows, all at once calls him the surety of the covenant, and not the priest. Why did he not say, ‘of so much better a covenant was Jesus made a *priest*?’ for this the whole context evidently seems to require. We may believe that under the name of suretyship is understood the priesthood also of Christ. For it is the office of a surety, not only to promise something in another’s name, and to pledge his credit for another, but also, if need be, to perform in another’s name, what he engaged. In human affairs, this takes place, when he for whom the surety engaged, does not perform; but in this case for a contrary reason (for the former cannot have a place here) inasmuch as he for whom Christ be-

* Mirum porro alicui videri posset cur divinus author de Christi sacerdotio in superioribus et in sequentibus agens, derepente eum sponsorem fœderis non vero sacerdotem vocet? Cur non dixerit tanto præstantioris fœderis factus est sacerdos Jesus? hoc enim plane requirere videtur totus orationis contextus. Credibile est in voce sponsionis sacerdotium quoque Christi intelligi. Sponsionis enim non modo est alieno nomine quippiam promittere, et fidem suam pro alio interponere; sed etiam, si ita res ferat, alterius nomine id quod spondit præstare. In rebus quidem humanis, si id non præstet is pro quo sponsor fidejussit; hic vero propter contrariam causam (nam prior hic locum habere non potest) nempe quatenus ille pro quo spondit Christus per ipsum Christum promissa sua nobis exhibet; qua in re præcipue Christi sacerdotiæ continetur.

comes a surety, exhibits to us his promises through Christ himself; and in this chiefly consists the priesthood of Christ."

Ansuc. (1) It may indeed seem strange to any one who imagines Christ to be such a surety as he does, why the Apostle should so call him, and so introduce him in the description of his priestly office, as that which belongs thereto. But grant what is the proper work and duty of a surety, and whom the Lord Jesus was a surety for, and it is evident that nothing more proper or pertinent could be mentioned by him, when he was in the declaration of that office. (2) He confesses that by his exposition of this suretyship of Christ, as making him a surety for God, he contradicts the nature and only notion of a surety among men. For such a one he acknowledges does nothing but in the defect and inability of them for whom he is engaged and undertakes. He is to pay that which they owe, and to do what is to be done by them, which they cannot perform. And if this be not the notion of a surety in this place, the Apostle makes use of a word no where else used in the whole Scripture, to teach us that which it never signifies among men, which is improbable and absurd. For the sole reason why he made use of it was, that from the nature and notion of it amongst men in other cases, we may understand the signification of it; what he intends by it, and what, under that name, he ascribes to the Lord Jesus. (3) He has no way to solve the Apostle's mention of Christ being a surety in the description of his priestly office, but by overthrowing the nature of that office also. For to confirm this absurd notion that Christ as a priest was a surety for God, he would have us believe that the priesthood of Christ consists in his making effectual to us the promises of God, or his effectual communicating of the good things promised to us; the falsehood of which notion, really destructive of the priesthood of Christ, I have elsewhere at large detected and confuted. Wherefore seeing the Lord Christ is a surety of the covenant as a priest, and all the sacerdotal actings of Christ have God for their immediate object, and are performed with him on our behalf, he was a surety for us also.

A surety, *sponsor, vas, præs, fidejussor*, for us, the Lord Christ was, by his voluntary undertaking out of his rich grace and love, to do, answer, and perform all that is required on our parts, that we may enjoy the benefits of the covenant, the grace and glory prepared, proposed, and promised in it, in the way and manner determined on by divine wisdom. And this may be reduced to two heads. 1. His answering for our trans

gressions against the first covenant. 2. His purchase and procurement of the grace of the new. "He was made a curse for us, that the blessing of Abraham might come upon us," Gal. iii. 13—15.

1. He undertook as the surety of the covenant to answer for all the sins of those who are to be, and are, made partakers of the benefits of it. That is, to undergo the punishment due to their sins; to make atonement for them, by offering himself a propitiatory sacrifice for the expiation of their sins, redeeming them by the price of his blood from their state of misery and bondage under the law and the curse of it, Isa. liii. 4—6, 10; Matt. xx. 28; 1 Tim. ii. 6; 1 Cor. vi. 20; Rom. iii. 25, 26; Heb. x. 5—8; Rom. viii. 2, 3; 2 Cor. v. 19—21; Gal. iii. 13. And this was absolutely necessary that the grace and glory prepared in the covenant might be communicated to us. Without this undertaking of his, and performance of it, the righteousness and faithfulness of God would not permit, that sinners, such as had apostatized from him, despised his authority and rebelled against him, falling thereby under the sentence and curse of the law, should again be received into his favour, and made partakers of grace and glory. This therefore the Lord Christ took upon himself, as the surety of the covenant.

2. That those who were to be taken into this covenant should receive grace enabling them to comply with the terms of it, fulfil its conditions, and yield the obedience which God required therein. For by the ordination of God, he was to procure, and did merit and procure for them the Holy Spirit, and all needful supplies of grace to make them new creatures, and enable them to yield obedience to God from a new principle of spiritual life, and that faithfully to the end. So was he the surety of this better testament. But all things belonging hereto will be handled at large in the place from whence, as I said, these are taken, as suitable to our present occasion.

But some have other notions of these things. For they say, that Christ by his death, and his obedience therein, whereby he offered himself a sacrifice of sweet smelling savour to God, procured for us the new covenant; or, as one speaks, all that we have by the death of Christ is, that thereto we owe the covenant of grace. For herein he did and suffered what God required and freely appointed him to do and suffer. Not that the justice of God required any such thing with respect to their sins for whom he died, and in whose stead, or 'to bestead' whom, he suffered, but what by a free constitution of divine wisdom

and sovereignty was appointed to him. Hereon, God was pleased to remit the terms of the old covenant, and to enter into a new covenant with mankind upon terms suited to our reason, possible to our abilities, and every way advantageous to us. For these terms are faith and sincere obedience, or such an assent to the truth of divine revelations, as is effectual in obedience to the will of God contained in them, upon the encouragement given thereto in the promises of eternal life, or a future reward made therein. On the performance of these conditions our justification, adoption, and future glory depend; for they are that righteousness before God, whereon he pardons our sins, and accepts our persons, as if we were perfectly righteous." Wherefore by this procuring the new covenant for us, which they ascribe to the death of Christ, they intend the abrogation of the old covenant, or of the law, or at least such a derogation from it, that it shall no more oblige us either to sinless obedience or punishment, nor require a perfect righteousness for our justification before God; and the constitution of a new law of obedience accommodated to our present state and condition, on whose observance all the promises of the gospel depend.

Others say, that in the death of Christ there was real satisfaction made to God; not to the law, or to God according to what the law required, but to God absolutely. That is, he did what God was well pleased and satisfied with, without any respect to his justice or the curse of the law. And they add, that hereon the whole righteousness of Christ is imputed to us, so far as that we are made partakers of the benefits thereof. And moreover, that the way of the communication of them to us, is by the new covenant which by his death, the Lord Christ procured. For the conditions of this covenant are established in the covenant itself, whereon God will bestow all the benefits and effects of it upon us, which are faith and obedience. Wherefore what the Lord Christ has done for us, is thus far accepted as our legal righteousness, that God upon our faith and obedience with respect thereto, releases and pardons all our sins of omission and commission. Upon this pardon there is no need of any positive perfect righteousness to our justification or salvation, but our own personal righteousness is accepted with God in the room of it, by virtue of the new covenant which Christ has procured. So is the doctrine hereof stated by Curcellæus, and those that join with him, or follow him.

Sundry things there are in these opinions that deserve an ex-

amination; and they will most, if not all of them, occur to us in our progress. That which alone we have occasion to inquire into with respect to what we have discoursed concerning the Lord Christ as surety of the covenant, and which is the foundation of all that is asserted in them, is, that Christ by his death procured the new covenant for us; which, as one says, "is all that we have thereby;" which if it should prove otherwise, we are not beholden to it for any thing at all. But these things must be examined. And,

1. The terms of "procuring the new covenant" are ambiguous. It is not yet (that I know of) by any declared how the Lord Christ procured it; whether he did so by his satisfaction and obedience, as the meritorious cause of it, or by what other kind of causality. Unless this be stated, we are altogether uncertain what relation of the new covenant to the death of Christ is intended. And to say that thereto we owe the new covenant, does not mend the matter, but rather renders the terms more ambiguous. Neither is it declared whether the constitution of the covenant, or the communication of the benefits of it, is intended. It is yet no less general, that "God was so well pleased with what Christ did, that hereon he made and entered into a new covenant with mankind." This they may grant who yet deny the whole satisfaction and merit of Christ. If they mean that the Lord Christ by his obedience and suffering meritoriously procured the making and establishing the new covenant, which was all that he so procured, and the entire effect of his death, what they say may be understood, but the whole nature of the mediation of Christ is overthrown thereby.

2. This opinion is liable to a great prejudice, in that whereas it is in such a fundamental article of our religion, and about that wherein the eternal welfare of the church is so nearly concerned, there is no mention made of it in the Scripture. For is it not strange, if this be, as some speak, the sole effect of the death of Christ, whereas sundry other things are frequently in the Scripture ascribed to it, as the effects and fruits thereof, that this which is only so should be no where mentioned, neither in express words, nor such as will allow of this sense by any just or lawful consequence. Our redemption, pardon of sins, the renovation of our natures, our sanctification, justification, peace with God, eternal life, are all jointly and severally assigned thereto in places almost without number. But it is no where said in the Scripture, "that Christ by his death, merited, procured, obtained the new covenant;" or

that God should enter into a new covenant with mankind; yea as we shall see, that which is contrary to it, and inconsistent with it, is frequently asserted.

3. To clear the truth herein, we must consider the several notions and causes of the new covenant; with the true and real respect of the death of Christ thereto. And it is variously represented to us,

1. In the designation and preparation of its terms and benefits in the counsel of God. And although this has the nature of an eternal decree, yet it is not the same with the decree of election, as some suppose. For that properly respects the subjects or persons for whom grace and glory are prepared. This is the preparation of that grace and glory, as to the way and manner of their communication. Some learned men judge that this counsel and purpose of the will of God, to give grace and glory in and by Jesus Christ to the elect in the way and by the means by him prepared, is formally the covenant of grace, or at least that the substance of the covenant is comprised therein. But it is certain, that more is required to complete the whole nature of a covenant. Nor is this purpose or counsel of God called the covenant in the Scripture, but is only proposed as the spring and fountain of it. Eph. i. 3—11. Unto the full exemplification of the covenant of grace, there is required the declaration of this counsel of God's will, accompanied with the means and powers of its accomplishment, and the prescription of the ways whereby we are so to be interested in it, and made partakers of the benefits of it. But in the inquiry after the procuring cause of the new covenant, it is the first thing that ought to come under consideration. For nothing can be the procuring cause of the covenant which is not so of this spring and fountain of it, of this idea of it in the mind of God, of the preparation of its terms and benefits. But this is nowhere in the Scripture affirmed to be the effect of the death or mediation of Christ; and to ascribe it thereto, is to overthrow the whole freedom of eternal grace and love. Neither can any thing that is absolutely eternal, as is this decree and counsel of God, be the effect of, or procured by any thing that is external and temporal.

2. It may be considered with respect to the federal transactions between the Father and the Son, concerning the accomplishment of this counsel of his will. What these were, wherein they consisted, I have declared at large; *Exercitat. vol. 2.* Neither do I call this the covenant of grace absolutely, nor is it

so called in the Scripture. But yet some will not distinguish between the covenant of the mediator, and the covenant of grace, because the promises of the covenant absolutely are said to be made to Christ, Gal. iii. 16; and he is the *πρωτον δεξιου*, or first subject of all the grace of it. But in the covenant of the mediator, Christ stands alone for himself, and undertakes for himself alone, and not as the representative of the church. But this he is in the covenant of grace. But this is that wherein it had its designed establishment as to all the ways, means, and ends of its accomplishment; and all things so disposed as that it might be effectual to the eternal glory of the wisdom, grace, righteousness, and power of God. Wherefore the covenant of grace could not be procured by any means or cause, but that which was the cause of this covenant of the mediator, or of God the Father with the Son, as undertaking the work of mediation. And as this is nowhere ascribed to the death of Christ in the Scripture, so to assert it, is contrary to all spiritual reason and understanding. Who can conceive that Christ by his death should procure the agreement between God and him, that he should die?

3. With respect to the declaration of it by especial revelation. This we may call God's making or establishing it, if we please; though *making* of the covenant in Scripture, is applied principally, if not only, to its execution or actual application to persons. 2 Sam. xxiii. 5; Jerem. xxxii. 40. This declaration of the grace of God, and the provision in the covenant of the mediator for the making of it effectual to his glory, is most usually called the covenant of grace. And this is twofold,

1. In the way of a singular and absolute promise; so was it first declared to, and established with Adam, and afterwards with Abraham. The promise is the declaration of the purpose of God before declared, or the free determination and counsel of his will, as to his dealing with sinners on the supposition of the fall, and their forfeiture of the first covenant state. Hereof the grace and will of God was the only cause. Heb. viii. 8. And the death of Christ could not be the means of its procurement, for he himself and all that he was to do for us, was the substance of that promise. And this promise as it is declarative of the purpose or counsel of the will of God, for the communication of grace and glory to sinners, in and by the mediation of Christ, according to the ways and on the terms prepared and disposed in his sovereign wisdom and pleasure, is formally the new covenant, though something yet is to be added to com-

plete its application to us. Now the substance of the first promise, wherein the whole covenant of grace was virtually comprised, directly respected and expressed the giving of him for the recovery of mankind from sin and misery by his death, Gen. iii. 15. Wherefore if he, and all the benefits of his mediation, his death and all the effects of it, be contained in the promise of the covenant, that is, in the covenant itself, then was not his death the procuring cause of that covenant, nor do we owe it thereto.

2. In the additional prescription of the way and means whereby it is the will of God, that we shall enter into a covenant state with him, or be interested in the benefits of it. This being virtually comprised in the absolute promise (for every promise of God tacitly requires faith and obedience in us) is expressed in other places by the way of the condition required on our part. This is not the covenant, but the constitution of the terms on our part, whereon we are made partakers of it. Nor is the constitution of these terms, an effect of the death of Christ, or procured thereby. It is a mere effect of the sovereign grace and wisdom of God. The things themselves as bestowed on us, communicated to us, wrought in us by grace, are all of them effects of the death of Christ; but the constitution of them to be the terms and conditions of the covenant is an act of mere sovereign wisdom and grace. "God so loved the world as to send his only begotten son" to die, not that faith and repentance might be the means of salvation, but that all his elect might believe, and that all that believe "might not perish, but have life everlasting." But yet it is granted that the constitution of these terms of the covenant respects the federal transaction between the Father and the Son, wherein they were ordered to the praise of the glory of God's grace; and so although their constitution was not the procurement of his death, yet without respect to it, it had not been. Wherefore the sole cause of God's making the new covenant, was the same with that of giving Christ himself to be our mediator, namely, the purpose, counsel, goodness, grace and love of God, as it is every where expressed in the Scripture.

4thly, The covenant may be considered as to the actual application of the grace, benefit and privileges of it to any persons, whereby they are made real partakers of them, or are taken into covenant with God. And this alone in the Scripture is intended by God's making a covenant with any. It is not a general revelation, or declaration of the terms and nature

of the covenant (which some call a universal conditional covenant, on what grounds they know best, seeing the very formal nature of making a covenant with any, includes the actual acceptance of it, and participation of the benefits of it by them) but a communication of the grace of it, accompanied with a prescription of obedience, that is God's making his covenant with any, as all instances of it in the Scripture declare.

It may be therefore inquired, what respect the covenant of grace has to the death of Christ, or what influence it has upon it.

I answer, supposing what is spoken of his being a surety thereof, it has a threefold respect thereto.

1. In that the covenant, as the grace and glory of it were prepared in the counsel of God, as the terms of it were fixed in the covenant of the Mediator, and as it was declared in the promise, was confirmed, ratified, and made irrevocable thereby. This our Apostle insists upon at large, Heb. ix. 15—20. And he compares his blood in his death and sacrifice of himself, to the sacrifices and their blood whereby the old covenant was confirmed, purified, dedicated or established, ver. 18, 19. Now these sacrifices did not procure that covenant, or prevail with God to enter into it; but only ratified and confirmed it; and this was done in the new covenant by the blood of Christ.

2. He thereby underwent and performed all that which in the righteousness and wisdom of God was required, that the effects, fruits, benefits and grace, intended, designed, and prepared in the new covenant might be effectually accomplished, and communicated to sinners. Hence although he procured not the covenant for us by his death, yet he was in his person, mediation, life and death, the only cause and means whereby the whole grace of the covenant is made effectual to us. For,

3. All the benefits of it were procured by him; that is, all the grace, mercy, privileges and glory that God has prepared in the counsel of his will, that were fixed as to the way of this communication in the covenant of the Mediator, and proposed in the promises of it, are purchased, merited, and procured by his death; and effectually communicated or applied to all the covenanters by virtue thereof, with others of his mediatory acts. And this is much more an eminent procuring of the new covenant, than what is pretended about the procurement of its terms and conditions. For if he should have procured no more but this, if we owe this only to his mediation, that God would thereon, or did grant and establish this rule, law, and promise, that

whoever believed should be saved, it were possible that no one should be saved thereby; yea, if he did no more, considering our state and condition, it was impossible that any one should be saved.

To give the sum of these things, it is inquired with respect to which of these considerations of the new covenant, it is affirmed that it was *procured* by the death of Christ. If it be said, that it is with respect to the actual communication of all the grace and glory prepared in the covenant, and proposed to us in the promises of it, it is most true. All the grace and glory promised in the covenant was purchased for the church by Jesus Christ. In this sense by his death he procured the new covenant. This the whole Scripture from the beginning of it in the first promise to the end of it, bears witness to. For it is in him alone that "God blesses us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly things." Let all the good things that are mentioned or promised in the covenant expressly, or by just consequence, be summed up, and it will be no hard matter to demonstrate concerning them all, and that both jointly and severally, that they were all procured for us by the obedience and death of Christ.

But this is not that which is intended. For most of this opinion deny that the grace of the covenant in conversion to God, the remission of sins, sanctification, justification, adoption and the like, are the effects or procurements of the death of Christ. And on the other hand they declare, that it is God's making of the covenant which they intend: that is, the contrivance of the terms and conditions of it, with their proposal to mankind for their recovery. But herein there is *ουδεν ειγχεος*. For

1. The Lord Christ himself, and the whole work of his mediation, as the ordinance of God for the recovery and salvation of lost sinners, is the first and principal promise of the covenant. So his exhibition in the flesh, his work of mediation therein with our deliverance thereby, was the subject of that first promise, which virtually contained this whole covenant. So he was of the renovation of it to Abraham when it was solemnly confirmed by the oath of God, Gal. iii. 16, 17. And Christ did not by his death procure the promise of his death, nor of his exhibition in the flesh, or his coming into the world, that he might die.

2. The making of this covenant is every where in the Scripture ascribed (as is also the sending of Christ himself to die)

to the love, grace and wisdom of God alone; no where to the death of Christ, as the actual communication of all grace and glory is. Let all the places be considered, where either the giving of the promise, the sending of Christ, or the making of the covenant is mentioned, either expressly or virtually, and in none of them are they assigned to any other cause, but the grace, love, and wisdom of God alone, all to be made effectual to us, by the mediation of Christ.

3. The assignation of the sole end of the death of Christ to be the procurement of the new covenant in the sense contended for, really makes void all the virtue of the death of Christ and of the covenant itself. For (1) the covenant which they intend, is nothing but the constitution and proposal of new terms and conditions for life and salvation to all men. Now whereas the acceptance and accomplishment of these conditions, depend upon the wills of men no way determined by effectual grace, it was possible that notwithstanding all Christ did by his death, yet no one sinner might be saved thereby, but that the whole end and design of God therein might be frustrated. (2) Whereas the substantial advantage of these conditions lies herein, that God will now for the sake of Christ, accept of an obedience, inferior to that required in the law, and so as that the grace of Christ does not raise up all things to a conformity and compliance with the holiness and will of God declared therein, but accommodate all things to our present condition, nothing can be invented more dishonourable to Christ and the gospel. For what does it else but make Christ the minister of sin, in disannulling the holiness that the law requires, or the obligation of the law to it, without any provision of what might answer, or come into the room of it, but that which is incomparably less worthy. Nor is it consistent with divine wisdom, goodness and immutability, to appoint mankind a law of obedience, and cast them all under the severest penalty upon the transgression of it, when he could in justice and honour, have given them such a law of obedience, whose observance might consist with many failings and sins. For if he have done that now, he could have done so before, and how far this reflects on the glory of the divine properties, might be easily manifested. Neither does this fond imagination comply with those testimonies of Scripture, that the Lord Christ "came not to destroy the law, but to fulfil it," that he is the end of the law, and that by faith the law is not annulled but established.

Lastly, the Lord Christ was the mediator and surety of the new covenant, in and by whom it was ratified, confirmed and established; and therefore by him the constitution of it was not procured. For all the acts of his office belong to that mediation; and it cannot be well apprehended how any act of mediation for the establishment of the covenant and rendering it effectual, should procure it.

But to return from this digression; that, wherein all the precedent causes of the union between Christ and believers, whence they become one mystical person, centre, and whereby they are rendered a complete foundation of the imputation of their sins to him, and of his righteousness to them, is the communication of his Spirit, the same Spirit that dwelleth in him, to them, to abide in, to animate and guide the whole mystical body and all its members. But this has of late been so much spoken to, that I shall do no more but mention it.

On the considerations insisted on, whereby the Lord Christ became one mystical person with the church, or bare the person of the church in what he did as mediator, in the holy, wise disposal of God as the author of the law, the supreme rector or governor of all mankind, as to their temporal and eternal concernments, and by his own consent, the sins of all the elect were imputed to him. This, having been the faith and language of the Church in all ages, and that derived from and founded in express testimonies of Scripture, with all the promises and presignations of his exhibition in the flesh from the beginning, cannot now with any modesty be expressly denied. Wherefore the Socinians themselves grant that our sins may be said to be imputed to Christ, and he to undergo the punishment of them, so far as that all things which befell him evil and afflictive in this life, with the death which he underwent, were occasioned by our sins. For had not we sinned, there had been no need of, nor occasion for his suffering. But notwithstanding this concession they expressly deny his satisfaction, or that properly he underwent the punishment due to our sins; wherein they deny also all imputation of them to him. Others say that our sins were imputed to him, *quoad reatum pœnæ*, as to the guilt of the punishment, but not *quoad reatum culpæ*, as to the guilt of the fault. But I must acknowledge that to me this distinction gives *inanem sine mente sonum*, an empty unmeaning sound. The substance of it is much insisted on by Feuarentinus, Dialog. 5. pag. 467. And he is followed by others. That which he would prove by it, is, that the Lord

Christ did not present himself before the throne of God, with the burden of our sins upon him, so as to answer to the justice of God for them. Whereas therefore *reatus*, or guilt, may signify either *dignitatem pœnæ* or *obligationem ad pœnam*, as Bellarmine distinguishes, de Amiss. Grat. lib. 7. cap. 7. with respect to Christ, the latter only is to be admitted. And the main argument he and others insist upon, is this; that if our sins be imputed to Christ, as to the *guilt* of the fault, as they speak, then he must be polluted with them, and thence be denominated a sinner in every kind. And this would be true, if our sins could be communicated to Christ by transfusion, so as to be his inherently and subjectively. But their being so only by *imputation* gives no countenance to any such pretence. However there is a notion of legal uncleanness, where there is no inherent defilement. So the priest who offered the red heifer to make atonement, and he that burned her, were said to be "unclean." Numb. xix. 7, 8. But hereon they say, that Christ died and suffered upon the special command of God, not that his death and suffering were any way due upon the account of our sins, or required in justice; which is utterly to overthrow the satisfaction of Christ.

Wherefore the design of this distinction, is to deny the imputation of the guilt of our sins to Christ; and then in what tolerable sense they can be said to be imputed to him, I cannot understand. But we are not tied up to arbitrary distinctions, and the sense that any are pleased to impose on the terms of them. I shall therefore first inquire into the meaning of these words, *guilt* and *guilty*, whereby we may be able to judge of what it is, which in this distinction is intended.

The Hebrews have no other word to signify *guilt* or *guilty* but חַטָּא . And this they use both for *sin*, the *guilt* of it, the *punishment* due to it, and a *sacrifice* for it. Speaking of the guilt of blood, they use not any word to signify guilt, but only say $\text{יָצַק דָּמָא$ it is "blood to him." So David prays "deliver me $\text{מִדַּם$ from blood," which we render "blood-guiltiness." Psa. li. 14. And this was because by the constitution of God, he that was guilty of blood, was to die by the hand of the magistrate or of God himself. But אָשָׁם *ascham* is no where used for guilt, but it signifies the relation of the sin intended to punishment. And other significations of it will be in vain sought for in the Old Testament.

In the New Testament, he that is guilty, is said to be ἐπιδοξος , Rom. iii. 19, that is, obnoxious to judgment or vengeance for

sin; one that ἡ δίκη ζῆλον οὐκ ἔχασεν, as they speak, Acts xxviii. 4, whom vengeance will not suffer to go unpunished. And ἐρωτος, 1 Cor. xi. 27, a word of the same signification. Once by ὀφειλω, Matt. xxiii. 18, to owe, to be indebted to justice. To be obnoxious, liable to justice, vengeance, punishment for sin, is to be guilty.

Reus, guilty, in the Latin, is of a large signification. He who is *crimini obnoxius*, or *pœnæ propter crimen*, or *voti debitor*, or *promissi*, or *officii ex sponsione*, is called *reus*. Especially every sponsor or surety, is *reus* in the law. *Cum servus pecuniam pro libertate pactus est, et ob eam rem, reum dederit*, (that is, *sponsorem, expromissorem*) *quamvis servus ab alio manumissus est, reus tamen obligabitur*. He is *reus* who engages himself for any other, as to the matter of his engagement. And the same is the use of the word in the best Latin authors. *Opportuna loca dividenda præfectis esse ac suæ quisque partis tutelæ reus sit*. Liv. de Bello Punic. lib. 5. "That every captain should so take care of the station committed to him, as that if any thing happened amiss, it should be imputed to him." And the same author again, *at quicumque aut propinquitate aut affinitate regiam contigissent, aliena culpa rei trucidarentur*, "should be guilty of the fault of another," (by imputation) "and suffer for it." So that in the Latin tongue he is *reus*, who for himself or any other is obnoxious to punishment or payment.

Reatus is a word of late admission into the Latin tongue, and was formed of *reus*. So Quintilian informs us in his discourse on the use of obsolete and new words, lib. 8. cap. 3. *Quæ vetera nunc sunt, fuerunt olim nova; quædam in usu perquam recentia*. *Messala primus reatum, munerarium Augustus dixerunt*; to which he adds, *piratica, musica*, and some others then newly come into use. But *reatus* at its first invention was of no such signification as it is now applied to. I mention it only to show, that we have no reason to be obliged to men's arbitrary use of words. Some lawyers first used it, *pro crimine*, a fault, exposing to punishment. But the original invention of it continued by long use, was to express the outward state and condition of him who was *reus*, after he was first charged in a cause criminal, before he was acquitted or condemned. Those among the Romans who were made *rei* by any public accusation, betook themselves to a poor, squalid habit, a sorrowful countenance, suffering their hair and beards to go undressed; hereby on custom and usage, the people

who were to judge on their cause, were inclined to compassion. And Milo furthered his sentence of banishment, because he would not submit to this custom which had such an appearance of pusillanimity and baseness of spirit. This state of sorrow and trouble so expressed, they called *reatus* and nothing else. It came afterwards to denote their state who were committed to custody in order to their trial, when the government ceased to be popular, wherein alone the other artifice was of use. And if this word be of any use in our present argument, it is to express the state of men after conviction of sin, before their justification. That is their *reatus*, the condition wherein the proudest of them cannot avoid to express their inward sorrow and anxiety of mind, by some outward evidences of them. Beyond this we are not obliged by the use of this word, but must consider the thing itself which now we intend to express thereby.

Guilt, in the Scripture, is the respect of sin to the sanction of the law, whereby the sinner becomes obnoxious to punishment. And to be guilty is to be *επιδοξος τω θεω*, liable to punishment for sin, from God, as the supreme Lawgiver and Judge of all. And so guilt or *reatus* is well defined to be *obligatio ad pœnam, propter culpam, aut admissam in se, aut imputatam, juste aut injuste*. For so Bathsheba says to David, that she and her son Solomon should be *חשתי* "sinners," that is, be esteemed guilty or liable to punishment for some evil laid to their charge. 1 Kings i. 21. And the distinction of *dignitas pœnæ*, and *obligatio ad pœnam*, is but the same thing in divers words. For both do but express the relation of sin to the sanction of the law, or if they may be conceived to differ, yet are they inseparable, for there can be no *obligatio ad pœnam*, where there is no *dignitas pœnæ*.

Much less is there any thing of weight in the distinction of *reatus culpæ* and *reatus pœnæ*. For this *reatus culpæ* is nothing but *dignitas pœnæ propter culpam*. Sin has other considerations, namely, its formal nature, as it is a transgression of the law; and the stain of filth that it brings upon the soul; but the guilt of it is nothing but its respect to punishment from the sanction of the law. And so indeed *reatus culpæ* or *reatus pœnæ*; the guilt of sin, is its desert of punishment. And where there is not this *reatus culpæ*, there can be no *pœnæ*, no punishment properly so called. For *pœna* is *vindicta noxæ*, the revenge due to sin. So therefore there can be no punishment, nor *reatus pœnæ*, the guilt of it, but where there is *rea-*

us culpæ, or sin considered with its guilt. And the *reatus pœnæ*, that may be supposed without the guilt of sin, is nothing but that obnoxiousness to afflictive evil on the occasion of sin, which the Socinians admit with respect to the suffering of Christ, and yet execrate his satisfaction.

And if this distinction should be apprehended to be of *reatus*, from its formal respect to sin and punishment, it must in both parts of the distinction be of the same signification, otherwise there is an equivocation in the subject of it. But *reatus pœnæ* is a liahleness, an obnoxiousness to punishment, according to the sentence of the law; that whereby a sinner becomes *ἰποδίκος τῷ Θεῷ*. And then *reatus culpæ* must be an obnoxiousness to sin, which is uncouth. There is therefore no imputation of sin, where there is no imputation of its guilt. For the guilt of punishment, which is not its respect to the desert of sin, is a plain fiction; there is no such thing *in rerum natura*. There is no guilt of sin, but its relation to punishment.

That therefore which we affirm herein is; that our sins were so transferred to Christ, that thereby he became *ἄλλος ἰποδίκος τῷ Θεῷ*, *reus*, responsible to God, and obnoxious to punishment in the justice of God for them. He was *alienæ culpæ reus*, perfectly innocent in himself; but took our guilt on him, or our obnoxiousness to punishment for sin. And so he may be, and may be said to be the greatest debtor in the world who never borrowed or owed one farthing on his own account, if he become surety for the greatest debt of others. So Paul became a debtor to Philemon, upon his undertaking for Onesimus, though before he owed him nothing.

And two things concurred to this imputation of sin to Christ. (1) The act of God imputing it. (2) The voluntary act of Christ himself in the undertaking of it, or admitting of the charge.

1. The act of God in this imputation of the guilt of our sins to Christ, is expressed by his laying all our iniquities upon him, making him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, and the like. For (1) as the supreme governor, lawgiver, and judge of all, to whom it belonged to take care that his holy law was observed, or the offenders punished, he admitted upon the transgression of it, the sponson and suretyship of Christ to answer for the sins of men, Heb. x. 5—7. (2) In order to this end, he made him under the law, or gave the law power over him, to demand of him, and inflict on him the penalty which was due to the sins of them for whom he undertook, Gal. iii. 13; iv. 4,

5. (3) For the declaration of the righteousness of God in this setting forth of Christ to be a propitiation, and to bear our iniquities, the guilt of our sins was transferred to him in an act of the righteous judgment of God, accepting and esteeming of him as the guilty person ; as it is with public sureties in every case.

2. The Lord Christ's voluntary susception of the state and condition of a surety, or undertaker for the church, to appear before the throne of God's justice for them, to answer whatever was laid to their charge, was required hereto. And this he did absolutely. There was a concurrence of his own will in and to all those divine acts whereby he and the Church were constituted one mystical person. And of his own love and grace did he as our surety stand in our stead before God, when he made inquisition for sin ; he took it on himself, as to the punishment which it deserved. Hence it became just and righteous that he should suffer, "the just for the unjust that he might bring us unto God." For if this be not so, I desire to know what is become of the guilt of the sins of believers ; if it were not transferred to Christ, it remains still upon themselves, or it is nothing. It will be said that guilt is taken away by the free pardon of sin. But if so, there was no need of punishment for it at all ; which is indeed what the Socinians plead, but by others is not admitted. For if punishment be not for guilt, it is not punishment.

But it is fiercely objected against what we have asserted, that if the guilt of our sins was imputed to Christ, then was he constituted a sinner thereby ; for it is the guilt of sin that makes any one to be truly a sinner. This is urged by Bellarmine ; lib. 2. de Justificat. not for its own sake, but to disprove the imputation of his righteousness to us, as it is continued by others with the same design. For, saith he, "if we be made righteous, and the children of God through the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, then was he made a sinner, *et quod horret animus cogitare, filius Diaboli*, by the imputation of the guilt of our sins, or our unrighteousness to him." And the same objection is pressed by others, with instances of consequences, which for many reasons I heartily wish had been forborne. But I answer,

1. Nothing is more absolutely true, nothing is more sacredly or assuredly believed by us, than, that nothing which Christ did or suffered, nothing that he undertook or underwent, did or could constitute him, subjectively, inherently, and thereon personally a sinner, or guilty of any sin of his own. To bear the

guilt or blame of other men's faults, to be *alienæ culpæ reus*, makes no man a sinner, unless he did unwisely or irregularly undertake it. But that Christ should admit of any thing of sin in himself, as it is absolutely inconsistent with the hypostatical union, so it would render him unmeet for all other duties of his office. Heb. vii. 25, 26. And I confess it has always seemed scandalous to me, that Socinus, Crellius, and Grotius grant that in some sense Christ offered for his own sins, and would prove it from that very place wherein it is positively denied, Heb. vii. 27. This ought to be sacredly fixed, and not a word used, nor thought entertained of any possibility of the contrary, upon any supposition whatever.

2. None ever dreamed of a transfusion or propagation of sin from us to Christ, such as there was from Adam to us. For Adam was a common person to us, we are not so to Christ; yea he is so to us; and the imputation of our sins to him, is a singular act of divine dispensation, which no evil consequence can ensue upon.

3. To imagine such an imputation of our sins to Christ, as that thereon they should cease to be our sins, and become his absolutely, is to overthrow that which is affirmed. For on that supposition Christ would not suffer for our sins, for they ceased to be ours, antecedently to his sufferings. But the *guilt* of them was so transferred to him, that through his suffering for it, it might be pardoned to us.

These things being premised, I say,

1. There is in sin a transgression of the preceptive part of the law, and there is an obnoxiousness to the punishment from the sanction of it. It is the first that gives sin its formal nature, and where that is not subjectively, no person can be constituted formally a sinner. However any one may be so denominated as to some certain end or purpose, yet without this, formally a sinner none can be, whatever be imputed to him. And where that is, no non-imputation of sin as to punishment, can free the person in whom it is, from being formally a sinner. When Bathsheba told David that she and her son Solomon should be חַטָּאִים "sinners," by having crimes laid to their charge; and when Judah told Jacob, that he would be a "sinner before him always," on account of any evil that befel Benjamin, (it should be imputed to him) yet neither of them could thereby be constituted a sinner formally. And on the other hand, when Shimei desired David not to impute sin to him, whereby he escaped present punishment, yet did not that non-imputation free him

formally from being a sinner. Wherefore sin under this consideration as a transgression of the preceptive part of the law, cannot be communicated from one to another, unless it be by the propagation of a vitiated principle or habit. But yet neither so will the personal sin of one as inherent in him, ever come to be the personal sin of another. Adam has upon his personal sin communicated a vicious, depraved, and corrupted nature to all his posterity; and besides, the guilt of his actual sin is imputed to them, as if it had been committed by every one of them. But yet his particular personal sin, neither ever did, nor ever could become the personal sin of any one of them, any otherwise than by the imputation of its guilt to them. Wherefore our sins neither are, nor can be so imputed to Christ, as that they should become subjectively his, as they are a transgression of the preceptive part of the law. A physical translation or transfusion of sin is in this case naturally and spiritually impossible; and yet on a supposition thereof alone, do the horrid consequences mentioned depend. But the guilt of sin is an external respect of it, with regard to the sanction of the law only. This is separable from sin, and if it were not so, no one sinner could either be pardoned or saved. It may therefore be made another's by imputation, and yet that other not rendered formally a sinner thereby. This was that which was imputed to Christ, whereby he was rendered obnoxious to the curse of the law. For it was impossible that the law should pronounce any accursed but the guilty; nor would do so, Deut. xxvii. 26.

2. There is a great difference between the imputation of the righteousness of Christ to us, and the imputation of our sins to Christ; so as that he cannot in the same manner be said to be made a sinner by the one, as we are made righteous by the other. For our sin was imputed to Christ only, as he was our surety for a time; to this end, that he might take it away, destroy it and abolish it. It was never imputed to him, so as to make any alteration absolutely in his personal state and condition. But his righteousness is imputed to us, to abide with us, to be ours always, and to make a total change in our state and condition as to our relation to God. Our sin was imputed to him, only for a season, not absolutely, but as he was a surety, and to the special end of destroying it; and taken on him, on this condition that his righteousness should be made ours for ever. All things are otherwise in the imputation of his righteousness to us, which respects us absolutely, and not under

a temporary capacity, abides with us for ever, changes our state and relation to God, and is an effect of superabounding grace.

But it will be said, that if our sins as to the guilt of them were imputed to Christ, then God must hate Christ; for he hateth the guilty. I know not well how I come to mention these things, which indeed I look upon as cavils, such as men may multiply if they please, against any part of the mysteries of the gospel. But seeing it is mentioned, it may be spoken to. And

(1) It is certain that the Lord Christ's taking on him the guilt of our sins, was a high act of obedience to God, Heb. x. 5, 6; and for which the Father loved him. John x. 17, 18. There was therefore no reason why God should hate Christ, for his taking on him our debt and the payment of it, in an act of the highest obedience to his will. (2) God in this matter is considered as a rector, ruler and judge. Now it is not required of the severest judge, that as a judge he should hate the guilty person, no, although he be guilty originally by inhesion and not by imputation. As such, he has no more to do, but consider the guilt and pronounce the sentence of punishment. But (3) suppose a person out of an heroic generosity of mind should become an *Αντιληξος* for another, for his friend, for a good man, so as to answer for him with his life, as Judah undertook to be for Benjamin as to his liberty, which when a man has lost, he is civilly dead, and *capite diminutus*;—would the most cruel tyrant under heaven that should take away his life, in that case, hate him? would he not rather admire his worth and virtue? As such an one it was that Christ suffered, and no otherwise. (4) All the force of this exception depends on the ambiguity of the word hate. For it may signify either an aversion or detestation of mind, or only a will of punishing, as in God mostly it does. In the first sense there was no ground why God should hate Christ on this imputation of guilt to him; whereby he became *non propriae sed alienae culpæ reus*. Sin inherent renders the soul polluted, abominable, and the only object of divine aversion. But for him who was perfectly innocent, holy, harmless, undefiled in himself, who did no sin, neither was there guile found in his mouth, to take upon him the guilt of others' sins, thereby to comply with and accomplish the design of God for the manifestation of his glory and infinite wisdom, grace, goodness, mercy, and righteousness, to the certain expiation and destruction of sin, nothing could render him more glo-

rious and lovely in the sight of God or man. But for a will of punishing in God, where sin is imputed, none can deny it, but they must therewith openly disavow the satisfaction of Christ.

The heads of some few of those arguments wherewith the truth we have asserted is confirmed, shall close this discourse.

1. Unless the guilt of sin was imputed to Christ, sin was not imputed to him in any sense; for the punishment of sin is not sin; nor can those who are otherwise minded, declare what it is of sin, that is imputed. But the Scripture is plain, that "God laid on him the iniquity of us all;" and made him to be sin for us, which could not otherwise be but by imputation.

2. There can be no punishment but with respect to the guilt of sin personally contracted, or imputed. It is guilt alone that gives what is materially evil and afflictive the formal nature of punishment, and nothing else. And therefore those who understand full well the harmony of things and opinions, and are free to express their minds, constantly declare, that if one of these be denied, the other must be so also; and if one be admitted they must both be so. If guilt was not imputed to Christ, he could not, as they plead well enough, undergo the punishment of sin; much he might do and suffer on the occasion of sin, but undergo the punishment due to sin he could not. And if it should be granted that the guilt of sin was imputed to him, they will not deny but that he underwent the punishment of it; and if he underwent the punishment of it, they will not deny but that the guilt of it was imputed to him; for these things are inseparably related.

3. Christ was made a "curse for us," the curse of the law; as is expressly declared. Gal. iii. 13, 14. But the curse of the law respects the guilt of sin only; so that where that is not, it cannot take place in any sense, and where that is, it inseparably attends it. Deut. xxvii. 26.

4. The express testimonies of the Scripture to this purpose cannot be evaded, without an open wresting of their words and sense. So God is said to make all our iniquities to meet upon him; and he bare them on him as his burden, for so the word signifies. Isa. liii. 6. "God hath laid on him the iniquity," that is, the guilt "of us all, ver. 11; "and their sin (or guilt) shall he bear." For that is the intendment of γz , where joined with any other word that denotes sin as it is in those places; Psa. xxxii. 5; "thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin," that is, the guilt of it, which is that alone that is taken away by pardon. So we read that "his soul was made an offering for the guilt of

sin," "that he was made sin," "that sin was condemned in his flesh," &c.

5. This was represented in all the sacrifices of old, especially the great anniversary on the day of expiation, with the ordinance of the scape goat, as has been before declared.

6. Without a supposition hereof it cannot be understood, how the Lord Christ should be our *Αντιπαρθετος* or suffer *αυτι ημων*, *in our stead*, unless we will admit the exposition of Mr. Ho, a late writer, who reckoning up how many things the Lord Christ did in our stead, adds as the sense thereof, that it is, "to bestead us;" than which if he can invent any thing more fond and senseless, he has a singular faculty in such an employment.



CHAPTER IX.

THE FORMAL CAUSE OF JUSTIFICATION; OR, THE RIGHTEOUSNESS ON ACCOUNT OF WHICH BELIEVERS ARE JUSTIFIED BEFORE GOD. OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.

THE principal differences about the doctrine of justification are reducible to three heads. (1) The nature of it; namely, whether it consists in an internal change of the person justified by the infusion of a habit of inherent grace or righteousness; or whether it be a forensic act, in the judging, esteeming, declaring, and pronouncing such a person to be righteous, thereon absolving him from all his sins, giving to him right and title to life. Herein we have to do only with those of the Church of Rome; all others, both Protestants and Socinians, being agreed on the *forensic* sense of the word, and the nature of the thing signified thereby. And this I have already spoken to, so far as our present design requires, and that I hope with such evidence of truth, as cannot well be gainsaid. Nor may it be supposed that we have too long insisted thereon, as an opinion which is obsolete, and long since sufficiently confuted. I think much otherwise, and that those who avoid the Romanists in these controversies, will give a greater appearance of fear, than of contempt. For when all is done, if free justification through the blood of Christ and the imputation of his righteousness, be not able to preserve its station, in the minds of men, the Popish doctrine of justification must and will return upon the world,

with all the concomitants and consequences of it. Whilst any knowledge of the law or gospel is continued amongst us, the consciences of men will at one time or other, living or dying, be really affected with a sense of sin, as to its guilt and danger. Hence that trouble and those disquietments of mind will ensue, which will force men, be they never so unwilling, to seek after some relief and satisfaction. And what will not men attempt, who are reduced to the condition expressed. Micah. vi. 7, 8. Wherefore in this case, if the true and only relief of distressed consciences of sinners who are weary and heavy laden, be hid from their eyes; if they have no apprehension of, nor trust in that which alone they may oppose to the sentence of the law, and interpose between God's justice and their souls, wherein they may take shelter from the storms of that wrath which abides on them that believe not; they will betake themselves to any thing which confidently tenders them present ease and relief. Hence many persons living all their days in an ignorance of the righteousness of God, are oftentimes on their sick beds, and in their dying hours, proselyted to a confidence in the ways of rest and peace, which the Romanists impose upon them. For such seasons of advantage do they wait for, to the reputation as they suppose of their own zeal, in truth to the scandal of the Christian religion. But finding at any time the consciences of men under disquietments, and ignorant of, or disbelieving that heavenly relief which is provided in the gospel, they are ready with their applications and medicines, having on them pretended approbations of the experience of many ages, and an innumerable company of devout souls in them. Such is their doctrine of justification, with the addition of those other ingredients of confession, absolution, penances or commutations, aids from saints and angels, especially the blessed Virgin, all warmed by the fire of purgatory, and confidently administered to persons, sick of ignorance, darkness and sin. And let none please themselves in the contempt of these things. If the truth concerning evangelical justification be once disbelieved among us, or obliterated by any artifices, out of the minds of men, to these things at one time or other, they must and will betake themselves. For the new schemes and projections of justification which some at present would supply us with, are no way suited, nor able to give relief or satisfaction to a conscience really troubled for sin, and seriously inquiring how it may have rest and peace with God. I shall take the boldness therefore to say, whoever be offended at it, that if we lose the ancient doctrine of justifi-

cation through faith in the blood of Christ, and the imputation of his righteousness to us, public profession of religion will quickly issue in popery or atheism, or at least in what is the next door to it.

The second principal controversy is about the formal cause of justification, as it is expressed and stated by those of the Roman church. And under these terms some Protestant divines have consented to debate the matter in difference. I shall not interpose into a strife of words. So the Romanists will call that which we inquire after. Some of ours say, the righteousness of Christ imputed; some, the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, is the formal cause of our justification; some, that there is no formal cause of justification, but this is that which supplies the place and use of a formal cause, which is the righteousness of Christ. In none of these things will I concern myself, though I judge what was mentioned in the last place, to be most proper and significant.

The substance of the inquiry wherein alone we are concerned is, what is that righteousness whereby, and wherewith, a believing sinner is justified before God; or whereon he is accepted with God, has his sins pardoned, is received into grace and favour, and has a title given him to the heavenly inheritance? I shall no otherwise propose this inquiry, as knowing that it contains the substance of what convinced sinners look after in and by the gospel.

And herein it is agreed by all, the Socinians only excepted, that the primary or procuring cause of the pardon of our sins, and acceptance with God, is the satisfaction and merit of Christ. Howbeit it cannot be denied, but that some retaining the names of them, seem to renounce or disbelieve the things themselves. But we need not to take any notice thereof, until they are free more plainly to express their minds. But as concerning the righteousness itself inquired after, there seems to be a difference among them, who yet all deny it to be the righteousness of Christ imputed to us. For those of the Roman church plainly say, that upon the infusion of a habit of grace, with the expulsion of sin and the renovation of our natures thereby, which they call the first justification, we are actually justified before God, by our own works of righteousness. Hereon they dispute about the merit and satisfactoriness of those works, with their indignity of the reward of eternal life. Others as the Socinians openly disclaim all merit in our works; only some, out of reverence as I suppose, to the antiquity of the word, and under the

shelter of the ambiguity of its signification, have faintly attempted an accommodation with it. But in the substance of what they assent to this purpose, to the best of my understanding, they are all agreed. For what the Papists call *Justitia operum*, "the righteousness of works," they call a personal inherent evangelical righteousness, whereof we have spoken before. And whereas the Papists say, that this righteousness of works is not absolutely perfect, nor in itself able to justify us in the sight of God, but owes all its worth and dignity for this purpose to the merit of Christ, they affirm that this evangelical righteousness is the condition whereon we enjoy the benefits of the righteousness of Christ, in the pardon of our sins, and the acceptance of our persons before God. But as to those who will acknowledge no other righteousness wherewith we are justified before God, the meaning is the same, whether we say that on the condition of this righteousness we are made partakers of the benefits of the righteousness of Christ; or that it is the righteousness of Christ which makes this righteousness of ours accepted with God. But these things must afterwards more particularly be inquired into.

3. The third inquiry wherein there is not an agreement in this matter is, upon a supposition of a necessity, that he who is to be justified, should one way or other be interested in the righteousness of Christ, what it is that on our part is required thereto. This some say to be faith alone, others faith and works also, and that in the same kind of necessity and use. What we at present undertake to consider, is the second thing proposed. And indeed, herein lies the substance of the whole controversy about our justification before God, upon the determination and stating whereof, the determination of all other incident questions depends.

This therefore is that which herein I affirm: *The righteousness of Christ* (in his obedience and suffering for us) *imputed to believers, as they are united to him by his Spirit, is that righteousness whereon they are justified before God, on account whereof their sins are pardoned, and a right is granted them to the heavenly inheritance.*

This position is such as wherein the substance of that doctrine in this important article of evangelical truth which we plead for, is plainly and fully expressed. And I have chosen the rather thus to express it, because it is that thesis wherein the learned Davenant laid down that common doctrine of the reformed churches whose defence he undertook. This is the

shield of truth in the whole cause of justification, which whilst it is preserved safe, we need not trouble ourselves about the differences that are among learned men, about the most proper stating and declaration of some lesser concernments of it. This is the refuge, the only refuge of distressed conscience, wherein they may find rest and peace.

For the confirmation of this assertion, I shall do these three things: (1) Reflect on what is needful to the explanation of it. (2) Answer the most important general objections against it. (3) Prove the truth of it by arguments and testimonies of the Holy Scripture.

As to the first of these, or what is necessary to the explanation of this assertion, it has been sufficiently spoken to in our foregoing discourses. The heads of some things only shall at present be called over.

1. The foundation of the imputation asserted is union. Hereof there are many grounds and causes as has been declared. But that which we have immediate respect to as the foundation of this imputation, is that whereby the Lord Christ and believers actually coalesce into one mystical person. This is by the Holy Spirit inhabiting in him as the head of the church in all fulness, and in all believers according to their measure, whereby they become members of his mystical body. That there is such an union between Christ and believers, is the faith of the catholic Church, and has been so in all ages. Those who seem in our days to deny it or question it, either know not what they say, or their minds are influenced by the doctrine of those who deny the divine persons of the Son, and of the Spirit. Upon supposition of this union, reason will grant the imputation pleaded for to be reasonable; at least, that there is such a peculiar ground for it, as is not to be exemplified in any things natural or political among men.

2. The nature of imputation has been fully spoken to before, and thereto I refer the reader for the understanding of what is intended thereby.

3. That which is imputed is the righteousness of Christ; and briefly I understand hereby his whole obedience to God in all that he did and suffered for the church. This I say is imputed to believers, so as to become their only righteousness before God to the justification of life.

If beyond these things any expressions have been made use of in the explanation of this truth, which have given occasion to any differences or contests, although they may be true and

defensible against objections, yet shall not I concern myself in them. The substance of the truth as laid down, is that which I have undertaken to defend, and where that is granted or consented to, I will not contend with any about their way and methods of its declaration, nor defend the terms and expressions that have by any been made use of therein. For instance, some have said, that "what Christ did and suffered, is so imputed to us, as that we are judged and esteemed in the sight of God to have done or suffered ourselves in him." This I shall not concern myself in. For although it may have a sound sense given to it, and is used by some of the ancients, yet because offence is taken at it, and the substance of the truth we plead for it is better otherwise expressed, it ought not to be contended about. For we do not say that God judges or esteems that we did and suffered in our own persons what Christ did and suffered, but only that he did it and suffered it in our stead. Hereon God makes a grant and donation of it to believers upon their believing, to their justification before him. And the like may be said of many other expressions of the like nature.

These things being premised, I proceed to the consideration of the general objections that are urged against the imputation we plead for. And I shall insist only on some of the principal of them, and whereinto all others may be resolved; for it were endless to go over all that any man's invention can suggest to him of this kind. And some general considerations we must take along with us herein. As,

1. The doctrine of justification is a part, yea an eminent part of the mystery of the gospel. It is no marvel therefore if it be not so exposed to the common notions of reason, as some would have it to be. There is more required to the true spiritual understanding of such mysteries; yea, unless we intend to renounce the gospel, it must be asserted, that reason as it is corrupted, and the mind of man destitute of divine supernatural revelation, dislike every such truth, and rise up in enmity against it. So the Scripture directly affirms, Rom. viii. 7; 1 Cor. ii. 14.

2. Hence are the minds and inventions of men wonderfully fertile in coining objections against evangelical truths, and raising cavils against them. Seldom to this purpose do they want an endless number of sophistical objections, which because they know no better, they themselves judge unanswerable. For carnal reason being once set at liberty under the false notion of truth, to act itself freely and boldly against spi-

ritual mysteries, is subtle in its arguings, and pregnant in its invention of them. How endless, for instance, are the sophisms of the Socinians against the doctrine of the Trinity, and how do they triumph in them as unanswerable. Under the shelter of them they despise the force of the most evident testimonies of the Scripture, and those multiplied on all occasions. In like manner they deal with the doctrine of the satisfaction of Christ, as the Pelagians of old did with that of his grace. Wherefore he that will be startled at the appearance of subtle or plausible objections, against any gospel mysteries that are plainly revealed, and sufficiently attested in the Scripture, is not likely to come to much stability in his profession of them.

3. The most of the objections which are levied against the truth in this cause, arise from the want of a due comprehension of the order of the work of God's grace, and of our compliance therewith in a way of duty, as was before observed. For they consist in opposing those things one to another as inconsistent, which in their proper place and order are not only consistent, but mutually subservient one to another; and are found so in the experience of them that truly believe. Instances hereof have been given before, and others will immediately occur. Taking the consideration of these things with us, we may see the origin of the objections, and of what force they are.

4. Let it be considered that the objections which are made use of against the truth we assert, are all of them taken from certain consequences, which as it is supposed, will ensue on the admission of it. And as this is the only expedient to perpetuate controversies, and make them endless, so to my best observation I never yet met with any one, but that, to give an appearance of force to the absurdity of the consequences from whence he argues, he framed his suppositions, or the state of the question, to the disadvantage of them who he opposed; a course of proceeding which I wonder good men are not either weary or ashamed of.

1. It is objected, "that the imputation of the righteousness of Christ overthrows all remission of sins on the part of God." This is pleaded for by Socinus, and by others it is also made use of. A confident charge this seems to them who steadfastly believe that without this imputation, there could be no remission of sin. But they say, that he who has a righteousness imputed to him that is absolutely perfect, so as to be made his own, needs no pardon, has no sin that should be forgiven, nor

can ever need forgiveness. But because this objection will occur to us again in the vindication of one of our ensuing arguments, I shall here briefly speak to it.

(1.) Grotius shall answer this objection; he says,* “Whereas we have said that Christ has procured two things for us, freedom from punishment, and a reward; the ancient Church attributes the former of them distinctly to his satisfaction, the latter to his merit. Satisfaction consists in the transferring of sins, (from us unto him;) merit, in the imputation to us of his most perfect obedience performed for us.” In his judgment the remission of sins, and the imputation of righteousness, were as consistent as the satisfaction and merit of Christ, as indeed they are.

(2.) Had we not been sinners, we should have had no need of the imputation of the righteousness of Christ to render us righteous before God. Being so, the first end for which it is imputed is the pardon of sin; without which we could not be righteous by the imputation of the most perfect righteousness. These things therefore are consistent, namely, that the satisfaction of Christ should be imputed to us for the pardon of sin, and the obedience of Christ be imputed to us, to render us righteous before God. And they are not only consistent, but neither of them singly were sufficient to our justification.

2. It is pleaded by the same author and others, “that the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, overthrows all necessity of repentance for sin, in order to the remission or pardon thereof, yea renders it altogether needless. For what need has he of repentance for sin, who by the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, is esteemed completely just and righteous in the sight of God? If Christ satisfied for all sins in the person of the elect; if as our surety he paid all our debts, and if his righteousness be made ours before we repent, then is all repentance needless.” And these things are much enlarged on by the same author in the place before mentioned.

Answer (1) It must be remembered, that we require evangelical faith, in order of nature, antecedently to our justification by the imputation of the righteousness of Christ to us, which also is the condition of its continuation. Wherefore whatever is necessary thereto, is in like manner required of us in order to believing. Amongst these, there is a sorrow for sin, and a

* Cum duo nobis peperisse Christum dixerimus, impunitatem et præmium, illud satisfactioni, hoc merito Christi distincte tribuit vetus Ecclesia. Satisfactio consistit in peccatorum translatione, meritum in perfectissimæ obedientiæ pro nobis præstitæ imputatione. Præfat. ad Lib. de Satisfact.

repentance of it. For whosoever is convinced of sin in a due manner, so as to be sensible of its evil and guilt, both as in its own nature it is contrary to the preceptive part of the holy law, and in the necessary consequences of it, in the wrath and curse of God, cannot but be perplexed in his mind, that he has involved himself therein. And that posture of mind will be accompanied with shame, fear, sorrow, and other afflictive passions. Hereon a resolution ensues, utterly to abstain from it for the future, with sincere endeavours to that purpose, issuing, if there be time and space for it, in reformation of life. And in a sense of sin, sorrow for it, fear concerning it, abstinence from it, and reformation of life, a repentance true in its kind consists. This repentance is usually called legal, because its motives are principally taken from the law; but yet there is moreover required to it that temporary faith of the gospel which we have before described. And as it usually produces great effects in the confession of sin, humiliation for it, and change of life, as in Ahab and the Ninevites, so ordinarily it precedes true saving faith, and justification thereby. Wherefore the necessity hereof, is no way weakened by the doctrine of the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, yea it is strengthened and made effectual thereby. For without it, in the order of the gospel, an interest therein is not to be attained. And this is that which in the Old Testament is so often proposed as the means and conditions of turning away the judgments and punishments threatened against sin. For it is true and sincere in its kind; neither do the Socinians require any other repentance to justification. For as they deny true evangelical repentance in all the especial causes of it, so that which may and does precede faith in order of nature, is all that they require. This objection therefore as managed by them, is a causeless vain pretence.

2. Justifying faith includes in its nature the entire principle of evangelical repentance, so that it is utterly impossible that a man should be a true believer, and not at the same instant of time be truly penitent. And therefore are they so frequently conjoined in the Scripture as one simultaneous duty. Yea the call of the gospel to repentance is a call to faith, acting itself by repentance. So the sole reason of that call to repentance which the forgiveness of sins is annexed to, (Acts ii. 38.) is the proposal of the promise which is the object of faith, ver. 39. And those conceivings and affections which a man has about sin, with a sorrow for it and repentance of it, upon

a legal conviction, being enlivened and made evangelical by the introduction of faith as a new principle of them, and giving new motives to them, become *evangelical*; so impossible is it that faith should be without repentance. Wherefore although the first act of faith, and its only proper exercise to justification, respects the grace of God in Christ and the way of salvation by him, as proposed in the promise of the gospel, yet is not this conceived in order of time to precede its actings in self-displicity, godly sorrow, and universal conversion from sin to God; nor can it be so, seeing it virtually and radically contains all of them in itself. However therefore evangelical repentance is not the condition of our justification, so as to have any direct influence upon it; nor are we said any where to be justified by repentance; nor is it conversant about the proper object which alone the soul respects therein; nor is a direct and immediate giving glory to God, on account of the way and work of his wisdom and grace in Christ Jesus, but a consequence thereof; nor is that reception of Christ which is expressly required to our justification, and which alone is required thereto; yet is it, in the root, principle, and promptitude of mind for its exercise, in every one that is justified, *then* when he is justified. And it is peculiarly proposed with respect to the forgiveness of sin, as that without which it is impossible we should have any true sense or comfort of it in our souls; but it is not so as any part of that righteousness on the consideration whereof our sins are pardoned, nor as that whereby we have an interest therein. These things are plain in the divine method of our justification, and the order of our duty prescribed in the gospel; as also in the experience of them that believe. Wherefore considering the necessity of legal repentance to believing, with the sanctification of the affection exercised therein by faith, whereby they are made evangelical, and the nature of faith as including in it a principle of universal conversion to God, and especially of that repentance, which has for its principal motive the love of God, and of Jesus Christ, with the grace from thence communicated, all which are supposed in the doctrine pleaded for, the necessity of true repentance is immovably fixed on its proper foundation.

3. As to what was said in the objection concerning Christ's suffering in the person of the elect, I know not whether any have used it or not, nor will I contend about it. He suffered in their stead; which all sorts of writers ancient and moder-

so express, "in his suffering he bare the person of the church." The meaning is what was before declared. Christ and believers are one mystical person, one spiritually animated body, head and members. This I suppose will not be denied; to do so is to overthrow the church and the faith of it. Hence what he did and suffered is imputed to them. And it is granted that as the surety of the covenant he paid all our debts, or answered for all our faults; and that his righteousness is really communicated to us. Why then, say some, there is no need of repentance, all is done for us already. But why so? why must we assent to one part of the gospel to the exclusion of another? Was it not free to God to appoint what way, method and order he would, whereby these things should be communicated to us? nay upon the supposition of the design of his wisdom and grace, these two things were necessary;

1. That this righteousness of Christ should be communicated to us, and be made ours in such a way and manner, as that he himself might be glorified therein, seeing he has disposed all things in this whole economy, "to the praise of the glory of his grace," Eph. i. 6. This was to be done by faith on our part. It is so, it could be no otherwise. For that faith whereby we are justified, is our giving to God the glory of his wisdom, grace and love. And whatever does so, is *faith*, and nothing else is so.

2. That whereas our nature was so corrupted and depraved, as that continuing in that state, it was not capable of a participation of the righteousness of Christ, or any benefit of it, to the glory of God, and our own good, it was in like manner necessary that it should be renewed and changed. And unless it were so, the design of God in the mediation of Christ, which was the entire recovery of us to himself could not be attained. And therefore as faith, under the formal consideration of it, was necessary to the first end, namely, that of giving glory to God, so to this latter end, it was necessary that this faith should be accompanied with, yea and contain in itself the seeds of all those other graces wherein the Divine nature consists, whereof we are to be made partakers. Not only therefore the thing itself, or the communication of the righteousness of Christ to us, but the way and manner, and means of it, depend on God's sovereign order and disposal. Wherefore although Christ made satisfaction to the justice of God, for all the sins of the church, and that as a common person, (for no man in his wits can deny but that he who is a mediator and a surety, is in some sense a

common person) and although he paid all our debts, yet does the particular interest of this or that man, in what he did and suffered, depend on the way, means, and order designed of God to that end. This and this alone gives the true necessity of all the duties which are required of us, with their order and their ends.

3dly, It is objected, "That the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, which we defend, overthrows the necessity of faith itself." This is home indeed. *Aliquid adhærebit*, is the design of all these objections. But they have reason to plead for themselves who make it. "For on this supposition," they say, "the righteousness of Christ is ours before we believe. For Christ satisfied for all our sins, as if we had satisfied in our own persons. And he who is esteemed to have satisfied for all his sins in his own person, is acquitted from them all, and accounted just, whether he believe or not; nor is there any ground or reason why he should be required to believe. If therefore the righteousness of Christ be really ours, because in the judgment of God we are esteemed to have wrought it in him, then it is ours before we believe. If it be otherwise, then it is plain that that righteousness itself can never be made ours by believing; only the fruits and effects of it may be suspended on our believing, whereby we may be made partakers of them. Yea if Christ made any such satisfaction for us as is pretended, it is really ours, without any further imputation. For being performed for us and in our stead it is the highest injustice not to have us accounted pardoned and acquitted, without any further imputation on the part of God, or faith on ours." These things I have transcribed out of Socinus, which I would not have done, but that I find others to have gone before me therein, though to another purpose. And he concludes with a confidence which others also seem in some measure to have learned of him. For he says to his adversary, *Hæc tua, tuorumque sententia, adeo fœda et execrabilis est, ut pestilentiorum errorem post homines natos in populo Dei ecclitisse non credam*; speaking of the satisfaction of Christ and the imputation of it to believers. And indeed his serpentine wit was fertile in the invention of cavils against all the mysteries of the gospel. Nor was he obliged by any one of them, so as to contradict himself in what he opposed concerning any other of them. For denying the deity of Christ, his satisfaction, sacrifice, merit, righteousness, and overthrowing the whole nature of his mediation, nothing stood in his way which he had a mind to oppose. But

I somewhat wonder how others can make use of his inventions in this kind, who, if they considered aright their proper tendency, would find them to be absolutely destructive of what they seem to own. So it is in this present objection against the imputation of the righteousness of Christ; if it has any force in it, as indeed it has not, it is to prove that the satisfaction of Christ was impossible; and so he intended it. But it will be easily removed.

I answer first in general; that the whole fallacy of this objection lies in the opposing one part of the design and method of God's grace in this mystery of our justification, to another; or the taking of one part of it to be the whole, which as to its efficacy and perfection depends on something else. Hereof we warned the reader in our previous discourses. For the whole of it is a supposition, that the satisfaction of Christ, if there be any such thing, must have its whole effect, without believing on our part, which is contrary to the whole declaration of the will of God in the gospel. But I shall principally respect them who are pleased to make use of this objection, and yet do not deny the satisfaction of Christ. And I say

1. When the Lord Christ died for us, and offered himself as a propitiatory sacrifice, God laid all our sins on him, Isa. liii. 6. And he then bare them all in his own body on the tree, 1 Pet. ii. 24. Then he suffered in our stead, and made full satisfaction for all our sins; for he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself, Heb. ix. 26; and by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified, Heb. x. 14. He whose sins were not actually and absolutely satisfied for, in that one offering of Christ, shall never have them expiated to eternity. For henceforth he dieth no more, there is no more sacrifice for sin. The repetition of a sacrifice for sin, which must be the crucifying of Christ afresh, overthrows the foundation of the Christian religion.

2. Notwithstanding this full, plenary satisfaction once made for the sins of the world that shall be saved; yet all men continue equally to be born by nature children of wrath, and whilst they believe not, the wrath of God abideth on them, John iii. 36; that is, they are obnoxious to, and under the curse of the law. Wherefore on the only making of that satisfaction, no one for whom it was made in the design of God, can be said to have suffered in Christ, nor to have an interest in his satisfaction, nor by any way or means be made partaker of it antecedently to another act of God in its imputation to him. For

this is but one part of the purpose of God's grace, as to our justification by the blood of Christ, namely, that he by his death should make satisfaction for our sins. Nor is it to be separated from what also belongs to it, in the same purpose of God. Wherefore from the position or grant of the satisfaction of Christ, no argument can be taken to the negation of a consequential act of its imputation to us; nor therefore of the necessity of our faith in the believing and receiving of it, which is no less the appointment of God, than it was that Christ should make that satisfaction. Wherefore

3. That which the Lord Christ paid for us, is as truly paid, as if we had paid it ourselves. So he speaks, Psalm lxxix. 5. "I restored that which I took not away." He made no spoil of the glory of God; what was done of that nature by us, he returned it to him. And what he underwent and suffered, he underwent and suffered in our stead. But yet the act of God in laying our sins on Christ, conveyed no actual right and title to us, to what he did and suffered. They are not immediately thereon, nor by virtue thereof, ours, or esteemed ours, because God has appointed somewhat else, not only antecedent thereto, but as the means of it, to his own glory. These things both as to their being and order, depend on the free ordination of God. But yet,

4. It cannot be said that this satisfaction was made for us on such a condition as should absolutely suspend the event, and render it uncertain whether it should ever be for us or not. Such a constitution may be righteous in pecuniary matters. A man may lay down a great sum of money for the discharge of another, on such a condition as may never be fulfilled. For on the absolute failure of the condition, his money may and ought to be restored to him, whereon he has received no injury or damage. But in penal suffering for crimes and sins, there can be no righteous constitution that shall make the event and efficacy of it depend on a condition absolutely uncertain, and which may not come to pass or be fulfilled. For if the condition fail, no recompense can be made to him who has suffered. Wherefore the way of the application of the satisfaction of Christ to them for whom it was made, is sure and steadfast in the purpose of God.

5. God has appointed that there shall be an immediate foundation of the imputation of the satisfaction and righteousness of Christ to us, whereon we may be said to have done and suffered in him, what he did and suffered in our stead, by that

grant, donation, and imputation of it to us; or that we may be interested in it, that it may be made ours, which is all we contend for. And this is our actual coalescence into one mystical person with him by faith. Hereon the necessity of faith originally depends. And if we shall add hereto the necessity of it likewise to that especial glory of God which he designs to exalt in our justification by Christ, as also to all the ends of our obedience to God, and the renovation of our natures into his image, its station is sufficiently secured against all objections. Our actual interest in the satisfaction of Christ, depends on our actual insertion into his mystical body by faith, according to the appointment of God.

4thly. It is yet objected, that if the righteousness of Christ be made ours, we may be said to be saviours of the world as he was, or to save others as he did. For he was so and did so by his righteousness and no otherwise. This objection also is of the same nature with those foregoing, a mere sophistical cavil. For,

1. The righteousness of Christ is not transfused into us, so as to be made inherently and subjectively ours, as it was in him, and which is necessarily required to that effect of saving others thereby. Whatever we may do, or be said to do with respect to others, by virtue of any power or quality inherent in ourselves, we can be said to do nothing to others, or for them, by virtue of that which is imputed to us, only for our own benefit. That any righteousness of ours should benefit another, it is absolutely necessary that it should be wrought by ourselves.

2. If the righteousness of Christ could be transfused into us, and be made inherently ours, yet could we not be, nor be said to be the saviours of others thereby. For our nature in our individual persons, is not *subjectum capace*, or capable to receive and retain a righteousness useful and effectual to that end. This capacity was given to it in Christ by virtue of the hypostatical union, and not otherwise. The righteousness of Christ himself as performed in the human nature, would not have been sufficient for the justification and salvation of the church, had it not been the righteousness of his person, who is both God and man; for "God redeemed his church with his own blood."

3. This imputation of the righteousness of Christ to us, as to its ends and use, has its measure from the will of God, and his purpose in that imputation. And this is, that it should be

the righteousness of them to whom it is imputed, and nothing else.

4. We do not say that the righteousness of Christ as made absolutely for the whole church, is imputed to every believer. But his satisfaction for every one of them in particular, according to the will of God, is imputed to them; not with respect to its general ends, but according to every one's particular interest. Every believer has his own *homer* of this bread of life; and all are justified by the same righteousness.

5. The Apostle declares, as we shall prove afterwards, that as Adam's actual sin is imputed to us to condemnation, so is the obedience of Christ imputed to us, to the justification of life. But Adam's sin is not so imputed to any person, as that he should then and thereby be the cause of sin and condemnation to all other persons in the world; but only that he himself should become guilty before God thereon. And so is it on the other side. And as we are made guilty by Adam's actual sin which is not inherent in us, but only imputed to us; so are we made righteous by the righteousness of Christ which is not inherent in us, but only imputed to us. And imputed to us it is, because himself was righteous with it, not for himself but for us.

It is yet said, that "if we insist on personal imputation to every believer of what Christ did, or if any believer be personally righteous in the very individual acts of Christ's righteousness, many absurdities will follow." But it was observed before, that when any design to oppose an opinion from the absurdities which they suppose would follow upon it, they are much inclined so to state it, that at least they may seem so to do. And this oftentimes the most worthy and candid persons are not free from in the heat of disputation. So I fear it is here fallen out. For as to "personal imputation" I do not well understand it. All imputation is to a person, and is the act of a person, be it of what, and what sort it will, but from neither of them can be denominated a personal imputation. And if an imputation be allowed that is not to the persons of men, namely, in this case to all believers, the nature of it has not yet been declared, as I know of.

That any have so expressed the imputation pleaded for, that every believer should be personally righteous in the very individual acts of Christ's righteousness, I know not; I have neither read nor heard any of them who have so expressed their mind. It may be some have done so; but I shall not undertake the de-

fence of what they have done. For it seems not only to suppose that Christ did every individual act which in any instance is required of us, but also that those acts are made our own inherently; both which are false and impossible. That which indeed is pleaded for in this imputation, is only this: that what the Lord Christ did and suffered as the mediator and surety of the covenant in answer to the law, for them and in their stead, is imputed to every one of them to the justification of life. And sufficient this is to that end without any such supposals. (1) From the dignity of the person who yielded his obedience, which rendered it both satisfactory and meritorious, and imputable to many. (2) From the nature of the obedience itself, which was a perfect compliance with, a fulfilling of, and satisfaction to, the whole law in all its demands. This on the supposition of that act of God's sovereign authority, whereby a representative of the whole church was introduced to answer the law, is the ground of his righteousness being made theirs, and being every way sufficient to their justification. (3) From the constitution of God, that what was done and suffered by Christ as a public person and our surety, should be reckoned to us as if done by ourselves. So the sin of Adam whilst he was a public person, and represented his whole posterity, is imputed to us all as if we had committed that actual sin. This Bellarmine himself frequently acknowledges.* "We sinned in the first man, when he sinned, and that transgression of his was also our transgression. For we could not be truly made sinners through the disobedience of Adam, unless his disobedience was also ours." And elsewhere, "that the actual sin of Adam is imputed to us, as if we all had committed that actual sin; that is, broken the whole law of God." And this is that whereby the Apostle illustrates the imputation of the righteousness of Christ to believers; and it may on as good grounds be charged with absurdities as the other. It is not therefore said that God judges that we have in our own persons done those very acts, and endured that penalty of the law which the Lord Christ did and endured. For this would overthrow all imputation. But what Christ did and suffered, that God imputes to believers to the justification of life, as if it had been done by themselves; and his righteousness as a public person is made theirs by im-

* *Peccavimus in primo homine quando ille peccavit, et illa ejus prævaricatio nostra etiam prævaricatio fuit. Non enim vere per Adami inobedientiam constitueremur peccatores, nisi inobedientia illius nostra etiam inobedientia esset. De Amis. Grat. et Stat. Peccat. lib. 5. cap. 18.*

putation, even as the sin of Adam whilst a public person, is made the sin of all his posterity by imputation.

Hereon none of the absurdities pretended, which are really such, do at all follow. It does not follow, that Christ in his own person performed every individual act that we in our circumstances are obliged to in a way of duty; nor was there any need that so he should do. This imputation, as I have showed, stands on other foundations. Nor does it follow, that every saved person's righteousness before God is the same identically and numerically with Christ's in his public capacity as mediator; for this objection destroys itself, by affirming that as it was his, it was the righteousness of God-man; and so it has an especial nature as it respects or relates to his person. It is the same that Christ in his public capacity wrought or effected. But there is a wide difference in the consideration of it, as his absolutely and as made ours. It was formally inherent in him, is only materially imputed to us; was actively his, is passively ours; was wrought in the person of God-man, for the whole church; is imputed to each single believer, as to his own concernment only. Adam's sin as imputed to us, is not the sin of a representative, though it be of him that was so; but is the particular sin of every one of us. But this objection must be further spoken to where it occurs afterwards. Nor will it follow, that on this supposition we should be accounted to have done, that which was done long before we were in a capacity of doing any thing. For what is done for us and in our stead, before we are in any such capacity, may be imputed to us, as is the sin of Adam. And yet there is a manifold sense wherein men may be said to have done what was done for them, and in their name before their actual existence; so that therein is no absurdity. As to what is added by the way, that Christ did not do nor suffer the *idem*, the identical thing, that we were obliged to; whereas he did what the law required, and suffered what the law threatened to the disobedient, which is the whole of what we are obliged to, it will not be so easily proved; nor the arguments very suddenly answered whereby the contrary has been confirmed. That Christ did sustain the place of a surety, or was the surety of the new covenant, the Scripture so expressly affirms, that it cannot be denied. And that there may be sureties in cases criminal, as well as civil and pecuniary, has been proved before. What else occurs about the singularity of Christ's obedience as he was mediator, proves only that his righteousness as formally and inherently his, was peculiar to himself, and

that the adjuncts of it which arise from its relation to his person, as it was inherent in him, are not communicable to them to whom it is imputed.

It is moreover urged "That upon the supposed imputation of the righteousness of Christ, it will follow that every believer is justified by the works of the law. For the obedience of Christ was a legal righteousness, and if that be imputed to us, then are we justified by the law, which is contrary to express testimonies of Scripture in many places." Ans. (1) I know nothing more frequent in the writings of some learned men, than that the righteousness of Christ is our legal righteousness; who yet I presume are able to free themselves of this objection. (2) If this follow in the true sense of being justified by the law, or the works of it, so denied in the Scripture, their weakness is much to be pitied who can see no other way whereby we may be freed from an obligation to be justified by the law, but by this imputation of the righteousness of Christ. (3) The Scripture which affirms that "by the deeds of the law no man can be justified," affirms in like manner, that "by faith we do not make void the law, but establish it;" that "the righteousness of the law is fulfilled in us;" that Christ "came not to destroy the law, but to fulfil it, and is the end of the law for righteousness unto them that believe." And that the law must be fulfilled or we cannot be justified, we shall prove afterwards. (4) We are not hereon justified by the law or the works of it, in the only sense of that proposition in the Scripture, and to coin new senses or significations of it, is not safe. The meaning of it in the Scripture is, that only "the doers of the law shall be justified," Rom. ii. 13; and that "he that doth the things of it shall live by them," chap. x. 5; namely, in his own person, by the way of personal duty which alone the law requires. But if we who have not fulfilled the law in the way of inherent personal obedience, are justified by the imputation of the righteousness of Christ to us, then are we justified by Christ and not by the law. But it is said, that "this will not relieve, for if his obedience be so imputed to us, that we are accounted by God in judgment to have done what Christ did, we are as much justified by the law as if we had in our own proper persons performed an unsinning obedience to it." This I confess I cannot understand. The nature of this imputation is here represented as formally, in such a way as we cannot acknowledge; from thence alone this inference is made, which yet in my judgment does not follow

thereon. For grant an imputation of the righteousness of another to us, be it of what nature it will, all justification by the law and works of it in the sense of the Scripture is gone for ever. The admission of imputation takes off all power from the law to justify; for it can justify none, but upon a righteousness that is originally and inherently his own. "The man that doth them shall live in them." If the righteousness that is imputed be the ground and foundation of our justification, and made ours by that imputation, state it how you will, that justification is of grace and not of the law. However I know not of any that say we are accounted of God in judgment personally to have done what Christ did; and it may have a sense that is false; namely, that God should judge us in our own persons to have done those acts which we never did. But what Christ did for us and in our stead, is imputed and communicated to us, as we coalesce into one mystical person with him by faith, and thereon are we justified. And this absolutely overthrows all justification by the law or the works of it; though the law be established, fulfilled and accomplished, that we may be justified.

Neither can any on the supposition of the imputation of the righteousness of Christ truly stated, be said to merit their own salvation. Satisfaction and merit are adjuncts of the righteousness of Christ as formally inherent in his own person; and as such it cannot be transfused into another. Wherefore as it is imputed to individual believers, it has not these properties accompanying it which belong only to its existence in the person of the Son of God. But this was spoken to before, as much also of what was necessary to be here repeated.

These objections I have in this place taken notice of, because the answers given to them tend to the further explanation of that truth, whose confirmation by arguments and testimonies of Scripture I shall now proceed to.

CHAPTER X.

ARGUMENTS FOR JUSTIFICATION BY THE IMPUTATION OF THE
RIGHTEOUSNESS OF CHRIST. THE FIRST ARGUMENT FROM THE
NATURE AND USE OF OUR OWN PERSONAL RIGHTEOUSNESS.

THERE is a justification of convinced sinners on their believing. Hereon are their sins pardoned, their persons accepted with God, and a right is given to them, to the heavenly inheritance. This state they are immediately taken into upon their faith, or believing in Jesus Christ. And a state it is of actual peace with God. These things at present I take for granted, and they are the foundation of all that I shall plead in the present argument. And I take notice of them because some seem, to the best of my understanding, to deny any real actual justification of sinners on their believing in this life. For they make justification to be only a general conditional sentence declared in the gospel, which as to its execution, is delayed to the day of judgment. For whilst men are in this world, the whole condition of it being not fulfilled, they cannot be partakers of it, or be actually and absolutely justified. Hereon it follows, that indeed there is no real state of assured rest and peace with God by Jesus Christ, for any persons in this life. This at present I shall not dispute about, because it seems to me to overthrow the whole gospel, the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and all the comfort of believers about which I hope we are not as yet called to contend.

Our inquiry is, how convinced sinners do on their believing obtain the remission of sins, acceptance with God, and a right to eternal life. And if this can no other way be done, but by the imputation of the righteousness of Christ to them, then thereby alone are they justified in the sight of God. And this assertion proceeds on a supposition that there is a righteousness required to the justification of any person whatever. For whereas God in the justification of any person, declares him to be acquitted from all crimes laid to his charge, and to stand as righteous in his sight, it must be on the consideration of a righteousness, whereon any man is so acquitted and declared; for the judgment of God is according to truth. This we have sufficiently evidenced before in that juridical procedure wherein the Scripture represents to us the justification of a believing

sinner. And if there be no other righteousness whereby we may be thus justified, but only that of Christ imputed to us, then thereby must we be justified or not at all. And if there be any such other righteousness, it must be our own, inherent in us, and wrought out by us. For these two kinds inherent and imputed righteousness, our own and Christ's, divide the whole nature of righteousness, as to the end inquired after. And that there is no such inherent righteousness, no such righteousness of our own whereby we may be justified before God, I shall prove in the first place. And I shall do it, first from express testimonies of Scripture, and then from the consideration of the thing itself. And two things I shall premise hereto.

1. That I shall not consider this righteousness of our own absolutely in itself, but as it may be conceived to be improved and advanced by its relation to the satisfaction and merit of Christ; for many will grant that our inherent righteousness is not of itself sufficient to justify us in the sight of God; but take it as it has value and worth communicated to it from the merit of Christ, and so it is accepted to that end, and judged worthy of eternal life. We could not merit life and salvation, had not Christ merited that grace for us whereby we may do so; and merited also that our works should be of such a dignity with respect to reward. We shall therefore allow what worth can be reasonably thought to be communicated to this righteousness from its respect to the merit of Christ.

2. Whereas persons of all sorts and parties take various ways in the assigning of an interest in our justification to our own righteousness, so that no parties are agreed about it, nor many of the same mind among themselves, as might easily be manifested in the Papists, Socinians, and others, I shall so far as it is possible in the ensuing arguments have respect to them all. For my design is to prove, that it has no such interest in our justification before God, as that the righteousness of Christ should not be esteemed the only righteousness whereon we are justified.

And first, we shall produce some of those many testimonies which may be pleaded to this purpose, *Psa. cxxx. 3, 4.* "If thou Lord shouldst mark iniquities, O Lord, who should stand? But there is forgiveness with thee that thou mayest be feared." There is an inquiry included in these words, how a man, how any man may be justified before God; how he may "stand," that is, in the presence of God, and be accepted with him; how he shall stand in judgment, as it is explained, *Psa. i. 5.* "The

wicked shall not stand in the judgment," shall not be acquitted on their trial. That which first offers itself to this end, is his own obedience. For this the law requires of him in the first place, and this his own conscience calls upon him for. But the Psalmist plainly declares that no man can thence manage a plea for his justification with any success. And the reason is, because notwithstanding the best of the obedience of the best of men, there are iniquities found with them against the Lord their God. And if men come to their trial before God whether they shall be justified or condemned, these also must be heard and taken into the account. But then no man can "stand," no man can "be justified," as it is elsewhere expressed. Wherefore the wisest and safest course is, as to our justification before God, utterly to forego this plea, and not to insist on our own obedience, lest our sins should appear also, and be heard. No reason can any man give on his own account, why they should not so be. And if they be so, the best of men will be cast in their trial, as the Psalmist declares.

Two things are required in this trial that a sinner may stand. (1) That his iniquities be not observed, for if they be so, he is lost for ever. (2) That a righteousness be produced and pleaded that will endure the trial. For justification is upon a justifying righteousness. For the first of these, the Psalmist tells us, it must be through pardon or forgiveness. "But there is forgiveness with thee," wherein lies our only relief against the condemnatory sentence of the law with respect to our iniquities; that is, through the blood of Christ; for in him "we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins," Ephes. i. 7. The other cannot be our own obedience, because of our iniquities. Wherefore this the same Psalmist directs us to. *Psa. lxxi. 16.* "I will go in the strength of the Lord God; I will make mention of thy righteousness, of thine only." The righteousness of God, and not his own, yea in opposition to his own, is the only plea that in this case he would insist upon.

If no man can stand a trial before God upon his own obedience, so as to be justified before him, because of his own personal iniquities; and if our only plea in that case be the righteousness of God, the righteousness of God only and not our own, then is there no personal inherent righteousness in any believers whereon they may be justified; which is that which is to be proved.

The same is again asserted by the same person, and that more plainly and directly. *Psa. cxliii. 2.* "Enter not into judgment

with thy servant, for in thy sight shall no man living be justified." This testimony is the more to be considered, because as it is derived from the law, Exod. xxxiv. 7, so it is transferred to the gospel, and twice urged by the Apostle to the same purpose. Rom. iii. 20; Gal. ii. 16.

The person who insists on this plea with God, professes himself to be his servant. Enter not into judgment with thy servant; that is, one that loved him, feared him, yielded all sincere obedience. He was not a hypocrite, not an unbeliever, not an unregenerate person, who had performed no works but such as were legal, such as the law required, and such as were done in the strength of the law only; such works as all will acknowledge to be excluded from our justification; and which as many judge, are only those which are so excluded. David it was, who was not only converted, a true believer, had the Spirit of God, and the aids of special grace in his obedience, but had this testimony to his sincerity, that he was "a man after God's own heart." And this witness had he in his own conscience of his integrity, uprightness, and personal righteousness, so that he frequently avows them, appeals to God concerning the truth of them, and pleads them as a ground of judgment between him and his adversaries. We have therefore a case stated in the instance of a sincere and eminent believer, who excelled most in inherent personal righteousness.

This person under these circumstances, thus testified to, both by God and in his own conscience, as to the sincerity, yea, as to the eminency of his obedience, considers how he may stand before God, and be justified in his sight. Why does he not now plead his own merits, and that, if not *ex condigno*, yet at least *ex congruo*, he deserved to be acquitted and justified? But he left this plea for that generation of men that were to come after, who would "justify themselves," and despise others. But suppose he had no such confidence in the merit of his works as some have now attained to, yet why does he not freely enter into judgment with God, put it to the trial whether he should be justified or not, by pleading that he had fulfilled the condition of the new covenant, that everlasting covenant which God made with him, ordered in all things and sure? For upon a supposition of the procurement of that covenant and the terms of it, by Christ, (for I suppose the virtue of that purchase he made of it, is allowed to extend to the Old Testament) this was all that was required of him. Is it not to

be feared that he was one of them who see no necessity of personal holiness and righteousness, seeing he makes no mention of it, how it should stand him in the greatest stead? At least he might plead his faith as his own duty and work to be imputed to him for righteousness. But whatever the reason be, he waves them all, and absolutely deprecates a trial upon them. "Come not," says he, "O Lord, into judgment with thy servant," as it is promised that he who believes should not come into judgment. John v. 24.

And if this holy person renounce the whole consideration of all his personal inherent righteousness, in every kind, and will not insist upon it under any pretence, in any place, as to any use in his justification before God, we may safely conclude there is no such righteousness in any whereby they may be justified. And if men would but leave those shades and coverts under which they hide themselves in their disputations, if they would forego those pretences and distinctions wherewith they delude themselves and others, and tell us plainly what plea they dare make in the presence of God, from their own righteousness and obedience that they may be justified before him, we should better understand their minds than now we do. There is one, I confess, who speaks with some confidence to this purpose. And that is Vasquez the Jesuit.* "Inherent righteousness renders the soul so just and holy, and consequently a child of God, that in fact it renders it an heir worthy of eternal glory. Nay, God himself cannot cause that a righteous man of this kind should not be worthy of eternal bliss! Is it not sad that David should discover so much ignorance of the worth of his inherent righteousness, and discover so much pusillanimity with respect to his trial before God, whereas God himself could not otherwise order it, but that he was and must be worthy of eternal blessedness?"

The reason the Psalmist gives why he will not put it to the trial whether he should be acquitted or justified upon his own obedience, is this general axiom, "for in thy sight," or before thee, "shall no man living be justified." This must be spoken absolutely, or with respect to some one way or cause of justification. If it be spoken absolutely, then this work ceases for ever, and there is indeed no such thing as justification before

* *Inherens justitia ita reddit animam justam et sanctam, ac proinde filiam Dei, ut hoc ipso reddat eam hæredem. et dignam æterna gloria; imo ipse Deus efficere non potest ut hujusmodi justus dignus non sit æterna beatitudine.*

God. But this is contrary to the whole Scripture, and destructive of the gospel. Wherefore it is spoken with respect to our own obedience and works. He does not pray absolutely that he would not enter into judgment with him, for this were to forego his government of the world, but that he would not do so on the account of his own duties and obedience. But if so be these duties and that obedience answered in any sense or way, what is required of us as a righteousness to justification, there was no reason why he should deprecate a trial by them or upon them. But whereas the Holy Ghost so positively affirms, that no man living shall be justified in the sight of God, by or upon his own works or obedience, it is, I confess, marvellous to me, that some should so interpret the Apostle James, as if he affirmed the express contrary; namely, that we are justified in the sight of God by our own works, whereas indeed he says no such thing. This therefore is an eternal rule of truth, by, or upon his own obedience, no man living can be justified in the sight of God. It will be said "that if God enter into judgment with any on their own obedience by and according to the law, then indeed none can be justified before him. But God judging according to the gospel, and the terms of the new covenant, men may be justified upon their own duties, works, and obedience." Ans. (1) The negative assertion is general, and unlimited; that no man living shall (on his own works or obedience) be justified in the sight of God. And to limit it to this or that way of judging, is not to distinguish but to contradict the Holy Ghost. (2) The judgment intended is only with respect to justification, as is plain in the words. But there is no judgment on our works or obedience, with respect to righteousness and justification, but by the proper rule and measure of them, which is the law. If they will not endure the trial by the law, they will endure no trial as to righteousness and justification in the sight of God. (3) The prayer and plea of the Psalmist on this supposition, are to this purpose: "O Lord, enter not into judgment with thy servant, by or according to the law; but enter into judgment with me, on my own works and obedience according to the rule of the gospel;" for which he gives this reason, "because in thy sight shall no man living be justified;" how remote this from his intention need not be declared. (4) The judgment of God to justification according to the gospel, does not proceed on our works of obedience, but upon the righteousness of Christ, and our interest therein by

faith, as is too evident to be modestly denied. Notwithstanding this exception, therefore, hence we argue;—

If the most holy of the servants of God, in and after a course of sincere fruitful obedience, testified to by God himself, and witnessed in their own consciences, that is, whilst they have the greatest evidences of their own sincerity, and that indeed they are the servants of God, do renounce all thoughts of such a righteousness thereby, as whereon in any sense they may be justified before God; then there is no such righteousness in any, but it is the righteousness of Christ alone imputed to us whereon we are so justified. But that so they do, and ought all of them so to do, because of the general rule here laid down, that in the sight of God no man living shall be justified, is plainly affirmed in this testimony.

I no way doubt but that many learned men, after all their pleas for an interest of personal righteousness and works in our justification before God, do as to their own practice betake themselves to this method of the Psalmist, and cry as the prophet Daniel does in the name of the Church; “we do not present our supplications before thee for our righteousness, but for thy great mercies,” Dan. ix. 18. And therefore Job (as we have formerly observed) after a long and earnest defence of his own faith, integrity, and personal righteousness, wherein he justified himself against the charge of Satan and men, being called to plead his cause in the sight of God, and declare on what grounds he expected to be justified before him, renounces all his former pleas, and betakes himself to the same with the Psalmist, Job xl. 4; xlii. 6.

It is true in particular cases, and as to some especial end in the providence of God, a man may plead his own integrity and obedience before God himself. So did Hezekiah when he prayed for the sparing of his life, Isa. xxxviii. 3. “Remember now, O Lord, I beseech thee, how I have walked before thee in truth, and with a perfect heart, and have done that which is good in thy sight.” This I say may be done with respect to temporal deliverance, or any other particular end wherein the glory of God is concerned. So was it greatly in sparing the life of Hezekiah at that time. For whereas he had with great zeal and industry reformed religion, and restored the true worship of God, the cutting him off in the midst of his days, would have occasioned the idolatrous multitude to have reflected on him as one dying under a token of divine displeasure. But none ever made this plea before God, for the absolute justifica-

tion of their persons. So Nehemiah in that great contest which he had about the worship of God, and the service of his house, pleads the remembrance of it before God, in his justification against his adversaries, but resolves his own personal acceptance with God into pardoning mercy; "and spare me according to the multitude of thy mercies," Neh. xiii. 22.

Another testimony we have to the same purpose, in the prophet Isaiah, speaking in the name of the Church, Isa. lxiv. 6. "We are all as an unclean thing, and all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags." It is true the prophet in this place makes a deep confession of the sins of the people. But yet withal he joins himself with them, and asserts the especial interest of those concerning whom he speaks by adoption; that God was their Father, and they his people, Isa. lxiii. 16; lxiv. 8, 9. And the righteousnesses of all that are the children of God are of the same kind; however they may differ in degrees, and some of them may be more righteous than others. But it is all of it described to be such, that we cannot, I think, justly expect justification in the sight of God, upon the account of it. But whereas the consideration of the nature of our inherent righteousness belongs to the second way of the confirmation of our present argument, I shall not further here insist on this testimony.

Many others also to the same purpose, I shall wholly omit; namely, all those wherein the saints of God or the Church, in an humble acknowledgment and confession of their own sins, betake themselves to the mercy and grace of God alone, as dispensed through the mediation and blood of Christ; and all those wherein God promises to pardon and blot out our iniquities for his own sake, for his name's sake; to bless the people not for any good that was in them, nor for their righteousness, nor for their works, the consideration whereof he excludes from having any influence on any actings of his grace towards them; and all those wherein God expresses his delight in them alone, and his approbation of them who hope in his mercy, trust in his name, betaking themselves to him as their only refuge, pronouncing them accursed who trust in any thing else, or glory in themselves; such as contain singular promises to them that betake themselves to God, as fatherless, hopeless, and lost in themselves.

The testimonies which are multiplied to this purpose, sufficiently prove, that the best of God's saints have not a righteousness of their own, whereon they can in any sense be justified

before God. For they all, in the places referred to, renounce any such righteousness of their own, all that is in them, all that they have done or can do, and betake themselves to grace and mercy alone. And whereas, as we have before proved, God in the justification of any, exercises grace towards them with respect to a righteousness, whereon he declares them righteous and accepted before him, they all respect a righteousness which is not inherent in us but imputed to us.

Herein lies the substance of all that we inquire into, in this matter of justification. All other disputes about any kind of interest for our own works and obedience in our justification before God, are but the speculations of men at ease. The conscience of a convicted sinner, who presents himself in the presence of God, finds all practically reduced to this one point, namely, whether he will trust to his own personal inherent righteousness, or in a full renunciation of it, betake himself to the grace of God, and the righteousness of Christ alone. In other things he is not concerned. And let a man phrase his own righteousness as he pleases, let him pretend it meritorious, or only evangelical, not legal, only an accomplishment of the condition of the new covenant, a cause without which he cannot be justified, it will not be easy to frame his mind to any confidence in it, as to justification before God; so as not to deceive him in the issue.

The second part of the present argument is taken from the nature of the thing itself, or the consideration of this personal inherent righteousness of our own, what it is and wherein it consists, and of what use it may be in our justification. And to this purpose it may be observed,

1. That we grant an inherent righteousness in all that believe, as has been before declared. "For the fruit of the Spirit is in all goodness and righteousness and truth," Ephes. v. 9. "Being made free from sin, we become the servants of righteousness," Rom. vi. 18. And our duty it is to "follow after righteousness, godliness, faith, love, meekness," 1 Tim. ii. 22. And although righteousness be mostly taken for an especial grace or duty, distinct from other graces and duties, yet we acknowledge that it may be taken for the whole of our obedience before God; and the word is so used in the Scripture, where our own righteousness is opposed to the righteousness of God. And it is either habitual or actual. There is an habitual righteousness inherent in believers, as they have "put on the new man which after God is created in righteousness

and true holiness," Ephes. iv. 24; as they are the "workmanship of God created in Jesus Christ unto good works," ii. 8. And there is an actual righteousness consisting in those good works whereto we are so created, or the fruits of righteousness, which are to the praise of God by Jesus Christ. And concerning this righteousness it may be observed; (1) that men are said in the Scripture, to be just or righteous by it, but no one is said to be justified by it before God; (2) that it is not ascribed to, or found in any, but those that are actually justified in order of nature antecedent thereto.

This being the constant doctrine of all the Reformed churches and divines, it is an open calumny whereby the contrary is ascribed to them, or any of those who believe the imputation of the righteousness of Christ for our justification before God. So Bellarmine affirms that no Protestant writers acknowledge an inherent righteousness, but only Bucer and Chemnitius, when there is no one of them, by whom either the thing itself, or the necessity of it, is denied. But some excuse may be made for him, from the manner whereby they expressed themselves, wherein they always carefully distinguished between inherent holiness, and that righteousness whereby we are justified. But we are now told by one, that if we should affirm it an hundred times he could scarce believe us. This is somewhat severe; for although he speaks but to one, yet the charge falls equally upon all who maintain that imputation of the righteousness of Christ, which he denies; who being at least the generality of all Protestant divines, they are represented either as so foolish, as not to know what they say, or so dishonest as to say one thing and believe another. But he endeavours to justify his censure by sundry reasons; and first he says, "that inherent righteousness can on no other account be said to be ours, than that by it we are made righteous; that is, that it is the condition of our justification required in the new covenant. This being denied, all inherent righteousness is denied." But how is this proved? What if one should say, that every believer is inherently righteous, but yet that this inherent righteousness was not the condition of his justification, but rather the consequence of it, and that it is no where required in the new covenant as the condition of our justification, how shall the contrary be made to appear? The Scripture plainly affirms that there is such an inherent righteousness in all that believe; and yet as plainly that we are justified before God, by faith without works. Wherefore that it is the condition of our justifica-

tion and so antecedent to it, is expressly contrary to that of the Apostle; "to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness." Rom. iv. 5. Nor is it the condition of the covenant itself, as that whereon the whole grace of the covenant is suspended. For as it is habitual, wherein the denomination of righteous is principally taken, it is a grace of the covenant itself, and so not a condition of it, Jerem. xxxi. 33; xxxii. 39; Ezek. xxxvi. 25—27. If no more be intended, but that it is as to its actual exercise what is indispensably required of all that are taken into covenant, in order to the complete ends of it, we are agreed. But hence it will not follow that it is the condition of our justification. It is added, "that all righteousness respects a law and a rule, by which it is to be tried. And he is righteous, who has done these things which that law requires, by whose rule he is to be judged." But (1) this is not the way whereby the Scripture expresses our justification before God, which alone is under consideration; namely, that we bring to it a personal righteousness of our own, answering the law whereby we are to be judged. Yea an assertion to this purpose is foreign to the gospel, and destructive of the grace of God by Jesus Christ. (2) It is granted, that all righteousness respects a law as the rule of it; and so does this whereof we speak, namely, the moral law, which being the sole eternal unchangeable rule of righteousness, if it do not in the substance of it answer thereto, a righteousness it is not. But this it does in as much, as that so far as it is habitual, it consists in the renovation of the image of God, wherein that law is written in our hearts; and all the actual duties of it are as to the substance of them, what is required by that law. But as to the manner of its communication to us, and of its performance by us from faith in God by Jesus Christ, and love to him, as the author and fountain of all grace and mercy procured and administered by him, it has respect to the gospel. What will follow from hence? why, that he is just who does those things which that law requires whereby he is to be judged. He is so certainly. For "not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified," Rom. ii. 13. "So Moses describeth the righteousness of the law, that the man that doth those things shall live in them," Rom. x. 5. But although the righteousness whereof we discourse, be required by the law, as certainly it is, for it is nothing but the law in our hearts, from whence we walk in the ways and keep the

statutes or commandments of God; yet does it not so answer the law, as that any man can be justified by it. But then it will be said, that if it does not answer that law and rule whereby we are to be judged, then it is no righteousness; for all righteousness must answer the law whereby it is required. And I say it is most true, it is no perfect righteousness; it does not so answer the rule and law, so that we can be justified by it, or safely judged on it. But so far as it does answer the law, it is a righteousness, that is, imperfectly so, and therefore is an imperfect righteousness; which yet gives the denomination of righteous to them that have it, both absolutely and comparatively. It is said therefore, "that it is the law of grace or the gospel from whence we are denominated righteous with this righteousness." But that we are by the gospel denominated righteous from any righteousness that is not required by the moral law, will not be proved. Nor does the law of grace or the gospel any where require of us, or prescribe to us this righteousness, as that whereon we are to be justified before God. It requires faith in Christ Jesus, or the receiving of him as he is proposed in the promises of it, in all that are to be justified. It requires in like manner repentance from dead works in all that believe; as also the fruits of faith, conversion to God and repentance, in the works of righteousness, which are to the praise of God by Jesus Christ; with perseverance therein to the end. And all this may, if you please, be called our evangelical righteousness, as being our obedience to God according to the gospel. But yet the graces and duties wherein it consists, do no more perfectly answer the commands of the gospel, than they do those of the moral law. For that the gospel abates from the holiness of the law, and makes that to be no sin which is sin by the law, or approves absolutely of less intention or lower degrees in the love of God, than the law does, is an impious imagination.

And that the gospel requires all these things entirely and equally, as the condition of our justification before God, and so antecedently thereto, is not yet proved, nor ever will be. It is hence concluded, "that this is our righteousness, according to the evangelical law which requires it: by this we are made righteous, that is, not guilty of the non-performance of the condition required in that law." And these things are said to be "very plain." So no doubt they seemed to the author; to us they are intricate and perplexed. However, I wholly deny that our faith, obedience, and righteousness, considered as ours,

as wrought by us, although they are all accepted with God through Jesus Christ according to the grace declared in the gospel, do perfectly answer the commands of the gospel, requiring them of us, as to matter, manner, and degree; and therefore it is utterly impossible that they should be the cause or condition of our justification before God. Yet in the explanation of these things, it is added by the same author, "that our maimed and imperfect righteousness is accepted to salvation, as if it were every way absolute and perfect; for that so it should be, Christ has merited by his most perfect righteousness." But it is justification alone and not salvation that we discourse about; and that the works of obedience or righteousness have another respect to salvation, than they have to justification, is too plainly and too often expressed in the Scripture, to be modestly denied. And if this weak and imperfect righteousness of ours, be esteemed and accepted as every way perfect before God, then either it is because God judges it to be perfect, and so declares us to be most just, and justified thereon in his sight, or he judges it not to be complete and perfect, yet declares us to be perfectly righteous in his sight thereby. Neither of these I suppose can well be granted. It will therefore be said, it is neither of them; but "Christ has obtained by his complete and most perfect righteousness and obedience, that this lame and imperfect righteousness of ours should be accepted as every way perfect." And if it be so, it may be some will think it best not to go about by this weak, halt, and imperfect righteousness, but as to their justification betake themselves immediately to the most perfect righteousness of Christ, which I am sure the Scripture encourages them to. And they will be ready to think, that the righteousness which cannot justify itself, but must be obliged to grace and pardon through the merits of Christ, will never be able to justify them. But what will ensue on this explanation of the acceptance of our imperfect righteousness to justification upon the merit of Christ? This only so far as I can discern, that Christ has merited and procured, either that God should judge that to be perfect, which is imperfect and declare us perfectly righteous when we are not so, or that he should judge the righteousness still to be imperfect (as it is) but declare us to be perfectly righteous with and by this imperfect righteousness. These are the plain paths that men walk in, who cannot deny but that there is a righteousness required to our justification, or that we may be declared righteous before God, in the sight of God, according to the judgment of God

yet denying the imputation of the righteousness of Christ to us, will allow of no other righteousness to this end, but that which is so weak and imperfect as that no man can justify it in his own conscience, nor without a phrensy of pride, can think or imagine himself perfectly righteous thereby.

And whereas it is added, that "he is blind who sees not that this righteousness of ours is subordinate to the righteousness of Christ," I must acknowledge myself otherwise minded, notwithstanding the severity of this censure. It seems to me that the righteousness of Christ is subordinate to this righteousness of our own, as here it is stated, and not the contrary. For the end of all is our acceptance with God as righteous. But according to these thoughts, it is our own righteousnesses whereon we are immediately accepted with God as righteous. Only Christ has deserved by his righteousness, that our righteousness may be so accepted, and is therefore as to the end of our justification before God, subordinate thereto.

But to return from this digression, and to proceed to our argument; this personal inherent righteousness which according to the Scripture we allow in believers, is not that whereby, or wherewith, we are justified before God. For it is not perfect, nor perfectly answers any rule of obedience that is given to us, and so cannot be our righteousness before God to our justification. Wherefore we must be justified by the righteousness of Christ imputed to us, or be justified without respect to any righteousness, or not be justified at all. And a threefold imperfection accompanies it.

First, as to the principle of it, as it is habitually resident in us. For (1) There is a contrary principle of sin abiding with it in the same subject whilst we are in this world. For contrary qualities may be in the same subject whilst neither of them is in the highest degree. So it is in this case, Gal. v. 17. "For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh, and these are contrary one to the other, so that ye cannot do the things that ye would." (2) None of the faculties of our souls are perfectly renewed whilst we are in this world. "The inward man is renewed day by day." 2 Cor. iv. 16. And we are always to be purging ourselves from all pollution of flesh and spirit, 2 Cor. vii. 1. And hereto belongs whatever is spoken in the Scripture, whatever believers find in themselves by experience of the remainders of indwelling sin, in the darkness of our minds, whence at best we know but in part, and through ignorance are ready to wander out of the

way, Heb. v. 2 ; in the deceitfulness of the heart, and disorder of affections. I understand not how any one can think of pleading his own righteousness in the sight of God, or suppose that he can be justified by it upon this single account of the imperfection of its inherent habit or principle. Such notions arise from the ignorance of God and ourselves, or the want of a due consideration of the one and the other. Neither can I apprehend how a thousand distinctions can safely introduce it into any place or consideration in our justification before God. He that can search in any measure by a spiritual light into his own heart and soul, will find, "God be merciful to me a sinner," a better plea than any he can be furnished with from any worth of his own. "What is man that he should be clean, and he that is born of a woman that he should be righteous?" Job xv. 14—16 ; xviii. 19. Hence says Gregory in Job ix. lib. 9. cap. 14. *Ut sæpe diximus, omnis justitia humana injustitia esse convincitur si distincte judicetur.* Bernard speaks to the same purpose, and almost in the same words, Serm. fest. omni. sanct. *Quid potest esse omnis humana justitia coram Deo? nomine jacta prophetam, velut pannus menstruatus reputabitur; et si distincte judicetur, injustitia invenietur omnis justitia nostra et minus habens.* A man cannot be justified in any sense by that righteousness which upon trial will appear rather to be an unrighteousness.

2. It is imperfect with respect to every act and duty of it, whether internal or external. There is iniquity cleaving to our holy things, and "all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags," Isa. lxiv. 6. It has been often and well observed, that if a man, the best of men, were left to choose the best of his works that ever he performed, and thereon to enter into judgment with God, if only under this notion, that he has answered and fulfilled the condition required of him, as to his acceptance with God, it would be his wisest course, (at least it would be so in the judgment of Bellarmine) to renounce it, and betake himself to grace and mercy alone.

3. It is imperfect by reason of incursion of actual sins. Hence our Saviour has taught us continually to pray for the forgiveness of our sins; and "if we say, that we have no sin we deceive ourselves;" for "in many things we offend all." And what confidence can be placed in this righteousness, which those who plead for it in this cause, acknowledge to be weak, maimed and imperfect?

I have but touched on these things, which might have been

handled at large, and are indeed of great consideration in our present argument. But enough has been spoken to manifest, that although this righteousness of believers be on other accounts like the fruit of the vine, that "glads the heart of God and man," yet as to our justification before God, it is like the wood of the vine, a pin is not to be taken from it to hang any weight of this cause upon.

Two things are pleaded in the behalf of this righteousness and its influence on our justification. (1) That it is absolutely complete and perfect. Hence some say that they are perfect and sinless in this life. They have no more concern in the mortification of sin, and growth in grace. And indeed this is the only rational pretence of ascribing our justification before God thereto. For were it so with any, what should hinder him from being justified thereon before God, but only that he has been a sinner, which spoils the whole market? But this vain imagination is so contrary to the Scripture, and the experience of all that know the terror of the Lord, and what it is to walk humbly before him, that I shall not insist on the refutation of it. (2) It is pleaded, that although this righteousness be not an exact fulfilling of the moral law, yet is it the accomplishment of the condition of the new covenant, or entirely answers the law of grace, and all that is required of us therein.

Ans. 1. This wholly takes away sin and the pardon of it, no less than does the conceit of sinless perfection which we now rejected. For if our obedience answer the only law and rule of it whereby it is to be tried, measured and judged, then is there no sin in us nor need of pardon. No more is required of any man to keep him absolutely free from sin, but that he fully answer, and exactly comply with the rule and law of his obedience whereby he must be judged. On this supposition therefore there is neither sin, nor any need of the pardon of it. To say that there is still both sin, and need of pardon with respect to the moral law of God, is to confess that law to be the rule of our obedience, which this righteousness no way answers; and therefore none by it can be justified in the sight of God.

2. Although this righteousness be accepted in justified persons by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, yet consider the principle of it, with all the acts and duties wherein it consists, as they are required and prescribed in the gospel to us, and they do neither jointly nor severally fulfil and answer the commands of the gospel, no more than they do the commands of

the law. Wherefore they cannot all of them constitute a righteousness consisting in an exact conformity to the rules of the gospel, or the law of it. For it is impious to imagine that the gospel requiring any duty of us, suppose the love of God, makes any abatement, as to the matter, manner, or degrees of perfection in it, from what was required by the law. Does the gospel require a lower degree of love to God, a less perfect love than the law did? God forbid. The same may be said concerning the inward frame of our natures, and all other duties whatever; wherefore although this righteousness is accepted in justified persons, (as God had respect to Abel, and then to his offering) in the way and to the ends that shall be afterwards declared; yet as it relates to the commands of the gospel, both it and all the duties of it, are no less imperfect, than it would be, if it should be left to its trial by the law of creation only.

3. I know not what some men intend. On the one hand they affirm that our Lord Jesus Christ has enlarged and heightened the spiritual sense of the moral law, and not only so, but added to it new precepts of more exact obedience than it required. But on the other they would have him to have brought down or taken off the obligation of the law, so that a man, according as he has adapted it to the use of the gospel, shall be judged of God to have fulfilled the whole obedience which it requires, who never answered any one precept of it according to its original sense and obligation. For so it must be, if this imperfect righteousness be on any account esteemed a fulfilling of the rule of our obedience, so that thereon we should be justified in the sight of God.

4. This opinion puts an irreconcilable difference between the law and the gospel, not to be composed by any distinctions. For according to it, God declares by the gospel a man to be perfectly righteous, justified and blessed, upon the consideration of a righteousness, that is imperfect; and in the law he pronounces every one accursed who continues not in all things required by it, and as they are therein required. But it is said that this righteousness is not otherwise to be considered, but as the condition of the new covenant wherein we obtain remission of sins on the sole account of the satisfaction of Christ wherein our justification consists.

Ans. 1. Some indeed do say so, but not all, not the most, not the most learned with whom in this controversy we have to do. And in our pleas for what we believe to be the truth,

we cannot always have respect to every private opinion whereby it is opposed. (2) That justification consists only in the pardon of sin, is so contrary to the signification of the word, the constant use of it in the Scripture, the common notion of it amongst mankind, the sense of men in their own consciences who find themselves under an obligation to duty, and express testimonies of the Scripture, that I somewhat wonder, how it can be pretended. But it shall be spoken to elsewhere. (3) If this righteousness be the fulfilling of the condition of the new covenant whereon we are justified, it must be in itself such as exactly answers some rule or law of righteousness, and so be perfect, which it does not; and therefore cannot bear the place of a righteousness in our justification. (4) That this righteousness is the condition of our justification before God, or that interest in the righteousness of Christ whereby we are justified, is not proved, nor ever will be.

I shall briefly add two or three considerations excluding this personal righteousness from its pretended interest in our justification, and close this argument.

I. That righteousness which neither answers the law of God, nor the end of God in our justification by the gospel, is not that whereon we are justified. But such is this inherent righteousness of believers, even of the best of them. (1) That it answers not the law of God has been proved from its imperfection. Nor will any sober person pretend that it exactly and perfectly fulfils the law of our creation. And this law cannot be disannulled whilst the relation of creator and rewarder on the one hand, and of creatures capable of obedience and rewards on the other, continues. Wherefore that which answers not this law will not justify us. For God will not abrogate that law, that the transgressors of it may be justified. "Do we," saith the Apostle (by the doctrine of justification by faith without works) "make void the law? God forbid; yea, we establish it," Rom. iii. 31. (2) That we should be justified with respect to it, answers not the end of God in our justification by the gospel. For this is to take away all glorying in ourselves, and all occasion of it, every thing that might give countenance to it, so that the whole might be to the praise of his own grace by Christ, Rom. iii. 27; 1 Cor. i. 29—31. How it is faith alone that gives glory to God herein, has been declared in the description of its nature. But it is evident that no man has, or can have possibly any other, any greater occasion of boasting in himself, with respect to his justification, than that he is justified on his

performance of that condition of it, which consists in his own personal righteousness.

2. No man was ever justified by it in his own conscience, much less can he be justified by it in the sight of God. For God is greater than our hearts and knows all things. There is no man so righteous, so holy in the whole world, nor ever was, but his own conscience would charge him in many things with his coming short of the obedience required of him, in matter or manner, in the kind or degrees of perfection. For "there is no man that liveth and sinneth not." Absolutely *Nemo absolvitur se judice*. Let any man be put to a trial in himself whether he can be justified in his own conscience, by his own righteousness, and he will be cast in the trial at his own judgment-seat. And he that does not thereon conclude, that there must be another righteousness whereby he must be justified, that originally and inherently is not his own, will be at a loss for peace with God. But it will be said, that men may be justified in their consciences, that they have performed the condition of the new covenant, which is all that is pleaded with respect to this righteousness. And I no way doubt but that men may have a comfortable persuasion of their own sincerity in obedience, and satisfaction in the acceptance of it with God. But it is when they try it, as an effect of faith, whereby they are justified, and not as the condition of their justification. Let it be thus stated in their minds that God requires a personal righteousness in order to their justification, whereon their determination must be, this is my righteousness which I present to God that I may be justified, and they will find difficulty in arriving at it, if I be not much mistaken.

3. None of the holy men of old whose faith and experience are recorded in the Scripture, did ever plead their own personal righteousness under any notion of it, either as to the merit of their works, or as to their complete performance of what was required of them as the condition of the covenant in order to their justification before God. This has been spoken to before

CHAPTER XI.

THE NATURE OF THE OBEDIENCE THAT GOD REQUIRES OF US.
THE ETERNAL OBLIGATION OF THE LAW THERETO.

OUR second argument shall be taken from the nature of that obedience or righteousness which God requires of us, that we may be accepted of him and approved by him. This being a large subject if fully to be handled, I shall reduce what is of our present concernment in it to some special heads or observations.

1. God being a most perfect, and therefore a most free agent, all his actings towards mankind, all his dealings with them, all his constitutions and laws concerning them, are to be resolved into his own sovereign will and pleasure. No other reason can be given of the original, of the whole system of them. This the Scripture testifies to, Psa. cxv. 3; cxxxv. 6; Prov. xvi. 4; Ephes. i. 9, 11; Rev. iv. 11. The being, existence, and natural circumstances of all creatures, being an effect of the free counsel and pleasure of God, all that belongs to them must be ultimately resolved thereinto.

2. Upon a supposition of some free acts of the will of God and the execution of them, constituting an order in the things that outwardly are of him, and their mutual respect to one another, some things may become necessary in this relative state, whose being was not absolutely necessary in its own nature. The order of all things and their mutual respect to one another, depends on God's free constitution, no less than their being absolutely. But upon a supposition of that constitution, things have in that order, a necessary relation one to another, and all of them to God. Wherefore

3. It was a free sovereign act of God's will to create, effect or produce such a creature as man is; that is, of a nature intelligent, rational, capable of moral obedience with rewards and punishments. But on a supposition hereof, man so freely made, could not be governed any other ways but by a moral instrument of law or rule, influencing the rational faculties of his soul to obedience, and guiding him therein. He could not in that constitution be contained under the rule of God, by a mere physical influence, as are all irrational or brute creatures. To suppose it, is to deny or destroy the essential faculty and

powers wherewith he was created. Wherefore on the supposition of his being, it was necessary that a law or rule of obedience should be prescribed to him, and be the instrument of God's government towards him.

4. This necessary law, so far forth as it was necessary, did immediately and unavoidably ensue upon the constitution of our natures in relation to God. Supposing the nature, being, and properties of God, with the works of creation on the one hand; and supposing the being, existence, and the nature of man, with his necessary relation to God, on the other, the law whereof we speak is nothing but the rule of that relation, which can neither be, nor be preserved, without it. Hence is this law eternal, indispensable, admitting of no other variation, than does the relation between God and man, which necessarily arises from their distinct natures and properties.

5. The substance of this law was, that man adhering to God, absolutely, universally, unchangeably, uninterruptedly, in trust, love, and fear, as the chiefest good, the first Author of his being, of all the present and future advantages whereof it was capable, should yield obedience to him, with respect to his infinite wisdom, righteousness and almighty power, to protect, reward, and punish, in all things known to be his will and pleasure, either by the light of his own mind, or especial revelation made to him. And it is evident that no more is required to the constitution and establishment of this law, but that God be God, and man be man, with the necessary relation that must thereon ensue between them. Wherefore

6. This law eternally and unchangeably obliges all men to obedience to God; even that obedience which it requires, and in the manner wherein it requires it. For both the substance of what it requires, and the manner of the performance of it, as to measures and degrees, are equally necessary and unalterable, upon the suppositions laid down. For God cannot deny himself, nor is the nature of man changed as to the essence of it whereto alone respect is had in this law, by any thing that can fall out. And although God might superadd to the original obligations of this law, what arbitrary commands he pleased, such as did not necessarily proceed or arise from the relation between him and us, which might be, and be continued, without them; yet would they be resolved into that principle of this law, that God in all things was absolutely to be trusted and obeyed.

7. "Known unto God are all his works from the foundation

of the world." In the constitution of this order of things he made it possible, and foresaw it would be future, that man would rebel against the preceptive power of this law, and disturb that order of things wherein he was placed under his moral rule. This gave occasion to that effect of infinite divine righteousness, in constituting the punishment that man should fall under upon his transgression of this law. Neither was this an effect of arbitrary will and pleasure, any more than the law itself was. Upon the supposition of the creation of man, the law mentioned was necessary from all the divine properties of the nature of God; and upon a supposition that man would transgress that law, God being now considered as his ruler and governor, the constitution of the punishment due to his sin and transgression of it, was a necessary effect of divine righteousness. This it would not have been, had the law itself been arbitrary. But that being necessary, so was the penalty of its transgression. Wherefore the constitution of this penalty, is liable to no more change, alteration, or abrogation, than the law itself, without an alteration in the state and relation between God and man.

8. This is that law, which our Lord Jesus Christ came not to destroy, but to fulfil, that he might be the end of it for righteousness to them that believe. This law he abrogated not, nor could do so without a destruction of the relation that is between God and man, arising from or ensuing necessarily on their distinct beings and properties. But as this cannot be destroyed, so the Lord Christ came to a contrary end; namely, to repair and restore it where it was weakened. Wherefore

9. This law, the law of sinless perfect obedience, with its sentence of the punishment of death on all transgressors, does and must abide in force for ever in this world; for there is no more required hereto, but that God be God, and man be man. Yet shall this be further proved.

1. There is nothing, not one word in the Scripture intimating any alteration in, or abrogation of this law; so that any thing should not be duty which it makes to be duty, or any thing not be sin, which it makes to be sin, either as to matter or degrees; or that the thing which it makes to be sin, or which is sin by the rule of it, should not merit and deserve that punishment which is declared in the sanction of it, or threatened by it. "The wages of sin is death." If any testimony of Scripture can be produced to either of these purposes, namely, that either any thing is not sin, in the way of omission or commission, in

the matter or manner of its performance, which is made to be so by this law, or that any such sin, or any thing that would have been sin by this law, is exempted from the punishment threatened by it, as to merit or desert, it shall be attended to. It is therefore in universal force towards all mankind. There is no relief in this case; but "Behold the Lamb of God."

In exception hereto it is pleaded, that when it was first given to Adam, it was the rule and instrument of a covenant between God and man, a covenant of works and perfect obedience. But upon the entrance of sin, it ceased to have the nature of a covenant to any. And it has so ceased, that on an impossible supposition, that any man should fulfil the perfect righteousness of it, yet should he not be justified or obtain the benefit of the covenant thereby. It is not therefore only become ineffectual to us as a covenant by reason of our weakness and disability to perform it, but it has ceased in its own nature so to be. But these things as they are not to our present purpose, so are they wholly improved. For

1. Our discourse is not about the federal adjunct of the law, but about its moral nature only. It is enough, that as a law, it continues to oblige all mankind to perfect obedience under its original penalty. For hence it will unavoidably follow, that unless the commands of it be complied with and fulfilled, the penalty will fall on all that transgress it. And those who grant that this law is still in force as to its being a rule of obedience, or as to its requiring duties of us, grant all that we desire. For it requires no obedience, but what it did in its original constitution, that is, sinless and perfect; and it requires no duty, nor prohibits any sin, but under the penalty of death upon disobedience.

2. It is true, that he who is once a sinner, if he should afterwards yield all that perfect obedience to God that the law requires, could not thereby obtain the benefit of the promise of the covenant. But the sole reason of it is, because he is antecedently a sinner, and so obnoxious to the curse of the law. And no man can be obnoxious to its curse, and have a right to its promise at the same time. But so to lay the supposition, that the same person is by any means free from the curse due to sin, and then to deny that, upon the performance of that perfect sinless obedience which the law requires, he should not have right to the promise of life thereby, is to deny the truth of God, and to reflect the highest dishonour upon his justice. Jesus Christ himself was justified by this law. And it is in

mutably true, that "he who doth the things of it shall live therein."

3. It is granted, that man continued not in the observance of this law, as it was the rule of the covenant between God and him. It was not the covenant, but the rule of it, and its being such was superadded to its being as a law. For the covenant comprised things that were not any part of a result from the necessary relation of God and man. Wherefore man by his sin as to demerit, may be said to break this covenant, and as to any benefit to himself to disannul it. It is also true, that God did never formally and absolutely renew or give again this law as a covenant a second time. Nor was there any need that so he should do, unless it were declaratively only, for so it was renewed at Sinai. For the whole of it being an emanation of eternal right and truth, it abides and must abide in full force for ever. Wherefore it is only thus far broken as a covenant, that all mankind, having sinned against the commands of it, and so by guilt with the impotency to obedience which ensued thereon, defeated themselves of any interest in its promise, and possibility of attaining any such interest, cannot have any benefit by it. But as to its power to oblige all mankind to obedience, and the unchangeable truth of its promises and threatenings, it abides the same as it was from the beginning.

2dly, Take away this law, and there is left no standard of righteousness to mankind, no certain boundaries of good and evil, but those pillars whereon God has fixed the earth are left to move and float up and down like the isle of Delos in the sea. Some say, the rule of good and evil to men is not this law in its original constitution, but the light of nature, and the dictates of reason. If they mean that light which was primogenial and concreated with our natures, and those dictates of right and wrong which reason originally suggested and approved, they only say in other words, that this law is still the unalterable rule of obedience to all mankind. But if they intend the remaining light of nature that continues in every individual in this depraved state thereof, and that under such additional depravations as traditions, customs, prejudices, and lusts of all sorts, have affixed to the most, there is nothing more irrational, and it is that which is charged with no less inconvenience than that it leaves no certain boundaries of good and evil. That which is good to one, will on this ground be in its own nature evil to another, and so on the contrary; and all the idolaters that ever were in the world might on this pretence be excused.

3dly, Conscience bears witness hereto. There is no good nor evil required or forbidden by this law, that upon the discovery of it, any man in the world can persuade or bribe his conscience not to comply with it in judgment, as to his concernment therein. It will accuse and excuse, condemn and free him, according to the sentence of this law, let him do what he can to the contrary.

In brief it is acknowledged, that God by virtue of his supreme dominion over all, may in some instances change the nature and order of things, so that the precepts of the divine law shall not in them operate in their ordinary efficacy. So was it in the case of his command to Abraham to slay his son, and to the Israelites to rob the Egyptians. But on a supposition of the continuance of that order of things which this law is the preservative of, such is the intrinsic nature of the good and evil commanded and forbidden therein, that it is not the subject of divine dispensation, as even the schoolmen generally grant.

10. From what we have discoursed, two things unavoidably ensue.

1. That whereas all mankind have by sin fallen under the penalty threatened to the transgression of this law; and suffering of this penalty which is eternal death, being inconsistent with acceptance before God, or the enjoyment of blessedness, it is utterly impossible that any one individual of the posterity of Adam should be justified in the sight of God, accepted with him or blessed by him, unless this penalty be answered, undergone, and suffered by them or for them; the *δικαιωμα του Θεου* herein is not to be abolished but established.

2. That to the same end of acceptance with God, justification before him and blessedness from him, the righteousness of this eternal law must be fulfilled in us, in such a way, that in the judgment of God which is according to truth, we may be esteemed to have fulfilled it, and be dealt with accordingly. For upon a supposition of a failure herein, the sanction of the law is not arbitrary, so that the penalty may or may not be inflicted, but necessary from the righteousness of God as the supreme governor of all.

11. About the first of these our controversy is with the Socinians only, who deny the satisfaction of Christ, and any necessity thereof. Concerning this I have treated elsewhere at large, and expect not to see an answer to what I have disputed on that subject. As to the latter of them, we must inquire how

we may be supposed to comply with the rule, and answer the righteousness of his unalterable law, whose authority we can no way be exempted from. And that which we plead is, that the obedience and righteousness of Christ imputed to us; his obedience as the surety of the new covenant, granted to us, made ours by the gracious constitution, sovereign appointment and donation of God, is that whereon we are judged and esteemed to have answered the righteousness of the law. "By the obedience of one many are made righteous." Rom. v. 19. "That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us." Rom. viii. 4. And hence we argue,

If there be no other way whereby the righteousness of the law may be fulfilled in us, without which we cannot be justified, but must fall inevitably under the penalty threatened to the transgression of it, but only the righteousness of Christ imputed to us, then is that the sole righteousness whereby we are justified in the sight of God; but the former is true, and so therefore is the latter.

12. On the supposition of this law, and its original obligation to obedience with its sanction and threatenings, there can be but one of three ways whereby we may come to be justified before God, who have sinned, and are no way able in ourselves to perform the obedience for the future which it requires. And each of them has a respect to a sovereign act of God with reference to this law. The first is the abrogation of it, that it should no more oblige us either to obedience or punishment. This we have proved impossible; and they will wofully deceive their own souls, who shall trust to it. The second is by transferring of its obligation to the end of justification on a surety or common undertaker. This is that which we plead for, as the substance of the mystery of the gospel, considering the person and grace of this undertaker or surety. And herein all things tend to the exaltation of the glory of God in all the holy properties of his nature, with the fulfilling and establishing of the law itself, Matt. v. 17; Rom. iii. 31; viii. 4; x. 3, 4. The third way is by an act of God towards the law, and another towards us, whereby the nature of the righteousness which the law requires is changed; which we shall examine as the only reserve against our present argument.

13. It is said, therefore, that by our own personal obedience we answer the righteousness of the law so far as it is required of us. But whereas no sober person can imagine that we can or that any one in our lapsed condition ever did yield in our

own persons that perfect sinless obedience to God which is required of us in the law of creation, two things are supposed, that our obedience, such as it is, may be accepted with God as if it were sinless and perfect. For although some will not allow that the righteousness of Christ is imputed to us for what it is, yet they contend that our own righteousness is imputed to us for what it is not. Of these things the one respects the law, the other our obedience.

14. That which respects the law is not the abrogation of it. For although this would seem the most expeditious way for the reconciliation of this difficulty, namely, that the law of creation is utterly abrogated by the gospel, both as to its obligation to obedience and punishment; and no law to be continued in force but that which requires only sincere obedience of us, whereof there is, as to the manner of the performance of duties, not any absolute rule or measure, yet this is not by many pretended. They say not that this law is so abrogated, as that it should not have the power and efficacy of a law towards us. Nor is it possible it should be so; nor can any pretence be given how it should so be. It is true, it was broken by man, is so by us all, and that with respect to its principal end of our subjection to God, and dependence upon him, according to the rule of it. But it is foolish to think that the fault of those to whom a righteous law is rightly given, should abrogate or disannul the law itself. A law that is good and just may cease and expire as to any power of obligation upon the ceasing or expiration of the relation which it respected. So the Apostle tells us, that when the husband of a woman is dead, she is free from the law of her husband, Rom. vii. 2. But the relation between God and us, which was constituted in our first creation, can never cease. But a law cannot be abrogated without a new law given, and made by the same, or an equal power that made it, either expressly revoking it, or enjoining things inconsistent with it, and contradictory to its observation. In the latter way the law of Mosaical institutions was abrogated and disannulled. There was not any positive law made for the taking of it away; but the constitution and introduction of a new way of worship by the gospel inconsistent with, and contrary to it, deprived it of all its obligatory power and efficacy. But neither of these ways has God taken away the obligation of the original law of obedience, either as to duties or recompenses of reward. Neither is there any direct law made for its abrogation; nor has he given any new law of mo-

ral obedience either inconsistent with, or contrary to it. Yea in the gospel it is declared to be established and fulfilled.

It is true, as was observed before, that this law was made the instrument of a covenant between God and man; and so there is another reason of it; for God has actually introduced another covenant inconsistent with it, and contrary to it. But yet neither does this instantly and *ipso facto* free all men from the law, in the way of a covenant. For to the obligation of a law there is no more required, but that the matter of it be just and righteous, that it be given or made by him who has just authority so to give or make it, and be sufficiently declared to them who are to be obliged by it. Hence the making and promulgation of a new law, does *ipso facto* abrogate any former law that is contrary to it, and frees all men from obedience to it, who were before obliged by it. But in a covenant it is not so. For a covenant does not operate by mere sovereign authority; it becomes not a covenant without the consent of them with whom it is made. Wherefore no benefit accrues to any, or freedom from the old covenant, by the constitution of the new, unless he has actually complied with it, has chosen it, and is interested in it thereby. The first covenant made with Adam, we did in him consent to, and accept of. And therein notwithstanding our sin, do we and must we abide, that is, under the obligation of it to duty and punishment, until by faith we are made partakers of the new. It cannot therefore be said, that we are not concerned in the fulfilling of the righteousness of this law, because it is abrogated.

15. Nor can it be said that the law has received a new interpretation, whereby it is declared, that it does not oblige, nor shall be construed for the future to oblige any to sinless and perfect obedience, but may be complied with on far easier terms. For the law being given to us when we were sinless, and on purpose to continue and preserve us in that condition, it is absurd to say that it did not oblige us to sinless obedience; and not an interpretation, but a plain perversion of its sense and meaning. Nor is any such thing once intimated in the gospel. Yea, the discourses of our Saviour upon the law, are absolutely destructive of any such imagination. For whereas the Scribes and Pharisees had attempted by their false glosses and interpretations to accommodate the law to the inclinations and lusts of men, (a course since pursued both notionally and practically, as all who design to burden the consciences of

men with their own commands endeavour constantly to recompense them, by an indulgence with respect to the commands of God;) he on the contrary rejects all such pretended accommodations and interpretations, restoring the law to its pristine crown, as the Jews' tradition is, that the Messiah shall do.

16. Nor can a relaxation of the law be pretended, if there be any such thing in rule. For if there be, it respects the whole being of the law, and consists either in the suspension of its whole obligation, at least for a season, or the substitution of another person to answer its demands, who was not in the original obligation, in the room of them that were. For so some say, that the Lord Christ was made under the law for us by an act of relaxation of the original obligation of the law; how properly, let them see to it. But here in no sense it can have place.

17. The act of God towards the law in this case intended, is a derogation from its obliging power as to obedience. For whereas it originally obliged to perfect sinless obedience, in all duties both as to their substance, and the manner of their performance, it shall be allowed to oblige us still to obedience, but not to that which is absolutely the same, especially not as to the completeness and perfection of it. For if it do so, either it is fulfilled in the righteousness of Christ for us, or no man living can ever be justified in the sight of God. Wherefore by an act of derogation from its original power, it is provided, that it shall oblige us still to obedience, but not that which is absolutely sinless and perfect; but although it be performed with less intention of love to God, or in a lower degree, than it did at first require, so it be sincere and universal as to all the parts of it, it is all that the law now requires of us. This is all that it now requires, as it is adapted to the service of the new covenant, and made the rule of obedience according to the law of Christ. Hereby is its preceptive part, so far as we are concerned in it, answered and complied with. Whether these things are so or no, we shall see immediately in a few words.

18. Hence it follows, that the act of God with respect to our obedience, is not an act of judgment according to any rule or law of his own; but an esteeming, accounting, accepting that as perfect or in the room of that which is perfect, which really and in truth is not so.

19. It is added that both these depend on, and are the procurements of the obedience, suffering, and merits of Christ.

For on their account it is, that our weak and imperfect obedience is accepted as if it were perfect, and the power of the law, to require obedience absolutely perfect is taken away. And these being the effects of the righteousness of Christ, that righteousness may on their account, and so far, be said to be imputed to us.

20. But notwithstanding the great endeavours that have been used to give a colour of truth to these things, they are both of them but fictions and imaginations of men that have no ground in the Scripture, nor comply with the experience of them that believe.

For to touch a little on the latter, in the first place; there is no true believer but has these two things fixed in his mind and conscience.

(1.) That there is nothing in principles, habits, qualities, or actions, wherein he comes short of a perfect compliance with the holy law of God, even as it required perfect obedience, but that it has in it the nature of sin, and that in itself deserving the curse annexed originally to the breach of that law. They do not therefore apprehend that its obligation is taken off, weakened or derogated from, in any thing. (2) That there is no relief for him, with respect to what the law requires, or to what it threatens, but by the mediation of Jesus Christ alone, who of God is made righteousness to him. Wherefore they do not rest in, or on the acceptance of their own obedience such as it is, to answer the law, but trust to Christ alone for their acceptance with God.

21. They are both of them doctrinally untrue; for as to the former: (1) It is unwritten. There is no intimation in the Scripture of any such dispensation of God with reference to the original law of obedience. Much is spoken of our deliverance from the curse of the law by Christ, but of the abatement of its preceptive power nothing at all. (2) It is contrary to the Scripture. For it is plainly affirmed that the law is not to be abolished, but fulfilled; not to be made void, but to be established; that the righteousness of it must be fulfilled in us. (3) It is a supposition both unreasonable and impossible. For (1) the law was a representation to us of the holiness of God, and his righteousness in the government of his creatures. There can be no alteration made herein, seeing with God himself there is no variableness nor shadow of changing. (2) It would leave no standard of righteousness, but only a Lesbian rule, which turns and applies itself to the light and abilities of men, and

leaves at least as many various measures of righteousness as there are believers in the world. (3) It concludes a variation in the centre of all religion which is the natural and moral relation of men to God. For so there must be, if all that was once necessary thereto, do not still continue so to be. (4) It is dishonourable to the mediation of Christ. For it makes the principal end of it to be, that God should accept of a righteousness to our justification, inexpressibly beneath that which he required in the law of our creation. And this in a sense makes him the minister of sin, or that he has procured an indulgence for it; not by the way of satisfaction and pardon whereby he takes away the guilt of it from the church; but by taking from it its nature and demerit, so that what was so originally should not continue so to be, or at least not deserve the punishment it was first threatened with. (5) It reflects on the goodness of God himself. For on this supposition that he has reduced his law into that state and order, as to be satisfied by an observation of it so weak, so imperfect, accompanied with so many failures and sins, as it is with the obedience of the best men in this world, (whatever thoughts to the contrary the frenzy of pride may suggest to the minds of any) what reason can be given consistent with his goodness why he should give a law at first of perfect obedience, which one sin laid all mankind under the penalty of to their ruin?

22. All these things and sundry others of the same kind, follow also on the second supposition of an imaginary estimation of that as perfect, which is imperfect, as sinless which is attended with sins innumerable. But the judgment of God is according to truth; neither will he reckon that to us for a perfect righteousness in his sight, which is so imperfect as to be like tattered rags, especially, having promised to us robes of righteousness and garments of salvation.

That which necessarily follows on these discourses is, That there is no other way whereby the original, immutable law of God may be established, and fulfilled with respect to us, but by the imputation of the perfect obedience and righteousness of Christ, who is the end of the law for righteousness to all that believe.

CHAPTER XII.

THE IMPUTATION OF THE OBEDIENCE OF CHRIST TO THE LAW,
DECLARED AND VINDICATED.

FROM the foregoing general argument, another issues in particular, with respect to the imputation of the active obedience or righteousness of Christ to us, as an essential part of that righteousness whereon we are justified before God. And it is as follows. If it were necessary that the Lord Christ, as our surety, should undergo the penalty of the law for us, or in our stead, because we have all sinned; then it was necessary also, that as our surety he should yield obedience to the preceptive part of the law for us also: and if the imputation of the former be needful for us to our justification before God, then is the imputation of the latter also necessary to the same end and purpose. For why was it necessary, or why would God have it so, that the Lord Christ, as the surety of the covenant, should undergo the curse and penalty of the law, which we had incurred the guilt of by sin, that we may be justified in his sight? Was it not, that the glory and honour of his righteousness, as the author of the law, and the supreme governor of all mankind, thereby might not be violated in the absolute impunity of the infringers of it? And if it were requisite to the glory of God, that the penalty of the law should be undergone for us, or suffered by our surety in our stead, because we had sinned; wherefore is it not as requisite to the glory of God, that the preceptive part of the law be complied with for us, in as much as obedience thereto is required of us? And as we are no more able of ourselves to fulfil the law, in a way of obedience, than to undergo the penalty of it, so that we may be justified thereby; so no reason can be given, why God is not as much concerned in honour and glory, that the preceptive power and part of the law be complied with, by perfect obedience, as that the sanction of it be established by undergoing the penalty of it. Upon the same grounds, therefore, that the Lord Christ's suffering the penalty of the law for us was necessary that we might be justified in the sight of God, and that the satisfaction he made thereby be imputed to us, as if we ourselves had made satisfaction to God, as Bellarmine speaks and grants; on the same it was equally necessary, that is, as to the glory and

honour of the legislator and supreme governor of all by the law, that he should fulfil the preceptive part of it, in his perfect obedience thereto, which also is to be imputed to us for our justification.

Concerning the first of these, namely, the satisfaction of Christ, and the imputation of it to us, our principal difference is with the Socinians. And I have elsewhere written so much in the vindication of the truth therein, that I shall not here again resume the same argument: it is here therefore taken for granted, although I know that there are some different apprehensions about the notion of Christ's suffering in our stead, and of the imputation of those sufferings to us. But I shall here take no notice of them, seeing I press this argument no further, but only so far, that the obedience of Christ to the law, and the imputation thereof to us, is no less necessary to our justification before God, than his suffering of the penalty of the law, and the imputation thereof to us, to the same end. The nature of this imputation, and what it is formally that is imputed we have considered elsewhere.

That the obedience of Christ the mediator is thus imputed to us, shall be afterwards proved in particular by testimonies of the Scripture. Here I intend only the vindication of the argument as before laid down, which will take us up a little more time than ordinary. For there is nothing in the whole doctrine of justification, which meets with a more fierce and various opposition: but the truth is great and will prevail.

The things that are usually objected and vehemently urged against the imputation of the obedience of Christ for our justification, may be reduced to three heads. (1.) That it is impossible. (2.) That it is useless. (3.) That it is pernicious to believe it. And if the arguments used for the enforcement of those objections, be as cogent as the charge itself is fierce and severe, they will unavoidably overthrow the persuasions of it in the minds of all sober persons. But there is oftentimes a wide difference between what is said, and what is proved, as will appear in the present case.

1. It is pleaded impossible on this single ground; namely, "that the obedience of Christ to the law was due from him on his own account, and performed by him for himself, as a man made under the law. Now what was necessary to himself, and done for himself, cannot be said to be done for us, so as to be imputed to us."

2. It is pretended to be useless from hence, because "all our

sins of omission and commission being pardoned in our justification on the account of the death and satisfaction of Christ, we are thereby made completely righteous; so that there is not the least necessity for, or use of the imputation of the obedience of Christ to us."

3. Pernicious also they say it is, as that which takes away the necessity of our own personal obedience, introducing antinomianism, libertinism, and all manner of evils.

For this last part of the charge, I refer it to its proper place. For although it be urged by some against this part of the doctrine of justification in a peculiar manner, yet it is managed by others, against the whole of it. And although we should grant, that the obedience of Christ to the law, is not imputed to us for our justification, yet shall we not be freed from disturbance by this false accusation; unless we will renounce the whole of the satisfaction and merit of Christ also. And we intend not to purchase our peace with the whole world at so dear a rate. Wherefore I shall in its proper place give this part of the charge its due consideration, as it reflects on the whole doctrine of justification, and all the cause thereof, which we believe and profess.

The first part of this charge, concerning the impossibility of the imputation of the obedience of Christ to us, is insisted on by Socinius. And there has been nothing since pleaded to the same purpose, but what has been derived from him, or wherein, at least, he has not anticipated the inventions of other men, and gone before them. And he makes this consideration the principle engine wherewith he endeavours the overthrow of the whole doctrine of the merit of Christ. For he supposes, that if all he did in a way of obedience, was due from himself on his own account, and was only the duty which he owed to God for himself in his station and circumstances, as a man in this world, it cannot be meritorious for us, nor any way imputed to us. And in like manner to weaken the doctrine of his satisfaction, and the imputation thereof to us, he contends that Christ offered as a priest for himself, in that kind of offering which he made on the cross. And his real opinion was, that whatever was of offering or sacrifice in the death of Christ, it was for himself; that is, it was an act of obedience to God which pleased him, as the savour of a sweet smelling sacrifice. His offering for us, is only the presentation of himself in the presence of God in heaven; now he has no more to do for himself in a way of duty. And the truth is, if the obe-

dience of Christ had respect to himself only; that is, if he yielded it to God, on the necessity of his condition, and did not do it for us, I see no foundation left to assert his merit upon, no more than I do for the imputation of it to them that believe.

That which we plead is, that the Lord Christ fulfilled the whole law for us; he did not only undergo the penalty of it due to our sins, but also yielded that perfect obedience which it required. And herein I shall not involve myself in the debate of the distinction between the active and passive obedience of Christ. For he exercised the highest active obedience in his suffering, when he offered himself to God through the eternal Spirit. And all his obedience, considering his person, was mixed with suffering, as a part of his exinanition and humiliation; whence it is said, that "though he was a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things that he suffered." And although doing and suffering are in various categories of things, yet Scripture testimonies are not to be regulated by philosophical artifices and terms. And it must needs be said, that the sufferings of Christ as they were purely penal, are imperfectly called his passive righteousness. For all righteousness is either in habit, or in action, whereof suffering is neither; nor is any man righteous, or so esteemed from what he suffers. Neither do sufferings give satisfaction to the commands of the law, which require only obedience. And hence it will unavoidably follow, that we have need of more than the mere sufferings of Christ, whereby we may be justified before God, if so be that any righteousness be required thereto. But the whole of what I intend is, that Christ's fulfilling of the law in obedience to its commands, is no less imputed to us for our justification, than his undergoing the penalty of it is.

I cannot but judge it sounds ill in the ears of all Christians, that the obedience of our Lord Jesus Christ as our mediator and surety to the whole law of God, was for himself alone, and not for us; or that what he did therein, was not that he might be the end of the law for righteousness to them that do believe, nor a means of the fulfilling of the righteousness of the law in us; especially considering, that the faith of the Church is, that he was given to us, born to us; that for us men, and for our salvation he came down from heaven, and did and suffered what was required of him. But whereas some who deny the imputation of the obedience of Christ to us, for our justification, do insist principally on the second thing mentioned, namely,

the unusefulness of it, I shall, under this first part of the charge, consider only the arguings of Socinus, which is the whole of what some at present endeavour to perplex the truth with.*

I have transcribed his words, that it may appear with whose weapons some young disputers, among ourselves, contend against the truth. The substance of his plea is, "that our Lord Jesus Christ was for himself, or on his own account, obliged to all that obedience which he performed." And this he endeavours to prove with this reason, "because if it were otherwise, then he might, if he would, have neglected the whole law of God, and have broken it at his pleasure." For he forgot to consider, that if he were not obliged to it upon his own account, but was so on ours, whose cause he had undertaken, the obligation on him to most perfect obedience, was equal to what it would have been, had he been originally obliged on his own account. However hence he infers, that what he did, could not be for us, "because it was so for himself, no more than what any other man is bound to do in a way of duty for himself, can be esteemed to have been done also for another." For he will allow of none of those considerations of the person of Christ which makes what he did and suffered, of another nature and efficacy, than what can be done or suffered by any other man. All that he adds, in the process of his discourse, is, "that whatever Christ did, that was not required by the law in general, was upon the especial command of God, and so done for himself; whence it cannot be imputed to us." And hereby he excludes the Church from any benefit by the mediation of Christ, but only what consists in his doctrine, example, and the exercise of his power in heaven for our good, which was the thing that he aimed at. But we shall consider those also which make use of his arguments, though not as yet openly to all his ends.

To clear the truth herein, the things ensuing must be observed.

* Jam vero manifestum est, Christum quia homo natus fuerat, et quidem, ut inquit Paulus, factus sub lege, legi divinae inquam, quæ æterna et immutabilis est, non minus quam cæteri homines obnoxium fuisse. Alioqui potuisset Christus æternam Dei legem negligere, sive etiam universam si voluisset infringere, quod impium est vel cogitare. Immo ut supra alicubi explicatum fuit, nisi ipse Christus legi divinae servandæ obnoxium fuisset, ut ex Pauli verbis colligitur, non potuisset is, qui ei legi servandæ obnoxii sunt, opem ferre et eos ad immortalitatis firmam spem traducere. Non differabat igitur hæc quidem ex parte Christus, quando homo natus erat, a cæteris hominibus. Quocirca nec etiam pro aliis, magis quam quilibet alius homo, legem divinam conservando, satisfacere potuit, quippe qui ipse eam servare omnino debuit.—De Servat. par. iii. cap. 5.

1. The obedience we treat of, was the obedience of Christ the Mediator. But the obedience of Christ as the Mediator of the covenant, was the obedience of his person: for "God redeemed his church with his own blood," Acts xx. 28. It was performed in the human nature, but the person of Christ was he that performed it. As in the person of a man, some of his acts, as to the immediate principle of operation, are acts of the body, and some are acts of the soul, yet in their performance and accomplishment, are they the acts of the person; so the acts of Christ in his mediation, as to their *ἰεργήματα* or immediate operation, were the actings of his distinct natures; some of the divine, and some of the human immediately. But as to their *ἀποτέλεσματα*, and the perfecting efficacy of them, they were the acts of his whole person: his acts who was that person, and whose power of operation was a property of his person. Wherefore the obedience of Christ which we plead to have been for us, was the obedience of the Son of God; but the Son of God was never absolutely made *ὑπο νόμου* "under the law," nor could be formally obliged thereby. He was indeed, as the Apostle witnesses, made so in his human nature, wherein he performed this obedience, "made of a woman, made under the law," Gal. iv. 4. He was so far "made under the law," as he was made of a woman. For in his person he abode "Lord of the Sabbath," Mark ii. 28, and therefore of the whole law. But the obedience itself was the obedience of that person, who never was, nor ever could absolutely be, made under the law, in his whole person. For the divine nature cannot be subjected to an outward work of its own, such as the law is; nor can it have an authoritative commanding power over it, as it must have, if it were made "under the law." Thus the Apostle argues, that Levi paid tithes in Abraham, because he was then in his loins, when Abraham himself paid tithes to Melchisedec, Heb. vii. And thence he proves, that he was inferior to the Lord Christ, of whom Melchisedec was a type. But may it not thereon be replied, that then no less the Lord Christ was in the loins of Abraham than Levi? "for verily," as the same Apostle speaks, "he took on him the seed of Abraham." It is true, therefore, that he was so in respect of his human nature; but as he was typified and represented by Melchisedec in his whole person, "without father, without mother, without genealogy, without beginning of days or end of life:" so he was not absolutely in Abraham's loins, and was exempted from being tithed in him. Wherefore the obedience whereof we treat, being not

the obedience of the human nature abstractedly, however performed in and by the human nature, but the obedience of the person of the Son of God, however the human nature was subject to the law, (in what sense, and to what ends shall be declared afterwards) it was not for himself, nor could be for himself, because his whole person was not obliged thereto. It is therefore a vain thing to compare the obedience of Christ, with that of any other man, whose whole person is under the law. For although that may not be for himself and others, (which yet we shall show that in some cases it may,) yet this may, yea must be for others, and not for himself. This then we must strictly hold to. If the obedience that Christ yielded to the law were for himself, whereas it was the act of his person, his whole person, and the divine nature therein, were made under the law, which cannot be. For although it is acknowledged, that in the ordination of God, his exanition was to precede his glorious majestic exaltation, as the Scripture witnesses, Phil. ii. 9; Luke xxiv. 26; Rom. xiv. 9; yet absolutely his glory was an immediate consequence of the hypostatical union, Heb. i. 6; Matt. ii. 11.

Socius, I confess, evades the force of this argument, by denying the divine person of Christ. But in this disputation I take that for granted, as having proved it elsewhere, beyond what any of his followers are able to contradict. And if we may not build on truths by him denied, we shall scarce have any one principle of evangelical truth left us to prove any thing from. However, I aim at those only at present, who concur with him in the matter under debate, but renounce his opinion concerning the person of Christ.

2. As our Lord Jesus Christ owed not in his own person this obedience for himself, by virtue of any authority or power that the law had over him, so he designed and intended it not for himself, but for us. This added to the former consideration, gives full evidence to the truth pleaded for; for if he was not obliged to it for himself, his person that yielded it, not being under the law; and if he intended it not for himself, then it must be for us, or be useless: it was in our human nature, that he performed all this obedience. Now the susception of our nature, was a voluntary act of his own, with reference to some end and purpose; and that which was the end of the assumption of our nature, was in like manner the end of all that he did therein. Now it was for us, and not for himself, that he assumed our nature; nor was any thing added to him

thereby : wherefore in the issue of his work, he proposes this only to himself, that he may "be glorified with that glory which he had with the Father, before the world was," by the removal of that veil which was put upon it in his eximianition. But that it was for us that he assumed our nature, is the foundation of the Christian religion ; as it is asserted by the Apostle, Heb. ii. 14 ; Phil. ii. 5—8.

Some of the ancient schoolmen disputed, that the Son of God should have been incarnate, although man had not sinned and fallen. The same opinion was fiercely pursued by Oslander, as I have elsewhere declared ; but none of them once imagined, that he should have been so made man, as to be made under the law, and be obliged thereby to that obedience which now he has performed : but they judged that immediately he was to have been a glorious head to the whole creation. For it is a common notion and presumption of all Christians, but only such as will sacrifice such notions to their own private conceptions, that the obedience which Christ yielded to the law on earth, in the state and condition wherein he yielded it, was not for himself, but for the church, which was obliged to perfect obedience, but was not able to accomplish it. That this was his sole end and design in it, is a fundamental article, if I mistake not, of the creed of most Christians in the world ; and to deny it consequently overthrows all the grace and love both of the Father and Son, in his mediation.

It is said, "that this obedience was necessary as a qualification of his person, that he might be meet to be a mediator for us, and therefore was for himself ; it belongs to the necessary constitution of his person, with respect to his mediatory work : " but this I positively deny. The Lord Christ was every way meet for the whole work of mediation, by the ineffable union of the human nature with the divine which exalted it in dignity, honour and worth, above any thing, or all things that ensued thereon. For hereby he became in his whole person the object of all divine worship and honour ; "for when he brings the first begotten into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him." Again that which is an effect of the person of the mediator as constituted such, is not a qualification necessary to its constitution ; that is, what he did as mediator, did not concur to the making of him meet so to be. But of this nature was all the obedience which he yielded to the law, for as such, "it became him to fulfil all righteousness."

Whereas therefore he was neither made man, nor of the posterity of Abraham for himself, but for the church, namely, to become thereby the surety of the covenant, and representative of the whole, his obedience as a man to the law in general, and as a son of Abraham to the law of Moses, was for us, and not for himself; so designed, so performed, and without a respect to the church, was of no use to himself. He was born to us, and given to us, lived for us, and died for us, obeyed for us, and suffered for us; that by the obedience of one, many might be made righteous. This was the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ; and this is the faith of the Catholic church. And what he did for us, is imputed to us. This is included in the very notion of his doing it for us, which cannot be spoken in any sense, unless that which he so did, be imputed to us. And I think men ought to be wary, that they do not by distinctions and studied evasions, for the defence of their own private opinions, shake the foundations of Christianity. And I am sure it will be easier for them, as it is in the proverb, "to wrest the club out of the hand of Hercules," than to dispossess the minds of true believers of this persuasion; that what the Lord Christ did in obedience to God according to the law, he designed in his love and grace to do it for them. He needed no obedience for himself, he came not into a capacity of yielding obedience for himself, but for us; and therefore for us it was, that he fulfilled the law in obedience to God according to the terms of it. The obligation that was on him to obedience, was originally no less for us, no less needful to us, no more for himself, no more necessary to him, than the obligation that was on him as the surety of the covenant, to suffer the penalty of the law, was either the one, or the other.

3. Setting aside the consideration of the grace and love of Christ, and the compact between the Father and the Son, as to his undertaking for us, which undeniably proves all that he did in the pursuit of them to be done for us, and not for himself; the human nature of Christ, by virtue of its union with the person of the Son of God, had a right to, and might have immediately been admitted into, the highest glory whereof it was capable, without any antecedent obedience to the law. And this is apparent from hence, in that from the first instant of that union, the whole person of Christ with our nature existing therein, was the object of all divine worship from angels and men, wherein consists the highest exaltation of that nature.

It is true, there was a peculiar glory that he was actually to

be made partaker of, with respect to his antecedent obedience and suffering, Phil. ii. 8, 9. The actual possession of this glory was, in the ordination of God, to be consequent to his obeying and suffering, not for himself, but for us. But as to the right and capacity of the human nature in itself, all the glory whereof it was capable, was due to it from the instant of its union. For it was therein exalted above the condition that any creature is capable of by mere creation. And it is but a Socinian fiction, that the first foundation of the divine glory of Christ was laid in his obedience, which was only the way of his actual possession of that part of his glory, which consists in his mediatory power and authority over all. The real foundation of the whole, was laid in the union of his person; whence he prays that the Father would glorify him, (as to manifestation) with that glory which he had with him before the world was.

I will grant, that the Lord Christ was *viator* whilst he was in this world, and not absolutely *possessor*; yet I say withal he was so, not that any such condition was necessary to him for himself; but he took it upon him by especial dispensation for us. And therefore the obedience he performed in that condition, was for us, and not for himself.

4. It is granted therefore, that the human nature of Christ was made *ὑπο νόμου*, as the Apostle affirms, that which was made of a woman, was made under the law. Hereby obedience became necessary to him, as he was and whilst he was *viator*. But this being by especial dispensation, intimated in the expression of it, he made was under the law, namely, as he was made of a woman, by especial dispensation and condescension expressed, Phil. ii. 6—8; the obedience he yielded thereon, was for us, and not for himself. And this is evident from hence, for he was so made under the law, as that not only he owed obedience to the precepts of it, but he was made obnoxious to its curse. But I suppose it will not be said, that he was so for himself, and therefore not for us. We owed obedience to the law, and were obnoxious to the curse of it, or *ὑποδικαί τῷ θεῷ*. Obedience was required of us, and was as necessary to us, if we would enter into life, as the answering of the curse for us was, if we would escape death eternal. Christ as our surety, is made under the law for us, whereby he becomes liable and obliged to the obedience which the law required, and to the penalty that it threatened. Who shall now dare to say, that he underwent the penalty of the law for us indeed, but he yielded obedience to it for himself only? The whole harmony

of the work of his mediation, would be disordered by such a supposition.

Judah, the son of Jacob, undertook to be a bondman instead of Benjamin his brother, that he might go free, Gen. xlv. 33. There is no doubt but Joseph might have accepted of the stipulation. Had he done so, the service and bondage he undertook, had been necessary to Judah, and righteous for him to bear; howbeit he had undergone it, and performed his duty in it, not for himself, but for his brother Benjamin; and to Benjamin it would have been imputed in his liberty. So when the Apostle Paul wrote those words to Philemon concerning Onesimus, verse 18, "If he hath wronged thee," dealt unrighteously or injuriously with thee, "or oweth thee ought," wherein thou hast suffered loss by him, "put it on my account," or impute it all to me; "I will repay it," or answer for it all. He supposes that Philemon might have a double action against Onesimus; the one *injuriarum*, and the other *damni* or *debiti*, of wrong and injury, and of loss or debt; which are distinct actions in the law: if he has wronged thee, or oweth thee ought. Hereon he proposes himself, and obliges himself by his express obligation, "I Paul have written it with my own hand," that he would answer for both, and pay back a valuable consideration if required. Hereby was he obliged in his own person to make satisfaction to Philemon; but yet he was to do it for Onesimus, and not for himself. Whatever obedience therefore was due from the Lord Christ, as to his human nature whilst in the "form of a servant," either as a man, or as an Israelite, seeing he was so not necessarily by the necessity of nature for himself, but by voluntary condescension and stipulation for us, for us it was, and not for himself.

5. The Lord Christ in his obedience was not a private, but a public person. He obeyed as he was the surety of the covenant, as the mediator between God and man. This I suppose will not be denied. He can by no imagination be considered out of that capacity. But what a public person does as a public person, that is as a representative of others, and an undertaker for them, whatever may be his own concernment therein, he does it not for himself, but for others. And if others were not concerned therein, if it were not for them, what he does would be of no use or signification. Yea, it implies a contradiction that any one should do any thing as a public person, and do it for himself only. He who is a public person, may do that wherein he alone is concerned, but he cannot do so as

he is a public person. Wherefore as Socinus, and those that follow him would have Christ to have offered for himself, which is to make him a mediator for himself, his offering being a mediatory act, which is both foolish and impious; so to affirm his mediatory obedience, his obedience as a public person, to have been for himself, and not for others, has but little less of impiety in it.

6. It is granted, that the Lord Christ having a human nature, which was a creature, it was impossible but that it should be subject to the law of creation. For there is a relation that necessarily arises from, and depends upon the beings of a creator and a creature. Every rational creature is eternally obliged from the nature of God, and its relation thereto, to love him, obey him, depend upon him, submit to him, and to make him its end, blessedness, and reward. But the law of creation thus considered, does not respect the world, and this life only, but the future state of heaven, and eternity also. And this law, the human nature of Christ is subject to, in heaven and glory, and cannot but be so, whilst it is a creature, and not God, that is, whilst it has its own being. Nor do any men fancy such a transfusion of divine properties into the human nature of Christ, as that it should be self-subsisting, and in itself, absolutely immense; for this would openly destroy it. Yet none will say, that he is now "under the law," in the sense intended by the Apostle. But the law in the sense described, the human nature of Christ was subject to, on its own account, whilst he was in this world. And this is sufficient to answer the objection of Socinus, mentioned at the entrance of this discourse, namely, "that if the Lord Christ were not obliged to obedience for himself, then might he, if he would, neglect the whole law, or infringe it." For besides that it is a foolish imagination concerning that holy thing which was hypostatically united to the Son of God, and thereby rendered incapable of any deviation from the divine will; the eternal indispensable law of love, adherence, and dependence on God, under which the human nature of Christ was, and is, as a creature, gives sufficient security against such suppositions.

But there is another consideration of the law of God, namely, as it is imposed on creatures by especial dispensation, for some time, and for some certain end; with some considerations, rules, and orders, that belong not essentially to the law, as before described. This is the nature of the written law of God, which the Lord Christ was made under, not necessarily

as a creature, but by especial dispensation. For the law, under this consideration, is presented to us as such, not absolutely and eternally, but whilst we are in this world, and that with this especial end, that by obedience thereto, we may obtain the reward of eternal life. And it is evident, that the obligation of the law, under this consideration, ceases when we come to the enjoyment of that reward. It obliges us no more formally by its command, "Do this and live," when the life promised is enjoyed. In this sense the Lord Christ was not made subject to the law for himself, nor did yield obedience to it for himself. For he was not obliged to it by virtue of his created condition. Upon the first instant of the union of his natures, being holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners, he might, notwithstanding the law that he was made subject to, have been stated in glory. For he that was the object of all divine worship, needed not any new obedience to procure for him a state of blessedness. And had he naturally, merely by virtue of his being a creature, been subject to the law in this sense, he must have been so eternally, which he is not. For those things which depend solely on the natures of God and the creature, are eternal and immutable. Wherefore, as the law in this sense was given to us, not absolutely, but with respect to a future state and reward; so the Lord Christ voluntarily subjected himself to it for us, and his obedience thereto was for us, and not for himself. These things added to what I have formerly written on this subject, whereto nothing has been opposed, but a few impertinent cavils, are sufficient to discharge the first part of that charge laid down before, concerning the impossibility of the imputation of the obedience of Christ to us; which indeed is equal to the impossibility of the imputation of the disobedience of Adam to us; whereby the Apostle tells us, that we were made sinners.

The second part of the objection or charge against the imputation of the obedience of Christ to us, is, "That it is useless to the persons that are to be justified. For whereas they have in their justification the pardon of all their sins, they are thereby righteous, and have a right or title to life and blessedness: for he who is so pardoned, as not to be esteemed guilty of any sin of omission or commission, wants nothing that is requisite thereto. For he is supposed to have done all that he ought, and to have omitted nothing required of him in a way of duty. Hereby he becomes not unrighteous, and to be not unrighteous, is the same as to be righteous. As he that is not dead, is alive.

Neither is there, nor can there be any middle state between death and life. Wherefore those who have all their sins forgiven, have the blessedness of justification; and there is neither need, nor use of any farther imputation of righteousness to them." And sundry other things of the same nature, are urged to the same purpose, which will be all of them either obviated in the ensuing discourse, or answered elsewhere.

Answer. This cause is of more importance, and more evidently stated in the Scriptures, than to be turned into such niceties, which have more of philosophical subtilty, than theological solidity, in them. This exception therefore might be dismissed without further answer, than what is given us in the known rule, That a truth well established and confirmed, is not to be questioned, much less relinquished on every entangling sophism, though it should appear insoluble. But as we shall see, there is no such difficulty in these arguings, but what may easily be discussed. And because the matter of the plea contained in them, is made use of by sundry learned persons who yet agree with us in the substance of the doctrine of justification, namely, that it is by faith alone, without works, through the imputation of the merit and satisfaction of Christ, I shall, as briefly as I can, discover the mistakes that it proceeds upon.

1. It includes a supposition, that he who is pardoned his sins of omission and commission, is esteemed to have done all that is required of him, and to have committed nothing that is forbidden. For without this supposition, the bare pardon of sin will neither make, constitute, nor denominate any man righteous. But this is far otherwise, nor is any such thing included in the nature of pardon. For in the pardon of sin, neither God nor man judges, that he who has sinned, has not sinned; which must be done, if he who is pardoned be esteemed to have done all that he ought, and to have done nothing that he ought not to do. If a man be brought on his trial for any evil fact, and being legally convicted thereof, be discharged by sovereign pardon; it is true, that in the eye of the law, he is looked upon as an innocent man, as to the punishment that was due to him; but no man thinks that he is made righteous thereby, or is esteemed not to have done that which really he has done, and whereof he was convicted. Joab and Abiathar the priest, were at the same time guilty of the same crime. Solomon gives order that Joab be put to death for his crime; but to Abiathar he gives a pardon. Did he thereby make,

declare or constitute him righteous? He himself expresses the contrary, affirming him to be unrighteous and guilty, only he remitted the punishment of his fault, 1 Kings ii. 26. Wherefore the pardon of sin discharges the guilty person from being liable or obnoxious to anger, wrath, or punishment, due to his sin; but it does not suppose, nor infer in the least, that he is thereby or ought thereon to be esteemed or adjudged to have done no evil, and to have fulfilled all righteousness. Some say, pardon gives a righteousness of innocency, but not of obedience. But it cannot give a righteousness of innocency, absolutely, such as Adam had. For he had actually done no evil. It only removes guilt, which is the respect of sin to punishment, ensuing on the sanction of the law. And this supposition, which is an evident mistake, animates this whole objection.

The like may be said of what is in like manner supposed, namely, that not to be unrighteous, which a man is on the pardon of sin, is the same with being righteous. For if not to be unrighteous be taken privatively, it is the same with being just or righteous; for it supposes that he who is so, has done all the duty that is required of him, that he may be righteous. But not to be unrighteous, negatively, as the expression is here used, does not do so. For at best it supposes no more, but that a man as yet has done nothing actually against the rule of righteousness. Now this may be when yet he has performed none of the duties that are required of him to constitute him righteous, because the times and occasions of them are not yet. And so it was with Adam in the state of innocency; which is the height of what can be attained by the complete pardon of sin.

2. It proceeds on this supposition, that the law, in case of sin, does not oblige to punishment and obedience both; so that it is not satisfied, fulfilled, or complied with, unless it be answered with respect to both. For if it does so, then the pardon of sin, which only frees us from the penalty of the law, yet leaves it necessary, that obedience be performed to it, even all that it requires. But this, in my judgment, is an evident mistake, and that such as does not establish the law, but make it void. And this I shall demonstrate.

1 The law has two parts or powers. (1) Its preceptive part, commanding and requiring obedience, with a promise of life annexed; "Do this and live." (2) The sanction on supposition of disobedience, binding the sinner to punishment, or a

meet recompense of reward. "In the day thou sinnest, thou shalt die." And every law properly so called, proceeds on these suppositions of obedience or disobedience, whence its commanding and punishing power is inseparable from its nature.

2. This law, whereof we speak, was first given to man in innocency; and therefore the first power of it, was only in act. It obliged only to obedience. For an innocent person could not be obnoxious to its sanction, which contained only an obligation to punishment, on supposition of disobedience. It could not therefore oblige our first parents to obedience and punishment both, seeing its obligation to punishment could not be in actual force, but on supposition of actual disobedience. A moral cause of, and motive to obedience it was, and had an influence upon the preservation of man from sin. To that end it was said to him, "In the day thou eatest, thou shalt surely die." The neglect hereof, and of that ruling influence which it ought to have had on the minds of our first parents, opened the door to the entrance of sin. But it implies a contradiction, that an innocent person should be under an actual obligation to punishment from the sanction of the law. It bound only to obedience, as all laws with penalties do, before their transgression. But

3. On the committing of sin, (and it is so with every one that is guilty of sin,) man came under an actual obligation to punishment. This is no more questionable than whether at first he was under an obligation to obedience. But then the question is, whether the first intention and obligation of the law to obedience ceases to affect the sinner, or continues so, as at the same time to oblige him to obedience and punishment, both its powers being in act towards him. And hereto I say,

1. Had the punishment threatened, been immediately inflicted to the utmost of what was contained in it, this could have been no question. For man had died immediately both temporally and eternally, and been cast out of that state wherein alone he could stand in any relation to the preceptive power of the law. He that is finally executed, has fulfilled the law so, that he owes no more obedience to it. But

2. God, in his wisdom and patience, has otherwise disposed of things. Man is continued a *viator* still in the way to his end, and not fully stated in his eternal and unchangeable condition, wherein neither promise nor threatening, reward nor punishment could be proposed to him. In this condition he

falls under a twofold consideration. (1) Of a guilty person, and so is obliged to the full punishment, that the law threatens. This is not denied. (2) Of a man, a rational creature of God, not yet brought to his eternal end.

3. In this state, the law is the only instrument and means of the continuance of the relation between God and him. Wherefore under this consideration it cannot but still oblige him to obedience, unless we shall say, that by his sin he has exempted himself from the government of God. Wherefore it is by the law, that the rule and government of God over men, is continued whilst they are *in statu viatorum*: for every disobedience, every transgression of its rule and order as to its commanding power casts as afresh, and further, under its power of obliging to punishment.

Neither can these things be otherwise; nor can any man living, not the worst of men, choose but judge himself, whilst he is in this world, obliged to give obedience to the law of God, according to the notices that he has of it by the light of nature or otherwise. A wicked servant that is punished for his fault, if it be with such a punishment as yet continues his being, and his state of servitude, is not by his punishment freed from an obligation to duty, according to the rule of it. Yea, his obligation to duty, with respect to that crime for which he was punished, is not dissolved, until his punishment be capital, and so put an end to his state. Wherefore seeing that by the pardon of sin, we are freed only from the obligation to punishment, there is moreover required to our justification, an obedience to what the law requires.

And this greatly strengthens the argument, in whose vindication we are engaged; for we, being sinners, were obnoxious both to the command and curse of the law. Both must be answered, or we cannot be justified. And as the Lord Christ could not, by his most perfect obedience, satisfy the curse of the law, "Dying thou shalt die;" so by the utmost of his suffering, he could not fulfil the command of the law, "Do this and live." Passion as passion is not obedience, though there may be obedience in suffering, as there was in that of Christ to the height. Wherefore as we plead that the death of Christ is imputed to us for our justification, so we deny that it is imputed to us for our righteousness. For by the imputation of the sufferings of Christ, our sins are remitted or pardoned, and we are delivered from the curse of the law, which he underwent. But we are not thence esteemed just or righteous, which we cannot

be without respect to the fulfilling of the commands of the law, or the obedience by it required. The whole matter is excellently expressed by Grotius in the words before alleged.*

3. The objection mentioned proceeds also on this supposition, that pardon of sin gives title to eternal blessedness in the enjoyment of God: for justification does so, and according to the authors of this opinion, no other righteousness is required thereto but pardon of sin. That justification gives right and title to adoption, acceptance with God, and the heavenly inheritance, I suppose will not be denied, and it has been proved already. Pardon of sin depends solely on the death or suffering of Christ: "in whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace," Ephes. i. 7. But suffering for punishment gives right and title to nothing, only satisfies for something; nor does it deserve any reward: it is no where said, Suffer this and live, but, Do this and live.

These things, I confess, are inseparably connected in the ordinance, appointment, and covenant of God. Whosoever has his sins pardoned, is accepted with God, has right to eternal blessedness. These things are inseparable, but they are not one and the same. And by reason of their inseparable relation, are they so put together by the Apostle, Rom. iv. 6—8. "Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man, to whom God imputeth righteousness without works: Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered: Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin." It is the imputation of righteousness, that gives right to blessedness; but pardon of sin is inseparable from it, and an effect of it, both being opposed to justification by works, or an internal righteousness of our own. But it is one thing to be freed from being liable to eternal death; and another to have right and title to a blessed and eternal life. It is one thing to be "redeemed from under the law," that is, the curse of it; another to receive the "adoption of sons." One thing to be freed from the curse, another to have the blessing of Abraham come upon us; as the Apostle distinguishes these things, Gal. iii. 13, 14; iv. 4, 5. And so does our Lord Jesus Christ, Acts xxvi. 18. "That they may receive forgiveness of

* *Cum duo nobis peperisse Christum dixerimus impunitatem et præmium, illud satisfactioni, hoc merito Christi distincte tribuit vetus ecclesia. Satisfactio consistit in meritorum translatione, meritum in perfectissimæ obedientiæ pro nobis præstitæ imputatione.*

sins, and inheritance (a lot and right to the inheritance) among them that are sanctified by faith that is in me." *Ἀφίσις ἁμαρτιῶν* which we have by faith in Christ is only a "dismissal of sin" from being pleadable to our condemnation; on which account "there is no condemnation unto them that are in Christ Jesus." But a right and title to glory, or the heavenly inheritance, it gives not. Can it be supposed, that all the great and glorious effects of present grace and future blessedness, should follow necessarily on, and be the effect of mere pardon of sin? Can we not be pardoned, but we must thereby of necessity be made sons, heirs of God, and co-heirs with Christ?

Pardon of sin is in God, with respect to the sinner, a free, gratuitous act; "forgiveness of sin through the riches of his grace." But with respect to the satisfaction of Christ, it is an act in judgment. For on the consideration thereof as imputed to him, God absolves and acquits the sinner upon his trial. But pardon on a juridical trial, on what consideration soever it be granted, gives no right nor title to any favour, benefit, or privilege, but only mere deliverance. It is one thing to be acquitted before the throne of a king, of crimes laid to the charge of any man, which may be done by clemency, or on other considerations; another to be made his son by adoption, and heir to his kingdom.

And these things are represented to us in the Scripture, as distinct and depending on distinct causes. So are they in the vision concerning Joshua the high priest, Zech. iii. 4, 5. "And he answered and spake unto those that stood before him saying, Take away the filthy garments from him. And unto him he said, Behold I have caused thine iniquity to pass from thee; and I will clothe thee with change of raiment. And I said, Let them set a fair mitre upon his head; so they set a fair mitre on his head, and clothed him with garments." It has been generally granted, that we have here a representation of the justification of a sinner before God. And the taking away of filthy garments, is expounded by the passing away of iniquity. When a man's filthy garments are taken away, he is no more defiled with them; but he is not thereby clothed. This is an additional grace and favour thereto, namely to be clothed with change of garments. And what this raiment is, is declared, Isa. lxi. 10: "He hath clothed me with the garments of salvation, he hath covered me with the robe of righteousness;" which the Apostle alludes to, Phil. iii. 9. Wherefore these things are distinct; namely, the taking away of the

filthy garments, and the clothing of us with change of raiment; or the pardon of sin, and the robe of righteousness. By the one are we freed from condemnation, by the other we have right to salvation. And the same is in like manner represented Ezek. xvi. 6—12.

This place I had formerly urged to this purpose about communion with God, which Mr. Hotchkiss in his usual manner attempts to answer. And to omit his reviling expressions, with the crude unproved assertion of his own conceits, his answer is, that by the change of raiment mentioned in the prophet, our own personal righteousness is intended. For he acknowledges that our justification before God is here represented. And so also he expounds the place produced in the confirmation of the exposition given, Isa. lxi. 10, where this change of raiment is called "the garments of salvation and the robe of righteousness;" and thereon affirms, that our righteousness itself, before God, is our personal righteousness; that is, in our justification before him, which is the only thing in question. To all which presumptions, I shall oppose only the testimony of the same prophet, which he may consider at his leisure, and which, at one time or other, he will subscribe to. Isa. lxiv. 6. "We are all as an unclean thing, and all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags." He who can make garments of salvation and robes of righteousness of these filthy rags, has a skill in composing spiritual vestments that I am not acquainted with. What remains in the chapter wherein this answer is given to that testimony of the Scripture, I shall take no notice of, it being after his accustomed manner, only a perverse wresting of my words to such a sense, as may seem to countenance him in casting a reproach upon myself and others.

There is therefore no force in the comparing of these things to life and death natural, which are immediately opposed; so that he who is not dead is alive, and he who is alive is not dead, there being no distinct state between that of life and death. For these things being of different natures, the comparison between them is no way argumentative. Though it may be so in things natural, it is otherwise in things moral and political, where a proper representation of justification may be taken, as it is forensic. If it were so, that there is no difference between been acquitted of a crime at the bar of a judge, and a right to a kingdom, nor any different state between these things, it would prove, that there is no intermediate estate between being

pardoned, and having a right to the heavenly inheritance. But this is a vain imagination.

It is true, that right to eternal life succeeds to freedom from the guilt of eternal death. "That they may receive forgiveness of sins, and an inheritance among them that are sanctified." But it does not do so, out of a necessity in the nature of the things themselves, but only in the free constitution of God. Believers have the pardon of sin, and an immediate right and title to the favour of God, the adoption of sons, and eternal life. But there is another state in the nature of the things themselves, and this might have been so actually, had it so seemed good to God; for who sees not, that there is a *status* or *conditio personæ*, wherein he is neither under the guilt of condemnation, nor has an immediate right and title to glory, in the way of inheritance? God might have pardoned men all their sins past, and placed them in a state and condition of seeking righteousness for the future, by the works of the law, that so they might have lived: for this would answer the original state of Adam. But God has not done so; true; but whereas he might have done so, it is evident that the disposal of men into this state and condition of right to life and salvation, does not depend on, nor proceed from the pardon of sin, but has another cause, which is the imputation of the righteousness of Christ to us, as he fulfilled the law for us.

And in truth, this is the opinion of the most of our adversaries in this cause: for they contend, that over and above the remission of sin, which some of them say is absolute, without any respect to the merit or satisfaction of Christ, while others refer it to them, there is moreover, a righteousness of works required to our justification; only they say, this is our own incomplete, imperfect righteousness, imputed to us, as if it were perfect, that is for what it is not; and not the righteousness of Christ, imputed to us for what it is.

From what has been discoursed, it is evident that, to our justification before God, is required, not only that we be freed from the damnatory sentence of the law, which we are by the pardon of sin, but moreover, that the righteousness of the law be fulfilled in us, or, that we have a righteousness answering the obedience that the law requires, whereon our acceptance with God, through the riches of his grace, and our title to the heavenly inheritance, depend. This we have not in and of our selves, nor can attain to, as has been proved. Wherefore the perfect obedience and righteousness of Christ is imputed to us or in the sight of God we can never be justified.

Nor are the cavilling objections of the Socinians, and those that follow them, of any force against the truth herein. They tell us, that the righteousness of Christ can be imputed but to one, if to any. "For who can suppose that the same righteousness of one should become the righteousness of many, even of all that believe? Besides, he performed not all the duties that are required of us in all our relations, he being never placed in them." These things, I say, are both foolish and impious, destructive to the whole gospel. For all things here depend on the ordination of God. It is his ordinance that "as through the offence of one many are dead; so his grace, and the gift of grace, through one man Christ Jesus, hath abounded unto many; and as by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation, so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all unto the righteousness of life, and by the obedience of one many are made righteous;" as the Apostle argues, Rom. v. "For God sent his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and for sin, that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us," Rom. viii. 3, 4. For "he was the end of the law (the whole end of it) for righteousness unto them that believe," Rom. x. 4. This is the appointment of the wisdom, righteousness and grace of God, that the whole righteousness and obedience of Christ should be accepted as our complete righteousness before him, imputed to us by his grace, and applied to us or made ours through believing, and consequently to all that believe. And if the actual sin of Adam be imputed to us all, who derive our nature from him to condemnation, though he sinned not in our circumstances and relations, is it strange that the actual obedience of Christ should be imputed to them who derive a spiritual nature from him, to the justification of life? Besides, both the satisfaction and obedience of Christ, as relating to his person, were in some sense infinite, that is, of an infinite value, and so cannot be considered in parts, as though one part of it were imputed to one, and another to another, but the whole is imputed to every one that believes; and if the Israelites could say, that David was worth ten thousand of them, 2 Sam. xviii. 3, we may well allow the Lord Christ, and so what he did and suffered, to be more than all of us, and all that we can do and suffer.

There are also sundry other mistakes that concur to that part of the charge against the imputation of the righteousness of Christ to us, which we have now considered; I say of his righteousness; for the Apostle in this case uses those two

words δικαιοσύνη and ὑπακοή, righteousness and obedience, as of the same signification, Rom. v. 18, 19. Such are those, that remission of sin and justification are the same, or that justification consists only in the remission of sin; that faith itself as our act and duty, being the condition of the covenant, is imputed to us for righteousness; or that we have a personal inherent righteousness of our own, that one way or other is our righteousness before God for justification, either as a condition or a disposition to it; or as having a congruity in deserving the grace of justification, or a downright merit of condignity thereof. For all these are but various expressions of the same thing, according to the variety of the conceptions of the minds of men about it. But they have been all considered and removed in our preceding discourses.

To close this argument and our vindication of it, and therewith to obviate an objection, I acknowledge that our blessedness and life eternal is in the Scripture oft-times ascribed to the death of Christ: but it is so (1) as the principal cause of the whole, and as that without which no imputation of obedience could have justified us; for the penalty of the law was indispensably to be undergone. (2) It is so, not exclusively of all obedience, whereof mention is made in other places, but as that whereto it is inseparably conjoined. *Christus in vita passivam habuit actionem; in morte passionem activam sustinuit; dum salutem operaretur in medio terra.* Bernard. "In order to work out salvation for men on earth, Christ led a life of passive action, and died a death of active passion." And so it is also ascribed to his resurrection, with respect to evidence and manifestation. But the death of Christ exclusively as to his obedience is no where asserted as the cause of eternal life, comprising that exceeding weight of glory wherewith it is accompanied.

Hitherto we have treated of and vindicated the imputation of the active obedience of Christ to us, as the truth of it was deduced from the preceding argument about the obligation of the law of creation. I shall now briefly confirm it with other reasons and testimonies.

1. That which Christ, the mediator and surety of the covenant, did in obedience to God, in the discharge and performance of his office, he did for us, and that is imputed to us. This has been proved already, and it has too great an evidence of truth to be denied. He was "born to us, given to us," Isa. ix. 6 "For what the law could not do, in that it was weak

through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us," Rom. viii. 3, 4. Whatever is spoken of the grace, love and purpose of God in sending or giving his Son, or of the love, grace and condescension of the Son in coming and undertaking the work of redemption designed to him, or of the office itself of a mediator or surety, gives testimony to this assertion. Yea, it is the fundamental principle of the gospel, and of the faith of all that truly believe. As for those by whom the divine person and satisfaction of Christ are denied, whereby they overturn the whole work of his mediation, we do not at present consider them. Wherefore what he so did, is to be inquired into. And

1. The Lord Christ our mediator and surety was in his human nature "made under the law," Gal. iv. 1. That he was not so for himself by the necessity of his condition, we have proved before. It was therefore *for us*. But as made "under the law," he yielded obedience to it; this therefore was for us, and is imputed to us. The exception of the Socinians that it is the judicial law only that is intended, is too frivolous to be insisted on. For he was made under that law whose curse we are delivered from. And if we are delivered only from the curse of the law of Moses, wherein they contend that there were neither promises nor threatening of eternal things, of any thing beyond this present life, we are still in our sins, under the curse of the moral law, notwithstanding all that he has done for us. It is excepted with more colour of sobriety, that he was made under the law only as to the curse of it. But it is plain in the text, that Christ was made under the law as we are under it. He was "made under the law to redeem them that were under the law." And if he was not made so as we are, there is no consequence from his being made under it, to our redemption from it. But we are so under the law, as not only to be obnoxious to the curse, but so as to be obliged to all the obedience that it required, as has been proved. And if the Lord Christ has redeemed us only from the curse of it by undergoing it, leaving us in ourselves to answer its obligation to obedience, we are not freed nor delivered. And the expression of "under the law," in the first place and properly, signifies being under the obligation of it to obedience, and consequently only with respect to the curse, Gal. iv. 21. "Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law." They did not desire to

be under the curse of the law, but only its obligation to obedience; which, in all usage of speech, is the first proper sense of that expression. Wherefore the Lord Christ being made under the law for us, he yielded perfect obedience to it for us, which is therefore imputed to us. For that what he did, was *done for us*, depends solely on imputation.

2. As he was thus made under the law, so he actually fulfilled it by his obedience to it. So he testifies concerning himself; "Think not that I am come to destroy the law and the prophets. I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil," Matt. v. 17. These words of our Lord Jesus Christ as recorded by the Evangelist, the Jews continually object against the Christians, as contradictory to what they pretend to be done by him, namely, that he has destroyed and taken away the law. And Maimonides in his treatise *De Fundamentis Legis*, has many blasphemous reflections on the Lord Christ as a false prophet in this matter. But the reconciliation is plain and easy. There was a twofold law given to the church, the moral and the ceremonial law. The first as we have proved is of eternal obligation. The other was given only for a time. That the latter of these was to be taken away and abolished, the apostle proves with invincible testimonies, out of the Old Testament against the obstinate Jews, in his Epistle to the Hebrews. Yet was it not to be taken away without its accomplishment, when it ceased of itself. Wherefore our Lord Christ did no otherwise dissolve or destroy that law, but by the accomplishment of it; and so he put an end to it, as is fully declared, Ephes. ii. 14—16. But the law *κατ' ἐξουσίαν*, that which obliges all men to obedience to God always, he came not *καταλύσαι*, "to destroy;" that is *ἀπορρησαι*, to abolish it, as an *ἀπορητής* is ascribed to the Mosaical law, Heb. ix.,* or *καταργησαι*, which the apostle denies to be done by Christ, and faith in him, Rom. iii. 31. "Do we then make void *καταργουμένον* the law through faith? God forbid; yea, we establish the law." *Νομοὶ ἱστῶσαι* is to confirm its obligation to obedience, which is done by faith only with respect to the moral law, the other being evacuated as to any power of obliging to obedience. This therefore is the law which our Lord Christ affirms that he came not to destroy; so he expressly declares in his ensuing discourse, showing both its power of obliging us always to obedience, and giving an ex-

* In the same sense is the word used, Matt. xxiv. 2; xxvi. 6; xxvii. 40. Mark xiii. 2; xiv. 58; xv. 29. Luke xxi. 6. Acts v. 38, 39; vi. 14. Rom. xiv. 20. 2 Cor. v. 1. Gal. ii. 18, mostly with an accusative case, of the things spoken of.

position of it. This law the Lord Christ came "to fulfil." Πληρῶσαι τον νομον, in the Scripture is the same with ἐμπληρῶσαι τον νομον in other writers; that is, to yield full perfect obedience to the commands of the law, whereby they are absolutely fulfilled; πληρῶσαι νομον, is not to make the law perfect; for it was always νομος τελειος, a "perfect law," James i. 25, but to yield perfect obedience to it; the same that our Saviour calls πληρῶσαι πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην, Matt. iii. 3, 15, "to fulfil all righteousness;" that is, by obedience to all God's commands and institutions, as is evident in the place. So the apostle uses the same expression, Rom. xiii. 8, "he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law."

It is a vain exception that Christ fulfilled the law by his doctrine, in the exposition of it. The opposition between the words to *fulfil* and to *destroy*, will admit of no such sense. And our Saviour himself expounds this fulfilling of the law, by doing the commands of it, v. 19. Wherefore the Lord Christ, as our mediator and surety, fulfilling the law by yielding perfect obedience thereto, did it for us, and to us it is imputed.

This is plainly affirmed by the Apostle, Rom. v. 18, 19. "Therefore as by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men to justification of life. For as by the disobedience of one many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." The full plea from and vindication of this testimony, I refer to its proper place in the testimonies given to the imputation of the righteousness of Christ to our justification in general. Here I shall only observe that the Apostle expressly and in terms affirms that by the obedience of Christ, we are made righteous or justified, which we cannot be but by the imputation of it to us. I have met with nothing that had the appearance of any sobriety for the eluding of this express testimony, but only, that by the obedience of Christ, his death and sufferings are intended, wherein he was obedient to God; as the Apostle says, he was "obedient unto death; the death of the cross," Phil. ii. 8. But yet there is herein no colour of probability. For, (1) It is acknowledged that there was such a near conjunction and alliance between the obedience of Christ, and his sufferings, that though they may be distinguished, yet can they not be separated. He suffered in the whole course of his obedience, from the womb to the cross; and he obeyed in all his sufferings to the last moment wherein he expired. But yet are they really

things distinct, as we have proved; and they were so in him, who "learned obedience by the things that he suffered," Heb. v. 8. (2) In this place *ὑπακοή*, obedience, ver. 19; and *δικαιώμα*, righteousness, ver. 18, are the same. "By the righteousness of one," and "by the obedience of one," are the same. But suffering, as suffering, is not righteousness. For if it were, then every one that suffers what is due to him, should be righteous, and so be justified, even the devil himself. (3) The righteousness and obedience here intended, are opposed to "the offence," but the offence intended was an actual transgression of the law; so is *παρπτῶμα*, a *fall from*, or a fall in, the course of obedience. Wherefore the *δικαιώμα* or righteousness must be an actual obedience to the commands of the law, or the force of the Apostle's reasoning and antithesis cannot be understood. (4) Particularly it is such an obedience as is opposed to the disobedience of Adam. "One man's disobedience," "one man's obedience." But the disobedience of Adam was an actual transgression of the law; and therefore the obedience of Christ here intended, was his active obedience to the law; which is what we plead for. And I shall not at present further pursue the argument, because the force of it in the confirmation of the truth contended for, will be included in those that follow.



CHAPTER XIII.

THE NATURE OF JUSTIFICATION PROVED FROM THE DIFFERENCE OF THE COVENANTS.

THAT which we plead in the third place to our purpose, is the difference between the two covenants. And herein it may be observed:

1. That by the two covenants I understand those which were absolutely given to the whole church, and were all to bring it to a complete and perfect state; that is the covenant of works, or the law of our creation as it was given to us, with promises and threatenings, or rewards and punishments annexed to it: and the covenant of grace revealed and proposed in the first promise. As to the covenant of Sinai, and the new testament as actually confirmed in the death of Christ, with

all the spiritual privileges thence arising, and the differences between them, they belong not to our present argument.

2. The whole entire nature of the covenant of works consisted in this; that upon our personal obedience, according to the law and rule of it, we should be accepted with God, and rewarded by him. Herein the essence of it consisted. And whatever covenant proceeds on these terms, or has the nature of them in it, however it may be varied, with additions or alterations, it is the same covenant still, and not another. As in the renovation of the promise wherein the essence of the covenant of grace was contained, God did oftentimes make other additions to it, as to Abraham and David; yet was it still the same covenant for the substance of it, and not another; so whatever variations may be made in, or additions to the dispensation of the first covenant, so long as this rule is retained, "Do this and live," it is still the same covenant, for the substance and essence of it.

3. Hence two things belonged to this covenant. (1) That all things were transacted immediately between God and man. There was no mediator in it, no one to undertake any thing, either on the part of God or man, between them. For the whole depending on every one's personal obedience, there was no place for a mediator. (2) That nothing but perfect sinless obedience would be accepted with God, or preserve the covenant in its primitive state and condition. There was nothing in it as to pardon of sin, no provision for any defect in personal obedience.

4. Wherefore this covenant being once established between God and man, there could be no new covenant made unless the essential form of it were of another nature; namely, that our own personal obedience be not the rule and cause of our acceptance and justification before God. For whilst this is so, as was before observed, the covenant is still the same; however the dispensation of it may be reformed or reduced, to suit our present state and condition. What grace soever might be introduced into it, that could not be so, which excluded all works from being the cause of our justification. But if a new covenant be made, such grace must be provided as is absolutely inconsistent with any works of ours, as to the first ends of the covenant, as the Apostle declares, Rom. xi. 6.

5. Wherefore the covenant of grace, supposing it a new, real, absolute covenant, and not a reformation of the dispensation of the old, or a reduction of it to the use of our present

condition (as some imagine it to be) must differ in the essence, substance, and nature of it from that first covenant of works. And this it cannot do, if we are to be justified before God on our personal obedience, wherein the essence of the first covenant consisted. If then the righteousness wherewith we are justified before God, be our own, our own personal righteousness; we are yet under the first covenant, and no other.

6. But things in the new covenant are indeed quite otherwise. For (1) it is of grace, which wholly excludes works; that is, so of grace, that our own works are not the means of justification before God; as in the places before alleged. (2) It has a mediator and surety, which is built alone on this supposition, that what we cannot do in ourselves which was originally required of us, and what the law of the first covenant cannot enable us to perform, that should be performed for us, by our mediator and surety. And if this be not included in the very first notion of a mediator and surety, yet it is in that of a mediator or surety who voluntarily interposes himself upon an open acknowledgment, that those for whom he undertakes, were utterly insufficient to perform what was required of them; on which supposition all the truth of the Scripture depends. It is one of the very first notions of Christianity, that the Lord Christ was "given to us," "born to us," that he came as a "mediator," to do for us what we could not do for ourselves, and not merely to suffer what we had deserved. And here instead of our own righteousness, we have the righteousness of God; instead of being righteous in ourselves before God, he is "the Lord our righteousness." And nothing but a righteousness of another kind and nature, to justification before God, could constitute another covenant. Wherefore the righteousness whereby we are justified, is the righteousness of Christ imputed to us, or we are still under the law, under the covenant of works.

It will be said that our personal obedience is by none asserted to be the righteousness wherewith we are justified before God, in the same manner as it was under the covenant of works. But the argument speaks not as to the manner or way whereby it is so; but to the thing itself. If it be so in any way or manner under what qualifications soever, we are under that covenant still. If it be of works any way, it is not of grace at all. But it is added, that the differences are such as are sufficient to constitute covenants effectually distinct. As (1) Perfect, sinless obedience was required in the first cove-

nant; but in the new, that which is imperfect and accompanied with many sins and failings, is accepted. *Answer.* This is *gratis dictum*, and begs the question. No righteousness to justification before God, is or can be accepted, but what is perfect. (2) Grace is the original fountain and cause of all our acceptance before God in the new covenant. *Answer.* It was so also in the old. The creation of man in original righteousness was an effect of divine grace, benignity, and goodness. And the reward of eternal life in the enjoyment of God, was of mere sovereign grace: yet what was then of works, was not of grace; no more is it at present. (3) There would then have been merit of works, which is now excluded. *Answer.* Such a merit as arises from an equality and proportion between works and reward, by the rule of commutative justice, would not have been in the works of the first covenant; and in no other sense is it now rejected by them that oppose the imputation of the righteousness of Christ. (4) All is now resolved into the merit of Christ, upon the account whereof alone, our own personal righteousness is accepted before God to our justification. *Answer.* The question is not on what account, nor for what reason it is so accepted, but whether it be or not; seeing its so being is effectually constitutive of a covenant of works.



CHAPTER XIV.

THE EXCLUSION OF ALL SORTS OF WORKS FROM AN INTEREST IN JUSTIFICATION. WHAT INTENDED BY THE LAW, AND THE WORKS OF IT, IN THE EPISTLES OF PAUL.

WE shall take our fourth argument from the express exclusion of all works of what sort soever from our justification before God. For this alone is that which we plead; namely, that no acts or works of our own are the causes or conditions of our justification; but that the whole of it is resolved into the free grace of God, through Jesus Christ, as the mediator and surety of the covenant. To this purpose the Scripture speaks expressly, Rom. iii. 28. "Therefore we conclude, that a man is justified by faith, without the works of the law." Rom. iv. 5; "But unto him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth

the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness." Rom. xi. 6. "If it be of grace, then is it not of works." Gal. ii. 16. "Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law, for by the works of the law, shall no flesh be justified." Eph. ii. 8, 9. "For by grace ye are saved through faith, not of works, lest any man should boast." Tit. iii. 5. "Not by works of righteousness, which we have done, but according unto his mercy he hath saved us."

These and the like testimonies are express, and in positive terms assert all that we contend for. And I am persuaded, that no unprejudiced person, whose mind is not prepossessed with notious and distinctions, whereof not the least tittle is offered to them from the texts mentioned, nor elsewhere, can but judge that the law in every sense of it, and all sorts of works whatever, that at any time, or by any means, sinners or believers do or can perform, are, not in this or that sense, but every way and in all senses, excluded from our justification before God. And if it be so, it is the righteousness of Christ alone that we must betake ourselves to, or this matter must cease for ever. And this inference the Apostle himself makes from one of the testimonies before mentioned, namely, that of Gal. ii. 16; for he adds upon it; "I through the law am dead to the law, that I might live unto God. I am crucified with Christ; nevertheless I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me, and the life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me. I do not frustrate the grace of God; for if righteousness come by the law then is Christ dead in vain."

Our adversaries are extremely divided among themselves, and can come to no consistency, as to the sense and meaning of the Apostle in these assertions; for what is proper and obvious to the understanding of all men, especially from the opposition that is made between the law and works on the one hand, and faith, grace, and Christ on the other, (which are opposed as inconsistent in this matter of our justification,) they will not allow, nor can do so without the ruin of the opinions they plead for. Wherefore their various conjectures shall be examined, as well to show their inconsistency among themselves, by whom the truth is opposed, as to confirm our present argument.

1. Some say it is the ceremonial law alone, and the works of it that are intended; or the law as given to Moses on Mount

Sinai, containing that entire covenant that was afterwards to be abolished. This was of old the common opinion of the schoolmen, though it be now generally exploded. And the opinion lately contended for, that the Apostle Paul excludes justification from the works of the law, not because no man can yield that perfect obedience which the law requires, or excludes works absolutely perfect, and sinless obedience; but because the law itself, which he intends, could not justify any by the observation of it, is nothing but the renovation of this obsolete notion, that it is the ceremonial law only, or the law given on Mount Sinai, abstracted from the grace of the promise, which could not justify any, in the observation of its rites and commands. But of all other conjectures, this is the most impertinent and contradictory to the design of the Apostle, and is therefore rejected by Bellarmine himself. For the Apostle treats of that law, the doers of which shall be justified, Rom. ii. 13. And the authors of this opinion would have it to be a law that can justify none of them that do it. That law he intends whereby is the knowledge of sin; for he gives this reason, why we cannot be justified by the works of it, namely, because by it, is the knowledge of sin, iii. 20. And by what law is the knowledge of sin, he expressly declares, where he affirms, that "he had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet," vii. 7; which is the moral law alone. That law he designs, which stops the mouth of all sinners, and makes all the world obnoxious to the judgment of God, iii. 19; which no law can do but the law written in the heart of men at their creation, ii. 14, 15; that law which if a man do the works of it, he shall live in them; Gal. iii. 12; Rom. x. 5; and which brings all men under the curse for sin, Gal. iii. 10; the law that is established by faith and not made void; Rom. iii. 31; which the ceremonial law is not, nor the covenant of Sinai; the law whose righteousness is to be fulfilled in us; Rom. viii. 4. And the instance which the Apostle gives of justification without the works of that law which he intends, namely that of Abraham, was some hundreds of years before the giving of the ceremonial law. Neither yet do I say that the ceremonial law and the works of it are excluded from the intention of the Apostle; for when that law was given, the observation of it was an especial instance of that obedience we owed to the first table of the decalogue; and the exclusion of the works thereof from our justification, in as much as the performance of them was part of that moral obedience which we owed to God, is exclusive

of all other works also. But that it is alone here intended, or that law which could never justify any by its observation, although it was observed in due manner, is a fond imagination, and contradictory to the express assertion of the Apostle. And whatever is pretended to the contrary, this opinion is expressly rejected by Augustine.* “Lest any one should think, that the Apostle had said that no one was justified by that law, which, under the ancient sacraments, contains many figurative precepts, whence also is that circumcision of the flesh, he immediately subjoins what law he means; and adds, ‘By the law is the knowledge of sin.’” And to the same purpose he speaks again.† “Not only those works of the law contained in the ancient sacraments, which, since the revelation of the New Testament are not observed by Christians, such as circumcision, the ceremonial observance of the Sabbath, abstinence from particular meats, the offering of animals in sacrifice, the new moons, unleavened bread, &c., but also the command of the law, ‘Thou shalt not covet,’ which every Christian acknowledges to be universally binding, do not justify a man, unless through the faith of Jesus Christ, and the grace of God through our Lord Jesus Christ.”

2. Some say the Apostle only excludes the perfect works required by the law of innocency, which is a sense diametrically opposite to that foregoing. But this best pleases the Socinians.‡ “Paul in this passage is treating about perfect works, and therefore he adds, ‘without the works of the law,’ to show that he

* Ne quisquam putaret hic Apostolum dixisse ea lege neminem justificari, quæ in sacramentis veteribus multa continent figurata concepta, unde etiam est ista circumcisio carnis, continuo subjungit, quam dixerit legem et addit; per legem cognitio peccati, lib. de Spirit. et Liter. cap. 8.

† Non solum illa opera legis quæ sunt in veteribus sacramentis, et nunc revelato Testamento novo non observantur a Christianis, sicut est circumcisio præputii, et sabbati carnalis vacatio, et a quibusdam escis abstinentia, et pecorum in sacrificiis immolatio, et neomenia et azymum, et cætera hujusmodi, verum etiam illud quod in lege dictum est, non concupisces, quod ubique et Christianus nullus ambigit esse dicendum, non justificat hominem, nisi per fidem Jesu Christi et gratiam Dei per Jesum Christum dominum nostrum. Epist. 200.

‡ Paulus agit de operibus et perfectis in hoc dicto, ideo enim adjecit, sine operibus legis, ut indicaretur loqui eum de operibus a lege requisitis, et sic de perpetua et perfectissima divinorum præceptorum obedientia sicut lex requirit. Cum autem talem obedientiam qualem lex requirit nemo præstare possit, ideo subjecit Apostolus nos justificari fide, id est, fiducia et obedientia ea quantum quisque præstare potest, et quotidie quam maximum præstare studet, et committitur. Sine operibus legis, id est, etsi interim perfecte totam legem sicut debebat complere nequit.—Socinus.

is speaking of works required by the law, and consequently, of that perpetual and perfect observance of the divine commands which the law requires. But as no man can render such an obedience as the law demands, therefore the Apostle adds that we are 'justified by faith,' that is by such a confidence and obedience as every one can render, and daily labours and strives as much as in him lies to render." But (1) We have herein the whole granted of what we plead for; namely, that it is the moral indispensable law of God that is intended by the Apostle; and that by the works of it no man can be justified, yea, that all the works of it are excluded from our justification; for it is, saith the Apostle, "without works." The works of this law being performed according to it, will justify them that perform them, as he affirms, Rom. ii. 13, and the Scripture elsewhere witnesses, that "he that doeth them, shall live in them;" but because this can never be done by any sinner, therefore all consideration of them is excluded from our justification. (2) It is a wild imagination that the dispute of the Apostle is to this purpose, that the perfect works of the law will not justify us, but imperfect works, which answer not the law, will do so. (3) Granting the law intended, to be the moral law of God, the law of our creation, there is no such distinction intimated in the least by the Apostle, that we are not justified by the perfect works of it which we cannot perform, but by some imperfect works that we can perform, and labour so to do. Nothing is more foreign to the design and express words of his whole discourse. (4) The evasion which they betake themselves to, that the Apostle opposes justification by faith to that of works which he excludes, is altogether vain in this sense. For they would have this faith to be our obedience to the divine commands in that imperfect manner which we can attain to. For when the Apostle has excluded all such justification by the law and the works thereof, he does not advance in opposition to them and in their room, our own faith and obedience; but adds, "being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ, whom God has set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood."

3. Some of late among ourselves, and they want not them who have gone before them, affirm that the works which the Apostle excludes from justification, are only the outward works of the law, performed without an inward principle of faith, fear, or the love of God. Servile works attended to from a respect to the threatening of the law, are those which will not

justify us. But this opinion is not only false but impious. For (1) The Apostle excludes the works of Abraham which were not such outward servile works as are imagined. (2) The works excluded are those which the law requires; and "the law is holy, just and good." But a law that requires only outward works without internal love to God, is neither holy, just nor good. (3) The law condemns all such works as are separated from the internal principle of faith, fear and love, for it requires that in all our obedience we should love the Lord our God with all our hearts. And the Apostle says not, that we are not justified by the works which the law condemns, but by them which the law commands. (4) It is highly reflecting on the honour of God, that he whose divine prerogative it is to know the hearts of men alone, and who, therefore regards them alone in all the duties of their obedience, should give a law requiring outward servile works only; for if the law intended require more, then are not those the only works excluded.

4. Some say in general it is the Jewish law that is intended, and think thereby to cast off the whole difficulty. But if by the Jewish law they intend only the ceremonial law, or the law absolutely as given by Moses, we have already showed the vanity of that pretence. But if they mean thereby the whole law or rule of obedience given to the church of Israel under the Old Testament, they express much of the truth; it may be more than they designed.

5. Some say that it is works, with a conceit of merit, that makes the reward to be of debt, and not of grace, that are excluded by the Apostle. But no such distinction appears in the text or context. For (1) The Apostle excludes all works of the law, that is, that the law requires of us in a way of obedience, be they of what sort they will. (2) The law requires no works with a conceit of merit. (3) Works of the law originally included no merit, as that which arises from the proportion of one thing to another in the balance of justice, and in that sense only is it rejected by those who plead for an interest of works in justification. (4) The merit which the Apostle excludes, is that which is inseparable from works, so that it cannot be excluded, unless the works themselves be so. And to their merit two things concur: (1) A comparative boasting that is, not absolutely in the sight of God, which follows the *meritum ex condigno*, which some poor sinful mortals have fancied in their works; but that which gives one man a preference above another in the obtaining of justification, which

grace will not allow. Rom. iv. 2. (2) That the reward be not absolutely of grace, but that respect be had therein to works, which makes it so far to be of debt; not out of an internal congruity which would not have been under the law of creation, but out of some congruity with respect to the promise of God, Rom. v. 4. In these two regards merit is inseparable from works; and the Holy Ghost utterly to exclude it, excludes all works from which it is inseparable, as it is from all. Wherefore (5) the Apostle speaks not one word about the exclusion of the merit of works only; but he excludes all works whatever, and that by this argument, that the admission of them would necessarily introduce merit in the sense described, which is inconsistent with grace. And although some think that they are injuriously dealt with, when they are charged with maintaining merit in their asserting the influence of our works upon our justification; yet those of them who best understand themselves, and the controversy itself, are not so averse from some kind of merit, as knowing that it is inseparable from works.

6. Some contend that the Apostle excludes only works wrought before believing, in the strength of our own wills and natural abilities, without the aid of grace. Works they suppose required by the law are such as we perform by the direction and command of the law, alone. But the law of faith requires works in the strength of the supplies of grace which are not excluded. This is that which the most learned and judicious of the church of Rome now generally betake themselves to. Those who amongst us plead for works in our justification, use many distinctions to explain their minds, and free their opinion from a coincidence with that of the Papists, yet they deny the name of merit and the thing itself, in the sense of the church of Rome, as it is renounced likewise by all the Socinians. Wherefore they make use of the preceding evasion, that merit is excluded by the Apostle, and works only as they are meritorious, although the Apostle's plain argument be that they are excluded because such a merit as is inconsistent with grace, is inseparable from their admission.

But the Roman church cannot so part with merit. Wherefore they are to find out a sort of works to be excluded only, which they are content to part with as not meritorious. Such are those before described, wrought as they say before believing, and without the aids of grace; and such, they say, are all the works of the law. And this they do with some more modesty and sobriety, than those amongst us, who would have

only external works and observances to be intended. For they grant that sundry internal works, as those of attrition, sorrow for sin, and the like, are of this nature. But the works of the law it is they say that are excluded. But this whole plea, and all the sophism wherewith it is countenanced, have been so discussed and defeated by Protestant writers of all sorts against Bellarmine and others, that it is needless to repeat the same things, or to add any thing to them. And the falsehood of it will be sufficiently evinced, in what we shall immediately prove concerning the law and works intended by the Apostle. However, the heads of the demonstration of the truth to the contrary may be touched on. And (1) the Apostle excludes all works without distinction or exception. And we are not to distinguish where the law does not distinguish before us. (2) All the works of the law are excluded; therefore all works wrought after believing by the aids of grace are excluded. For they are all required by the law. See Psa. exix. 35; Rom. vii. 22. Works not required by the law, are no less an abomination to God, than sins against the law. (3) The works of believers after conversion, performed by the aids of grace, are expressly excluded by the Apostle. So are those of Abraham after he had been a believer many years, and abounded in them to the praise of God. So he excludes his own works after his conversion, Gal. ii. 16; 1 Cor. iv. 4; Phil. iii. 9. And so he excludes the works of all other believers; Ephes. ii. 9, 10. (4) All works are excluded that might give countenance to boasting, Rom. iv. 2; iii. 17; Eph. ii. 9; 1 Cor. i. 29—31. But this is done more by the good works of regenerate persons, than by any works of unbelievers. (5) The law requires faith and love in all our works, and therefore if all the works of the law be excluded, the best works of believers are so. (6) All works are excluded which are opposed to grace working freely in our justification. But this all works whatever are, Rom. xi. 6. (7) In the Epistle to the Galatians the Apostle excludes from our justification all those works which the false teachers pressed as necessary thereto. But they urged the necessity of the works of believers, and those who were by grace already converted to God. For those upon whom they pressed them to this end, were already actually so. (8) They are good works that the Apostle excludes from our justification. For there can be no pretence of justification by those works that are not good, or which have not all things essentially requisite to make them so. But such are

all the works of unbelievers, performed without the aids of grace; they are not good, nor as such accepted with God; but want what is essentially requisite to the constitution of good works. And it is ridiculous to think that the Apostle disputes about the exclusion of such works from our justification, as no man in his wits would think to have any place therein. (9) The reason why no man can be justified by the law, is because no man can yield perfect obedience thereto. For by perfect obedience the law will justify, Rom. ii. 13; x. 5. Wherefore all works are excluded that are not absolutely perfect. But this the best works of believers are not; as we have proved before. (10) If there be a reserve for the works of believers performed by the aid of grace in our justification, it is, that either they may be con-causes thereof, or be indispensably subservient to those things that are so. That they are con-causes of our justification is not absolutely affirmed; neither can it be said, that they are necessarily subservient to them that are so. They are not so to the efficient cause thereof, which is the grace and favour of God alone, Rom. iii. 24, 25; iv. 16; Eph. ii. 8, 9; Rev. i. 6. Nor are they so to the meritorious cause of it, which is Christ alone, Acts xiii. 38; xxvi. 18; 1 Cor. i. 30; 2 Cor. v. 18—21; nor to the material cause of it; which is the righteousness of Christ alone; Rom. x. 3, 4. Nor are they so to faith in what place soever it be stated. For not only is faith alone mentioned, wherever we are taught the way how the righteousness of Christ is derived and communicated to us, without any intimation of the conjunction of works with it; but also, as to our justification they are placed in opposition and contradiction one to the other, Rom. iii. 28. And sundry other things are pleadable to the same purpose.

7. Some affirm that the Apostle excludes all works from our first justification, but not from the second, or as some speak, the continuation of our justification. But we have before examined these distinctions, and found them groundless.

Evident it is therefore, that men put themselves into an uncertain, slippery station, where they know not what to fix upon, nor wherein to find any such appearance of truth as to give them countenance in denying the plain and frequently repeated assertion of the Apostle.

Wherefore in the confirmation of the present argument, I shall more particularly inquire into what it is, that the Apostle intends by the law and works whereof he treats. For as to our justification, whatever they are, they are absolutely and uni-

versally opposed to grace, faith, the righteousness of God, and the blood of Christ, as those which are altogether inconsistent with them. Neither can this be denied or questioned by any, seeing it is the plain design of the Apostle to evince that inconsistency.

1. Wherefore in general, it is evident that the Apostle by the law and the works thereof, intended what the Jews with whom he had to do, understood by the law and their own whole obedience thereto. I suppose this cannot be denied. For without a concession of it, there is nothing proved against them, nor are they in any thing instructed by him. Suppose those terms equivocal, and to be taken in one sense by him, and by them in another, and nothing can be rightly concluded from what is spoken of them. Wherefore the meaning of these terms the *law* and *works*, the Apostle takes for granted as very well known, and agreed on between himself and those with whom he had to do.

2. The Jews by the law intended what the Scriptures of the Old Testament meant by that expression. For they are nowhere blamed for any false notion concerning the law, or that they esteemed any thing to be so, but what was so indeed, and what was so called in the Scripture. Their present oral law was not yet hatched, though the Pharisees were brooding it.

3. The law under the Old Testament, immediately refers to the law given at Mount Sinai, nor is there any distinct mention of it before. This is commonly called *the law* absolutely; but most frequently the "law of God," the "law of the Lord;" and sometimes the "law of Moses," because of his especial ministry in the giving of it. "Remember the law of Moses my servant, which I commanded unto him," Mal. iv. 4. And this the Jews intended by the law.

4. Of the law so given at Horeb, there was a distribution into three parts. (1) There was the "ten words;" Deut. iv. 13; x. 4; that is, the ten commandments written on two tables of stone. This part of the law was first given; was the foundation of the whole, and contained that perfect obedience which was required of mankind by the law of creation, and was now received into the church, with the highest attestations of its indispensable obligation to obedience or punishment. (2) כּוּסֵי which the LXX render by δικαιώματα, that is *jura*; "rights or statutes;" but the Latin from thence *justificationes*, "justifications," which has given great occasion of mistake in many both ancient and modern divines. We call it the ceremonial law

The Apostle terms this part of the law distinctly *νόμος ἐπιτολών ἐν δογμασιν*, Ephes. ii. 15. "The law of commandments contained in ordinances;" that is, consisting in a multitude of arbitrary commands. (3) *דברי ה'תורה* which we commonly call the judicial law. This distribution of the law shuts up the Old Testament, as it is used in places innumerable before, only the *דברי ה'תורה* the "ten words," is expressed by the general word *תורה* the law, Mal. iv. 4.

5. These being the parts of the law given to the church in Sinai, the whole of it is constantly called "the law," that is, the instruction (as the word signifies) that God gave to the church, in the rule of obedience which he prescribed to it. This is the constant signification of that word in Scripture, where it is taken absolutely; and thereon does not signify precisely the law as given at Horeb, but comprehends with it all the revelations that God made to the Old Testament, in the explanation and confirmation of that law, in rules, motives, directions and enforcements of obedience.

6. Wherefore "the law" is the whole rule of obedience which God gave to the church under the Old Testament, with all the efficacy wherewith it was accompanied by the ordinances of God, including in it all the promises and threatenings, that might be motives to the obedience that God required. This is that which God and the church called the law under the Old Testament, and which the Jews so called with whom our Apostle had to do. That which we called the moral law was the foundation of the whole; and those parts of it which we call the judicial and ceremonial law, were peculiar instances of the obedience which the church under the Old Testament was obliged to, in the especial polity and divine worship, which at that season were necessary to it. And two things the Scripture testifies to, concerning this law.

1. That it was a perfect complete rule of all that internal, spiritual and moral obedience which God required of the church. "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul; the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple," Psal. xix. 7. And it was so of all the external duties of obedience, for matter and manner, time and season; that in both the church might walk "acceptably before God," Isa. viii. 20. And although the original duties of the moral part of the law are often preferred before the particular instances of obedience in duties of outward worship; yet the whole law was always the whole rule of all the obedience internal and external that

God required of the church, and which he accepted in them that believed.

2. That this law, this rule of obedience as it was ordained of God to be the instrument of his rule of the church, and by virtue of the covenant made with Abraham, to whose administration it was adapted, and which its introduction on Sinai did not disannul, was accompanied with a power and efficacy enabling to obedience. The law itself as merely preceptive and commanding, administered no power or ability to those that were under its authority to yield obedience to it; no more do the mere commands of the gospel. Moreover under the Old Testament it enforced obedience on the minds and consciences of men, by the manner of its first delivery, and the severity of its sanction, so as to fill them with fear and bondage; and was besides accompanied with such burthensome rules of outward worship, as made it a heavy yoke to the people. But as it was God's doctrine, teaching, instruction, in all acceptable obedience to himself, and was adapted to the covenant of Abraham, it was accompanied with an administration of effectual grace, procuring and promoting obedience in the church. And the law is not to be looked on as separated from those aids to obedience, which God administered under the Old Testament, whose effects are therefore ascribed to the law itself. See Psa. i. xix. cxix.

3. This being the law in the sense of the Apostle, and those with whom he had to do, our next inquiry is, what was their sense of works, or works of the law? And I say it is plain that they intended hereby, the universal sincere obedience of the church to God, according to this law. And other works, the law of God acknowledges not; yea, it expressly condemns all works that have any such defect in them, as to render them unacceptable to God. Hence, notwithstanding all the commands that God had positively given for the strict observance of sacrifices, offerings, and the like, yet when the people performed them without faith and love, he expressly affirms that he commanded them not, that is, to be observed in such a manner. In these works therefore consisted their personal righteousness, as "they walked in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord, blameless," Luke i. 6, wherein they "instantly served God day and night," Acts xxvi. 7. And this they esteemed to be their own righteousness, their righteousness according to the law, as really it was, Phil. iii. 6, 9. For although the Pharisees had greatly corrupted the doctrine of the law, and put false glosses

on sundry precepts of it; yet, that the church in those days did by the works of the law, understand either ceremonial duties only, or external works, or works with a conceit of merit, or works wrought without an internal principle of faith, and love to God, or any thing but their own personal sincere obedience to the whole doctrine and rule of the law, there is nothing that should give the least colour of imagination. For

1. All this is perfectly stated in the suffrage which the scribe gave to the declaration of the sense and design of the law, with the nature of the obedience which it requires, that was made at his request by our blessed Saviour, Mark xii. 28—33. “And one of the scribes came, and having heard them reasoning together, and perceiving that he had answered them well, asked him, Which is the first commandment of all?” or as it is, Matt. xxii. 36, “Which is the great commandment in the law? And Jesus answered him, The first of all the commandments is, Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord; and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength; this is the first commandment: and the second is like, namely this, thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. And the scribe said unto him, Well, Master, thou hast said the truth; for there is one God, and there is none but he. And to love him with all the heart, and with all the understanding, and with all the soul, and with all the strength, and to love his neighbour as himself, is more than all whole burnt-offerings and sacrifices.” And this is so expressly given by Moses as the sum of the law, namely, faith and love, as the principle of all our obedience, Deut. vi. 4, 5, that it is marvellous what should induce any learned sober person to fix upon any other sense of it; as that it respected ceremonial or external works only, or such as may be wrought without faith or love. This is the law concerning which the Apostle disputes, and this the obedience wherein the works of it consist. And more than this, in the way of obedience, God never did nor will require of any in this world. Wherefore the law, which the Apostle excludes from justification, is that whereby we are obliged to believe in God as one God, the only God, and love him with all our hearts and souls, and our neighbours as ourselves. And what works there are, or can be in any persons regenerate or not regenerate, to be performed in the strength of grace, or without it, that are acceptable to God, that may not be reduced to these heads, I know not.

2. The Apostle himself declares, that it is the law and the

works of it in the sense we have expressed, that he excludes from our justification.

For the law he speaks of, is the "law of righteousness," Rom. ix. 31, the law whose righteousness is to be fulfilled in us, that we may be accepted with God, and freed from condemnation, Rom. viii. 5; that, in obedience whereto our own personal righteousness consists, whether what we judge so, before conversion, Rom. x. 6, or what is so after it, Phil. iii. 9, the law which if a man observe, he shall live, and be justified before God, Rom. ii. 13; Gal. iii. 12; Rom. x. 5; that law which is "holy, just, and good," which discovers and condemns all sin whatever, Rom. vii. 7—9.

From what has been discoursed, these two things are evident in the confirmation of our present argument. (1) That the law intended by the Apostle, when he denies that by the works of the law any can be justified, is the entire rule and guide of our obedience to God, even as to the whole frame and spiritual constitution of our souls, with all the acts of obedience or duties that he requires of us. And (2) that the works of this law which he so frequently and plainly excludes from our justification, and therein opposes to the grace of God, and the blood of Christ, are all the duties of obedience, internal, supernatural, external, ritual, however we are or may be enabled to perform them, that God requires of us. And these things excluded, it is the righteousness of Christ alone imputed to us, on the account whereof we are justified before God.

The truth is, so far as I can discern, the real difference that is at this day amongst us about the doctrine of our justification before God, is the same that was between the Apostle and the Jews, and no other. But controversies in religion make a great appearance of being new, when they are only varied and made different by the new terms and expressions that are introduced into the handling of them. So has it fallen out in the controversy about nature and grace; for as to the true nature of it, it is the same in these days, as it was between the Apostle Paul and the Pharisees, between Austin and Pelagius afterwards. But it has now passed through so many forms and dresses of words, that it can scarce be known to be what it was. Many at this day will condemn both Pelagius and the doctrine that he taught, in the words wherein he taught it, and yet embrace and approve of the things themselves which he intended. The introduction of every change in philosophical learning, gives an appearance of a change in the controversies

which are managed thereby. But take off the covering of philosophical expressions, distinctions, metaphysical notions, and futile terms of art, which some of the ancient schoolmen and later disputants have cast upon it, and the difference about grace and nature is amongst us all, the same that it was of old, and as it is allowed by the Socinians.

Thus the Apostle treating of our justification before God, does it in these terms which are both expressive of the thing itself, and were well understood by them with whom he had to do; such as the Holy Spirit in their revelation had consecrated to their proper use. Thus on the one hand he expressly excludes the law, our own works, our own righteousness, from any interest therein; and in opposition to, and as inconsistent with them in the matter of justification, he ascribes it wholly to the righteousness of God, righteousness imputed to us, the obedience of Christ, Christ made righteousness to us, the blood of Christ as a propitiation, faith receiving Christ and the atonement. There is no awakened conscience guided by the least beam of spiritual illumination, but in itself plainly understands these things, and what is intended in them. But through the admission of exotic learning, with philosophical terms and notions, into the way of teaching spiritual things in religion, a new face and appearance is put on the whole matter, and a composition made between those things which the Apostle directly opposes as contrary and inconsistent. Hence are all our discourses about preparations, dispositions, conditions, merits *de congruo* and *condigno*, with such a train of distinctions, that if some bounds be not fixed to the inventing and coining of them, (which being a facile work, grows on us every day) we shall not ere long be able to look through them, so as to discover the things intended, or rightly to understand one another. For as one said of lies, so it may be said of arbitrary distinctions, they must be continually new thatched over, or it will rain through. But the best way is to cast off all these coverings, and we shall then quickly see, that the real difference about the justification of a sinner before God, is the same and no other, as it was in the days of the Apostle Paul, between him and the Jews. And all those things which men are pleased now to plead for, with respect to a causality in our justification before God, under the names of preparations, conditions, dispositions, merit with respect to a first or second justification, are as effectually excluded by the Apostle, as if he had expressly named them every one. For in them all, there

is a management according to our conceptions, and the terms of the learning passing in the present age, of the plea for our own personal righteousness which the Jews maintained against the Apostle. And the true understanding of what he intends by the law, the works and righteousness thereof, would be sufficient to determine this controversy, but that men are grown very skilful in the art of endless wrangling.



CHAPTER XV.

FAITH ALONE.

THE truth which we plead has two parts. (1) That the righteousness of God imputed to us, to the justification of life, is the righteousness of Christ, by whose obedience we are made righteous. (2) That it is faith alone, which on our part is required to interest us in that righteousness, or whereby we comply with God's grant and communication of it, or receive it to our use and benefit. For although this faith is in itself the radical principle of all obedience, and whatever is not so, which cannot, which does not on all occasions, evidence, prove, show or manifest itself by works, is not of the same kind with it, yet as we are justified by it, its act and duty is such, or of that nature, that no other grace, duty or work can be associated with it, or be of any consideration. And both these are evidently confirmed in that description which is given us in the Scripture, of the nature of faith and believing to the justification of life.

I know that many expressions used in the declaration of the nature and work of faith herein, are metaphorical, at least are generally esteemed so to be. But they are such as the Holy Ghost in his infinite wisdom thought meet to make use of, for the instruction and edification of the church. And I cannot but say, that those who understand not how effectually the light of knowledge is communicated by them to the minds of them that believe, and a sense of the things intended, to their spiritual experience, seem not to have taken a due consideration of them. Nor, whatever skill we pretend to, do we know always what expressions of spiritual things are metaphorical.

Those oftentimes may seem so to be, which are most proper. However, it is most safe for us to adhere to the expressions of the Holy Spirit, and not to embrace such senses of things as are inconsistent with them, and opposite to them. Wherefore,

1. That faith whereby we are justified, is most frequently in the New Testament expressed by *receiving*. This notion of faith has been before spoken to, in our general inquiry into the use of it in our justification. It shall not therefore be here much again insisted on. Two things we may observe concerning it. (1) That it is so expressed with respect to the whole object of faith, or to all that any way concurs to our justification. For we are said to receive Christ himself. "To as many as received him, he gave power to become the sons of God," John i. 12. "As ye have received Christ Jesus the Lord," Col. ii. 6. In opposition hereto unbelief is expressed by "not receiving him," John i. 11; iii. 11; xii. 48; xiv. 17. And it is a receiving of Christ, as he is "the Lord our righteousness," as "of God he is made righteousness" to us. And as no grace, no duty can have any co-operation with faith herein, this reception of Christ not belonging to their nature, nor comprised in their exercise; so it excludes any other righteousness from our justification but that of Christ alone. For we are justified by faith; faith alone receives Christ, and what it receives is the cause of our justification, whereon we become "the sons of God." So we "receive the atonement," made by the blood of Christ, Rom. v. 11. For "God has set him forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood." And this receiving of the atonement, includes the soul's approbation of the way of salvation by the blood of Christ, and the appropriation of the atonement made thereby to our own souls. For thereby also we receive the forgiveness of sins; "that they may receive the forgiveness of sin, through the faith that is in me," Acts xxvi. 18. In receiving Christ we receive the atonement, and in the atonement we receive the forgiveness of sins. But moreover the grace of God, and righteousness itself, as the efficient and material cause of our justification are received also; even the "abundance of grace, and the gift of righteousness," Rom. v. 17. So that faith with the respect to all the causes of justification is expressed by receiving. For it also receives the promise, the instrumental cause on the part of God thereof, Acts ii. 41; Heb. ix. 15. (2) That the nature of faith and its acting with respect to all the causes of justification consisting in receiving, that which is the object of it must be

offered, tendered, and given to us, as that which is not our own, but is made our own by that giving and receiving. This is evident in the general nature of receiving. And herein, as was observed, as no other grace or duty can concur with it, so the righteousness whereby we are justified can be none of our own, antecedent to this reception, nor at any time inherent in us. Hence we argue, that if the work of faith in our justification be receiving of what is freely granted, given, communicated and imputed to us, that is, of Christ, of the atonement, of the gift of righteousness, of the forgiveness of sins, then have our other graces, our obedience, duties, works, no influence upon our justification, nor are any causes or conditions thereof. For they are neither that which receives, nor that which is received, which alone concur thereto.

2. Faith is expressed by *looking*. "Look unto me and be saved," Isa. xlv. 22. "A man shall look to his Maker, and his eyes shall have respect unto the Holy One of Israel," Isa. xvii. 1. "They shall look on me whom they have pierced," Zech. xii. 10; See Psa. cxxiii. 2. The nature hereof is expressed, John iii. 14, 15. "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have eternal life." For so was he to be lifted up on the cross in his death, John viii. 28; xii. 32. The story is recorded Numb. xxi. 8, 9. I suppose none doubt but that the stinging of the people by fiery serpents, and the death that ensued thereon were types of the guilt of sin, and the sentence of the fiery law thereon. For these things happened to them in types, 1 Cor. x. 11. When any was so stung or bitten, if he betook himself to any other remedies, he died and perished. Only they that looked to the brazen serpent that was lifted up, were healed and lived. For this was the ordinance of God, this way of healing alone had he appointed. And their healing was a type of the pardon of sin with everlasting life. So by their looking, is the nature of faith expressed, as our Saviour plainly expounds it in this place. "So must the Son of man be lifted up, that he that believeth on him," that is, as the Israelites looked to the serpent in the wilderness. And although this expression of the great mystery of the gospel by Christ himself, has been by some derided, or as they call it exposed, yet it is really as instructive of the nature of faith, justification and salvation by Christ, as any passage in the Scripture. Now if faith, whereby we are justified, and in that exercise of it wherein we are so, be a looking to Christ, under

a sense of the guilt of sin and our lost condition thereby, for all, for our only help and relief, for deliverance, righteousness, and life, then is it therein exclusive of all other graces and duties whatever; for by them we neither look, nor are they the things, which we look after. But so is the nature and exercise of faith expressed by the Holy Ghost. And they who believe, understand his mind. For whatever may be pretended of metaphor in the expression, faith is that act of the soul whereby they who are hopeless, helpless, and lost in themselves, do in a way of expectancy and trust seek for all help and relief in Christ alone; or there is not truth in it. And this also sufficiently evinces the nature of our justification by Christ.

3. It is in like manner frequently expressed by *coming* to Christ. "Come unto me all ye that labour," Matt. xi. 28. See John vi. 35, 37, 45, 65; vii. 37. To come to Christ for life and salvation, is to believe on him to the justification of life. But no other grace or duty is a coming to Christ, and therefore have they no place in justification. He who has been convinced of sin, who has been wearied with the burthen of it, who has really designed to fly from the wrath to come, and has heard the voice of Christ in the gospel, inviting him to come to him for help and relief, will tell you that this coming to Christ consists in a man's going out of himself, in a complete renunciation of all his own duties and righteousness, and betaking himself with all his trust and confidence to Christ alone, and his righteousness, for pardon of sin, acceptance with God, and a right to the heavenly inheritance. It may be some will say this is not believing, but canting; be it so, we refer the judgment of it to the church of God.

4. It is expressed by *flying for refuge*, Heb. vi. 18. "Who have fled for refuge, to lay hold on the hope set before us," Prov. xviii. 10. Hence some have defined faith to be *per fugium anima*, "the flight of the soul" to Christ for deliverance from sin and misery. And much light is given to the understanding of the thing intended thereby. For herein it is supposed, that he who believes is antecedently thereto convinced of his lost condition, and that if he abide therein he must perish eternally; that he has nothing of himself whereby he may be delivered from it; that he must betake himself to somewhat else for relief; that to this end he considers Christ as set before him and proposed to him in the promise of the gospel; that he judges this to be a holy, a safe way for his deliverance and acceptance with God, as that which has the characters of all divine excel-

lencies upon it. Hereon he flieth to it for refuge, that is, with diligence and speed, that he perish not in his present condition; he betakes himself to it by placing his whole trust and affiance thereon. And the whole nature of our justification by Christ is better declared hereby to the supernatural sense and experience of believers, than by an hundred philosophical disputations about it.

5. The terms and notions by which it is expressed under the Old Testament, are *leaning* on God, Micah iii. 11, or Christ, Cant. viii. 5, *rolling* or *casting* ourselves and our burthen on the Lord, Psa. xxii. 8; xxxvii. 5. The wisdom of the Holy Ghost in such expressions has by some been profanely derided. Resting on God, or in him, 2 Chron. xiv. 11; Psa. xxxvii. 7. *Cleaving* to the Lord, Deut. iv. 4; Acts xi. 15; as also by *trusting*, *hoping*, and *waiting*, in places innumerable. And it may be observed that those who acted faith as it is thus expressed, do every where declare themselves to be lost, hopeless, helpless, desolate, poor, orphans, whereon they place all their hope and expectation on God alone.

All that I would infer from these things, is, that the faith whereby we believe to the justification of life, or which is required of us in a way of duty that we may be justified, is such an act of the whole soul whereby convinced sinners wholly go out of themselves to rest upon God in Christ, for mercy, pardon, life, righteousness, and salvation, with an acquiescency of heart therein, which is the whole of the truth pleaded for.



CHAPTER XVI.

THE TRUTH PLEADED, FURTHER CONFIRMED BY TESTIMONIES OF SCRIPTURE.

THAT which we now proceed to, is the consideration of those express testimonies of Scripture which are given to the truth pleaded for, and especially of those places where the doctrine of the justification of sinners is expressly and designedly handled. From them it is, that we must learn the truth, and into them must our faith be resolved, to whose authority all

the arguings and objections of men must give place. By them is more light conveyed into the understandings of believers, than by the most subtle disputations. And it is a thing not without scandal, to see among Protestants whole books written about justification, wherein scarce one testimony of Scripture is produced, unless it be to find out evasions from the force of them. And in particular, whereas the Apostle Paul has most fully and expressly (as he had the greatest occasion so to do) declared and vindicated the doctrine of evangelical justification, not a few, in what they write about it, are so far from declaring their thoughts and faith concerning it out of his writings, that they begin to reflect upon them as obscure, and such as give occasion to dangerous mistakes; and unless, as was said, to answer and except against them upon their own corrupt principles, seldom or never make mention of them. As though we were grown wiser than he, or that Spirit whereby he was inspired, guided, actuated in all that he wrote; but there can be nothing more alien from the genius of Christianity, than for us not to endeavour humbly to learn the mystery of the grace of God herein, in the declaration of it made by him. But "the foundation of God standeth sure," what course soever men shall be pleased to take in their profession of religion.

For the testimonies which I shall produce and insist upon, I desire the reader to observe, (1) That they are but some of the many that might be pleaded to the same purpose. (2) That those which have been, or yet shall be alleged on particular occasions, I shall wholly omit; and such are most of them that are given to this truth in the Old Testament. (3) That in the exposition of them I shall, with what diligence I can, attend (1) To the analogy of faith, that is the manifest scope and design of the revelation of the mind and will of God in the Scripture. And that this is to exalt the freeness and riches of his own grace, the glory and excellency of Christ, and his mediation, to discover the woful, lost, forlorn condition of man by sin, to debase and depress every thing that is in and of ourselves, as to the attaining life, righteousness and salvation, cannot be denied by any one who have their senses exercised in the Scriptures. (2) To the experience of them that believe, with the condition of them who seek after justification by Jesus Christ. In other things I hope the best helps and rules of the interpretation of the Scripture shall not be neglected.

There is weight in this case deservedly laid on the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, as promised and given

to us; namely, "the Lord our righteousness," Jer. xxiii. 6. As the name Jehovah, being given and ascribed to him, is a full indication of his divine person; so the addition of his being our righteousness, sufficiently declares, that in, and by him alone we have righteousness, or are made righteous. So was he typified by Melchisedec, as first, "the king of righteousness," then "the king of peace," Heb. vii. 2. For by his righteousness alone have we peace with God. Some of the Socinians would evade this testimony, by observing, that righteousness in the Old Testament is used sometimes for benignity, kindness and mercy, and so they suppose it may be here. But the most of them, avoiding the palpable absurdity of this imagination, refer it to the righteousness of God in deliverance, and vindication of his people. So Brennius, briefly, *Ita vocatur quia Dominus per manum ejus judicium et justitiam faciet Israeli.* "He is so called, because the Lord, by *his* hand, shall execute judgment and justice for Israel." But these are evasions of bold men, who care not, so they may say somewhat, whether what they say be agreeable to the analogy of faith, or the plain words of the Scripture. Bellarmine who was more wary to give some appearance of truth to his answers, first gives other reasons, why he is called "the Lord our righteousness," and then, whether unawares, or overpowered by the evidence of truth, grants that sense of the words which contains the whole of the cause we plead for. Christ, he says, "may be called the Lord our righteousness, because he is the efficient cause of our righteousness." As God is said to be "our strength and salvation." Again, "Christ is said to be our righteousness; as he is our wisdom, our redemption, and our peace; because he has redeemed us, and makes us wise and righteous, and reconciles us to God;" and other reasons of the same nature are added by others. But not trusting to these expositions of the words, he adds,* "Christ is said to be our righteousness, because he has made satisfaction for us to the Father; and so gives and communicates that satisfaction to us, when he justifies us, that it may be said to be our satisfaction, and righteousness. And in this sense it would not be absurd if any one should say, that the righteousness of Christ and his merits are

* Deinde dicitur Christus justitia nostra, quoniam satisfacit Patri pro nobis, et eam satisfactionem ita nobis donat et communicat, cum nos justificat, ut nostra satisfactio et justitia dici possit. Hoc modo non esset absurdum, si quis diceret nobis imputari Christi justitiam et merita, cum nobis donantur et applicantur, ac si nos ipsi Deo satisfacissemus. De Justificat. lib. ii. cap. 10.

imputed to us, when they are given and applied to us, as if we ourselves had satisfied God."

In this sense we say, that Christ is the Lord our righteousness; nor is there any thing of importance in the whole doctrine of justification that we own, which is not here granted by the Cardinal; and that in terms which some among ourselves scruple and oppose. I shall therefore look a little further into this testimony which has wrested so eminent a confession of the truth from so great an adversary. "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise up unto David a righteous Branch, and this is his name whereby he shall be called, The Lord our righteousness," Jer. xxiii. 5, 6. It is confessed among Christians that this is an illustrious renovation of the first promise, concerning the incarnation of the Son of God, and our salvation by him. This promise was first given when we had lost our original righteousness, and were considered only as those who had sinned and come short of the glory of God. In this estate, a righteousness was absolutely necessary that we might be again accepted with God; for without a righteousness, yea, that which is perfect and complete, we never were so, nor ever can be so. In this estate it is promised that he shall be our righteousness, or as the Apostle expresses it, "the end of the law for righteousness to them that believe." That he is so there can be no question; the whole inquiry is, how he is so. This, say the most sober and modest of our adversaries, is because he is the efficient cause of our righteousness, that is, of our personal inherent righteousness. But this righteousness may be considered either in itself, as it is an effect of God's grace, and so it is good and holy, although it be not perfect and complete; or it may be considered as it is ours, inherent in us, accompanied with the remaining defilements of our nature; in that respect, as this righteousness is ours, the prophet affirms that (in the sight of God) "we are all as an unclean thing, and all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags," Isa. lxiv. 6; that is, our whole personal, inherent righteousness. And the Lord Christ cannot from hence be denominated "the Lord our righteousness," seeing it is all "as filthy rags." It must therefore be a righteousness of another sort whence this denomination is taken, and on the account whereof this name is given him, wherefore he is our righteousness, as all our righteousnesses are in him. So the church which confesses all her own righteousnesses to be filthy rags, says, "In the Lord have I righteousness," Isa. xlv. 24, which is expounded of Christ by the Apos-

tle, Rom. xiv. 11, "only in the Lord are my righteousnesses;" which two places the Apostle expresses, Phil. iii. 9, "that I may win Christ and be found in him, not having mine own righteousness which is of the law (in this case as filthy rags) but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith." Hence it is added, "in the Lord shall the seed of Israel be justified," ver. 25, namely, because he is, in what he is, in what he was, and did, as given to and for us, "our righteousness," and our righteousness is all in him; which totally excludes our own personal inherent righteousness from any interest in our justification, and ascribes it wholly to the righteousness of Christ. And thus is that emphatical expression of the psalmist, "I will go in the strength of the Lord God:" (for as to holiness and obedience, all our spiritual strength is from him alone) and "I will make mention of thy righteousness, of thine only;" Psal. lxxi. 16, the redoubling of the affix excludes all confidence and trusting in any thing but the righteousness of God alone. For this the Apostle affirms to be the design of God, in making Christ to be righteousness to us, namely, "that no flesh should glory in his presence, but that he that glorieth, should glory in the Lord," 1 Cor. i. 29—31. For it is by faith alone making mention, as to our justification, of the righteousness of God, of his righteousness only, that all boasting is excluded, Rom. iii. 27. And, besides, what shall be further pleaded from particular testimonies, the Scripture eminently declares how he is the Lord our righteousness, namely, in that he "makes an end of sin and reconciliation for iniquity, and brings in everlasting righteousness," Dan. ix. 24. For by these things is our justification completed; namely, in satisfaction made for sin, the pardon of it in our reconciliation to God, and the providing for us an everlasting righteousness. Therefore is he the Lord our righteousness, and so rightly called. Wherefore, seeing we had lost original righteousness, and had none of our own remaining, and stood in need of a perfect, complete righteousness, to procure our acceptance with God, and such a one as might exclude all occasion of boasting of any thing in ourselves, the Lord Christ being given and made to us the Lord our righteousness, in whom we have all our righteousness, our own, as it is ours, being as filthy rags in the sight of God, and this by making an end of sin, and reconciliation for iniquity, and bringing in everlasting righteousness, it is by his righteousness, by his only, that we are justified in the sight of God, and do glory. This is the substance of what, in this

case, we plead for; and thus it is delivered in the Scripture, in a way bringing more light and spiritual sense into the minds of believers, than those philosophical expressions, and distinctions, which vaunt themselves with a pretence of propriety and accuracy.

CHAPTER XVII.

TESTIMONIES OUT OF THE EVANGELISTS, CONSIDERED.

THE reasons why the doctrine of justification, by the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, is more fully and clearly delivered in the following writings of the New Testament, than it is in those of the Evangelists who wrote the history of the life and death of Christ, have been before declared. But yet in them also it is sufficiently attested, as to the state of the church before the death and resurrection of Christ, which is represented in them. Some few of the many testimonies which may be pleaded out of their writings to that purpose, I shall consider.

1. The principal design of our blessed Saviour's sermon, especially that part of it which is recorded Matt. v., is to declare the true nature of righteousness before God. The Scribes and Pharisees, from a bondage to whose doctrines he designed to vindicate the consciences of those that heard him, placed all our righteousness before God in the works of the law, or men's own obedience thereto. This they taught the people, and hereon they justified themselves, as he charges them, Luke xvi. 15. "Ye are they which justify yourselves before men, but God knoweth your hearts; for that which is highly esteemed among men, is abomination in the sight of God;" as in this sermon he makes it evident. And all those who were under their conduct, sought to "establish their own righteousness, as it were by the works of the law," Rom. ix. 33; x. 3. But yet were they convinced in their own consciences, that they could not attain to the law of righteousness; or to that perfection of obedience which the law required. Yet would they not forego their proud, fond imagination of justification by their own righteousness, but, as the manner of all men is in the same case, sought out other inventions to relieve them against their con-

victions. For to this end, they corrupted the whole law by their false glosses and interpretations, to bring down and debase the sense of it, to what they boasted in themselves to perform. So does he in whom our Saviour gives an instance of the principle and practice of the whole society, by way of a parable, Luke xviii. 10—12. And so the young man affirmed that he had kept the whole law from his youth, namely in their sense, Matt. xix. 20.

To root this pernicious error out of the church, our Lord Jesus Christ in many instances, gives the true spiritual sense and intention of the law, manifesting what the righteousness is which the law requires, and on what terms a man may be justified thereby. And among sundry others to the same purpose, two things he evidently declares. (1) That the law in its precepts and prohibitions had regard to the regulation of the heart, with all its first motions and actings. For he asserts, that the inmost thoughts of the heart, and the first motions of concupiscence therein, though not consented to, much less actually accomplished in the outward deeds of sin, and all the occasions leading to them, are directly forbidden in the law. This he does in his holy exposition of the seventh commandment. (2) He declares the penalty of the law, on the least sin, to be hell-fire, in his assertion of causeless anger to be forbidden in the sixth commandment. If men would but try themselves by these rules and others there given by our Saviour, it would, it may be, take them off from boasting in their own righteousness and justification thereby. But as it was then, so is it now also; the most of them who would maintain a justification by works, attempt to corrupt the sense of the law, and accommodate it to their own practice. The reader may see an eminent demonstration hereof, in a late excellent treatise, whose title is, "The Practical Divinity of the Papists discovered to be destructive of Christianity and men's souls." The spirituality of the law, with the severity of its sanction, extending itself to the least and most imperceptible motions of sin in the heart, are not believed, or not aright considered by them who plead for justification by works in any sense. Wherefore the principal design of the sermon of our Saviour is, to declare what is the nature of that obedience which God requires by the law, and to prepare the minds of his disciples to seek after another righteousness, which in the cause and means of it, was not yet plainly to be declared, although many of them being prepared by the ministry of John hungered and thirsted after it.

But he sufficiently intimates wherein it consisted, in that he affirms of himself, that he came to fulfil the law. What he came for, that he was sent for; for as he was sent, and not for himself, (he was born to us, given to us,) this was to fulfil the law, that so the righteousness of it might be fulfilled in us. And if we ourselves cannot fulfil the law in the proper sense of its commands, which yet is not to be abolished but established, as our Saviour declares; if we cannot avoid the curse and penalty of it upon its transgression; and if he came to fulfil it for us, all which are declared by himself, then is his righteousness, even that which he wrought for us in fulfilling the law, the righteousness wherewith we are justified before God. And whereas here is a twofold righteousness proposed to us, one in the fulfilling of the law by Christ; the other in our own perfect obedience to the law, as the sense of it is by him declared, and other middle righteousness between them there is none; it is left to the consciences of convinced sinners which of these they will adhere and trust to. And their direction herein is the principal design we ought to have in the declaration of this doctrine.

I shall pass by all those places wherein the foundations of this doctrine are surely laid, because it is not expressly mentioned in them. But such they are as in their proper interpretation do necessarily infer it. Of this kind are all those wherein the Lord Christ is said to die for us, or in our stead, to lay down his life a ransom for us, or in our stead, and the like; but I shall pass them by, because I will not digress at all from the present argument.

But the representation made by our Saviour himself, of the way and means whereon and whereby men come to be justified before God, in the parable of the Pharisee and the Publican, is a guide to all men who have the same design with them. Luke xviii. 9—14. "And he spake this parable unto certain which trusted in themselves, that they were righteous and despised others. Two men went up to the temple to pray, the one a Pharisee, and the other a Publican. The Pharisee stood and prayed thus with himself: God, I thank thee, that I am not as other men are, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this Publican. I fast twice in the week, I give tithes of all that I possess. And the Publican standing afar off, would not lift up so much as his eyes unto heaven, but smote upon his breast, saying, God, be merciful unto me a sinner. I tell you, that this man went down unto his house justified, rather

than the other. For every one that exalteth himself, shall be abased; and every one that humbleth himself, shall be exalted."

That the design of our Saviour herein was to represent the way of our justification before God, is evident. (1) From the description given of the persons whom he reflected on, ver. 9. They were such as "trusted in themselves, that they were righteous;" or, that they had a personal righteousness of their own before God. (2) From the general rule wherewith he confirms the judgment he had given concerning the persons described. "Every one that exalteth himself shall be abased, and he that abaseth himself shall be exalted." As this is applied to the Pharisee, and the prayer that is ascribed to him, it declares plainly that every plea of our own works, as to our justification before God, under any consideration, is a self-exaltation which God despises; and as applied to the Publican, that a sense of sin is the only preparation on our part for acceptance with him on believing.

Wherefore both the persons are represented as seeking to be justified, for so our Saviour expresses the issue of their address to God for that purpose: the one was justified, the other was not.

The plea of the Pharisee to this end consists of two parts. (1) That he had fulfilled the condition whereon he might be justified. He makes no mention of any merit, either of congruity, or condignity. Only whereas there were two parts of God's covenant then with the church, the one with respect to the moral, the other with respect to the ceremonial law, he pleads the observation of the condition of it in both parts, which he shows in instances of both kinds; only he adds the way that he took to further him in this obedience, somewhat beyond what was enjoined, namely, that he fasted twice in the week. For when men begin to seek for righteousness, and justification by works, they quickly think their best reserve lies in doing something extraordinary more than other men, and more indeed than is required of them. This brought forth all the Pharisaical austerities in the papacy. Nor can it be said, that all this signified nothing, because he was a hypocrite and a boaster; for it will be replied, that it should seem all are so who seek for justification by works. For our Saviour only represents one that does so; neither are these things laid in bar against his justification, but only that he exalted himself in trusting to his own righteousness. (2) In an ascription of all that he did to

God. "God, I thank thee." Although he did all this, yet he owned the aid and assistance of God by his grace in it all. He esteemed himself much to differ from other men, but ascribed it not to himself that so he did. All the righteousness and holiness which he laid claim to, he ascribed to the benignity and goodness of God. Wherefore he neither pleaded any merit in his works, nor any works performed in his own strength, without the aid of grace. All that he pretends is, that by the grace of God he had fulfilled the condition of the covenant, and thereon expected to be justified. And what ever words men shall be pleased to make use of in their vocal prayers, God interprets their minds according to what they trust in, as to their justification before him. And if some men will be true to their own principles, this is the prayer which, *mutatis mutandis*, they ought to make.

If it be said, that it is charged on this Pharisee, that he trusted in himself, and despised others, for which he was rejected, I answer, (1) This charge respects not the mind of the person, but the genius and tendency of the opinion. The persuasion of justification by works, includes in it a contempt of other men. For "if Abraham had been justified by works, he should have had whereof to glory." (2) Those whom he despised were such as placed their whole trust in grace and mercy; as this Publican. It were to be wished that all others of the same mind did not so also.

The issue is with this person, that he was not justified; neither shall any one ever be so on the account of his own personal righteousness. For our Saviour has told us, "that when we have done all," that is, when we have the testimony of our consciences to the integrity of our obedience, instead of pleading it to our justification, we should say, that is, really judge and profess, that we are "unprofitable servants," Luke xvii. 10. As the Apostle speaks, "I know nothing by myself, yet am I not thereby justified," 1 Cor. iv. 4. And he that is "an unprofitable servant," and has nothing to trust to but his service, will be cast out of the presence of God, Matt. xxv. 30. Wherefore, on the best of our obedience to confess ourselves "unprofitable servants," is to confess, that after all, in ourselves, we deserve to be cast out of the presence of God.

In opposition hereto, the state and prayer of the Publican, under the same design of seeking justification before God, are expressed. And the outward acts of his person are mentioned, as representing and expressive of the inward frame of his

mind. "He stood afar off;" he "did not so much as lift up his eyes;" he "smote upon his breast." All of them represent a person desponding, yea, despairing in himself. This is the nature, this is the effect of that conviction of sin, which we before asserted to be antecedently necessary to justification. Dispicency, sorrow, sense of danger, fear of wrath, all are present with him. In brief he declares himself guilty before God, and his mouth stopped, as to any apology or excuse. And his prayer is a sincere application of his soul, to sovereign grace and mercy, for a deliverance out of the condition, wherein he was by reason of the guilt of sin. And in the use of the word *ελαττομαι*, there is respect had to a propitiation. In the whole of his address there is contained (1) Self-condemnation and abhorrence. (2) Dispicency and sorrow for sin. (3) An universal renunciation of all works of his own, as any conditions of his justification. (4) An acknowledgment of his sin, guilt, and misery. And this is all that on our part is required to justification before God, excepting that faith whereby we apply ourselves to him for deliverance.

Some make a weak attempt from hence, to prove that justification consists wholly in the remission of sin, because on the prayer of the Publican, for mercy and pardon, he is said to be justified; but there is no force in this argument. For (1) The whole nature of justification is not here declared, but only what is required on our part thereto. The respect of it to the mediation of Christ, was not yet expressly to be brought to light, as was showed before. (2) Although the Publican makes his address to God, under a deep sense of the guilt of sin, yet he prays not for the bare pardon of sin, but for all that sovereign mercy or grace which God provided for sinners. (3) The term of justification must have the same sense, when applied to the Pharisee, as when applied to the Publican: and if the meaning of it, with respect to the Publican, be, that he was pardoned, then has it the same sense with respect to the Pharisee, he was not pardoned; but he came on no such errand; he came to be justified, not pardoned; nor does he make the least mention of his sin, or any sense of it. Wherefore although the pardon of sin be included in justification, yet to *justify*, in this place, has respect to a righteousness, whereon a man is declared just and righteous, wrapped up on the part of the Publican in the sovereign producing cause, the mercy of God.

Some few testimonies may be added out of the other Evan-

gelist, in whom they abound. "As many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name," John i. 12. Faith is expressed by the receiving of Christ. For to receive him, and to believe on his name, are the same. It receives him as set forth of God to be a propitiation for sin, as the great ordinance of God, for the recovery and salvation of lost sinners. Wherefore this notion of faith includes in it, (1) A supposition of the proposal and tender of Christ to us, for some end and purpose. (2) That this proposal is made to us in the promise of the gospel. Hence, as we are said to receive Christ, we are said to receive the promise also. (3) The end for which the Lord Christ is so proposed to us, in the promise of the gospel; and this is the same with that for which he was so proposed in the first promise, namely, the recovery and salvation of lost sinners. (4) That in the tender of his person, there is a tender made of all the fruits of his mediation, as containing the way and means of our deliverance from sin, and acceptance with God. (5) There is nothing required on our part to an interest in the end proposed, but receiving of him, or believing on his name. (6) Hereby are we entitled to the heavenly inheritance; we have power to become the sons of God, wherein our adoption is asserted, and justification included. What this receiving of Christ is, and wherein it consists, has been declared before, in the consideration of that faith whereby we are justified. That which hence we argue is, that there is no more required to the obtaining of a right and title to the heavenly inheritance but faith alone, in the name of Christ, the receiving of Christ, as the ordinance of God for justification and salvation. This gives us, I say, our original right thereto, and therein our acceptance with God, which is our justification, though more be required to the actual acquisition and possession of it. It is said, indeed, that other graces and works are not excluded, though faith alone be expressed. But every thing which is not a receiving of Christ, is excluded. It is, I say, virtually excluded, because it is not of the nature of that which is required. When we speak of that whereby we see, we exclude no other member from being a part of the body; but we exclude all but the eye from the act of seeing. And if faith be required, as it is a receiving of Christ, every grace and duty which is not so, is excluded as to the end of justification.

John iii. 14—18 "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up; that

whosoever believeth on him, should not perish, but have eternal life. For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him, should not perish, but have everlasting life. God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world, through him, might be saved. He that believeth on him, is not condemned; but he that believeth not, is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God."

I shall observe only a few things from these words, which in themselves convey a better light of understanding in this mystery to the minds of believers, than many long discourses of some learned men. (1) It is of the justification of men, and their right to eternal life thereon, that our Saviour discourses. This is plain in ver. 18. "He that believeth is not condemned, but he that believeth not, is condemned already." (2) The means of attaining this condition or state on our part, is believing only, as it is three times positively asserted, without any addition. (3) The nature of this faith is declared, (1) By its object, that is, Christ himself the Son of God; "whosoever believeth on him," which is frequently repeated. (2) The especial consideration, wherein he is the object of faith to the justification of life; and that is as he is the ordinance of God, given, sent, and proposed from the love and grace of the Father. "God so loved the world, that he gave;" "God sent his Son." (3) The especial act yet included in the type, whereby the design of God, in him, is illustrated. For this was the looking to the brazen serpent lifted up in the wilderness, by them who were stung with fiery serpents. Hereto our faith in Christ to justification answers, and includes a trust in him alone for deliverance and relief. This is the way, these are the only causes and means of the justification of condemned sinners, and are the substance of all that we plead for.

It will be said that all this proves not the imputation of the righteousness of Christ to us, which is the thing principally inquired after: but if nothing be required on our part to justification, but faith acted on Christ, as the ordinance of God for our recovery and salvation, it is the whole of what we plead for. A justification by the remission of sins alone, without a righteousness giving acceptance with God, and a right to the heavenly inheritance, is alien to the Scripture and the common notion of justification amongst men. And what this righteousness must be, upon a supposition that faith only, on our part, is

required to a participation of it, is sufficiently declared in the words wherein Christ himself is so often asserted as the object of our faith to that purpose.

Not to add more particular testimonies, which are multiplied to the same purpose, in this Evangelist, the sum of the doctrine declared by him, is, that the Lord Jesus Christ was the Lamb of God which takes away the sins of the world, that is, by the sacrifice of himself, wherein he answered and fulfilled all the typical sacrifices of the law: that to this end he sanctified himself, that those, who believe, might be sanctified, or perfected for ever by his own offering of himself: that in the gospel he is proposed, as lifted up and crucified for us, as bearing all our sins on his body on the tree; that by faith in him, we have adoption, justification, freedom from judgment and condemnation, with a right and title to eternal life; that those who believe not are condemned already, because they believe not on the Son of God; and as he elsewhere expresses it, make God a liar, in that they believe not his testimony, namely, that he has given unto us eternal life; and that this life is in his Son. Nor does he any where make mention of any other means, cause, or condition of justification on our part, but faith only, though he abounds in precepts to believers for love, and keeping the commands of Christ. And this faith is the receiving of Christ, in the sense newly declared. And this is the substance of the Christian faith in this matter; which oftentimes we rather obscure than illustrate, by debating the consideration of any thing in our justification, but the grace and love of God, the person and mediation of Christ, with faith in them.



CHAPTER XVIII.

THE NATURE OF JUSTIFICATION AS DECLARED IN THE EPISTLES OF PAUL, ESPECIALLY THAT TO THE ROMANS, CHAP. III.

THAT the way and manner of our justification before God with all the causes and means of it, are designedly declared by the Apostle in the Epistle to the Romans, chap. iii. 4, 5, as also vindicated from objections, so as to render his discourse thereon the proper seat of this doctrine, and whence it is principally to

be learned, cannot modestly be denied. The late exceptions of some, that this doctrine of justification by faith, without works, is found only in the writings of Paul, and that his writings are obscure and intricate, are both false and scandalous to Christianity, so that in this place we shall not afford them the least consideration. He wrote "as he was moved by the Holy Ghost." And as all the matter delivered by him was sacred truth, which immediately requires our faith and obedience, so the way and manner wherein he declared it, was such as the Holy Ghost judged most expedient for the edification of the church. And as he said himself with confidence, that if the gospel which he preached, and as it was preached by him, though accounted by them foolishness, was hid, so that they could not understand, nor comprehend the mystery of it, it was "hid to them that are lost;" so we may say, that if what he delivers in particular concerning our justification before God, seems obscure, difficult, or perplexed to us, it is from our prejudices, corrupt affections, or weakness of understanding at best, not able to comprehend the glory of this mystery of the grace of God in Christ, and not from any defect in his way and manner of the revelation of it. Rejecting therefore all such perverse insinuations, in a due sense of our own weakness, and acknowledgment that at best "we know but in part," we shall humbly inquire into the blessed revelation of this great mystery of the justification of a sinner before God, as by him declared in those chapters of his glorious Epistle to the Romans; and I shall do it with all possible brevity, so as not on this occasion to repeat what has been already spoken, or to anticipate what may be spoken in a more convenient place.

The first thing he does, is to prove all men to be under sin, and to be guilty before God. This he gives as the conclusion of his preceding discourse, from Rom. i. 18, or what he had evidently evinced thereby, chap. iii. 19, 23. Hereon an inquiry arises, how any of them come to be justified before God. And whereas justification is a sentence upon the consideration of a righteousness, his grand inquiry is, what that righteousness is on the consideration whereof a man may be so justified. And concerning this, he affirms expressly that it is not the righteousness of the law, nor of the works of it, whereby what he intends has been in part before declared, and will be further manifested in the process of our discourse. Wherefore in general he declares, that the righteousness whereby we are justified, is the "righteousness of God," in opposition to any righteousness of

our own, chap. i. 17; iii. 21, 22. And he describes this righteousness of God by three properties. (1) That it is *χωρίς νόμου*, "without the law," ver. 21, separated in all its concerns from the law; not attainable by it, nor any works of it; which they have no influence upon. It is neither our obedience to the law, nor attainable thereby. Nor can any expression more separate and exclude the works of obedience to the law, from any concurrence in it, than this doth. Wherefore whatever is, or can be performed by ourselves in obedience to the law, is rejected from any interest in this righteousness of God, or the procurement of it to be made ours. (2) That yet it is witnessed unto by the law, ver. 21. "The law and the prophets." The Apostle by this distinction of the books of the Old Testament, into the law and the prophets, manifests that by the law he understands the books of Moses; and in them, testimony is given to this righteousness of God, four ways.

(1) By a declaration of the causes of the necessity of it to our justification. This is done in the account given of our apostasy from God, of the loss of his image, and the state of sin that ensued thereon. For hereby an end was put to all possibility and hope of acceptance with God, by our own personal righteousness. By the entrance of sin, our own righteousness went out of the world; so that there must be another righteousness prepared and approved of God, and called the righteousness of God, in opposition to our own, or all relation of love and favour between God and man must cease for ever.

(2) In the way of recovery from this state, generally declared in the first promise of the blessed seed, by whom this righteousness of God was to be wrought and introduced; for he alone was to "make an end of sin, and to bring in everlasting righteousness," Dan. ix. 24, that righteousness of God, that should be the means of the justification of the church in all ages, and under all dispensations.

(3) By stopping up the way to any other righteousness through the threatenings of the law, and that curse which every transgression of it was attended with. Hereby it was plainly and fully declared, that there must be such a righteousness provided for our justification before men, as would answer and remove that curse.

(4) In the prefiguration and representation of that only way and means, whereby this righteousness of God was to be wrought. This it did in all its sacrifices, especially in the great anniversary sacrifice on the day of expiation, wherein

all the sins of the church were laid on the head of the sacrifice, and so carried away. (3) He describes it by the only way of our participation of it, the only means on our part of the communication of it to us. And this is by faith alone. "The righteousness of God, which is by the faith of Christ Jesus, unto all, and upon all them that believe; for there is no difference," ver. 22. Faith in Christ Jesus is so the only way and means, whereby this righteousness of God comes upon us, or is communicated to us, that it is so to all that have this faith, and only to them, and that without difference on the consideration of any thing else besides. And although faith taken absolutely, may be used in various senses, yet as thus specified and limited, the faith of Christ Jesus, or as he calls it, "the faith that is in me," Acts xxvi. 18, can intend nothing but the reception of him, and trust in him, as the ordinance of God for righteousness and salvation.

This description of the righteousness of God revealed in the gospel, which the Apostle asserts as the only means and cause of our justification before God, with the only way of its participation and communication to us by the faith of Christ Jesus, fully confirms the truth we plead for. For if the righteousness wherewith we must be justified before God be not our own, but the righteousness of God, as these things are directly opposed, Phil. iii. 9, and the only way whereby it comes upon us, or we are made partakers of it, is by the faith of Jesus Christ, then our own personal inherent righteousness or obedience has no interest in our justification before God; which argument is unanswerable, nor is the force of it to be waived by any distinctions whatever, if we keep our hearts to a due reverence for the authority of God in his word.

Having fully proved, that no men living have any righteousness of their own, whereby they may be justified, but are all shut up under the guilt of sin; and having declared, that there is a righteousness of God now fully revealed in the gospel, whereby alone we may be so; leaving all men in themselves to their own lot, in as much as "all have sinned and come short of the glory of God," he proceeds to declare the nature of our justification before God, in all the causes of it. ver. 24—26. "Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins, that are past, through the forbearance of God. To declare, I say at this time, his

righteousness, that he might be just, and the justifier of them that believe in Jesus."

Here it is, that we may, and ought, if any where, to expect the interest of our personal obedience under some qualification or other, in our justification, to be declared. For if it should be supposed (which yet it cannot with any pretence of reason) that in the foregoing discourse, the Apostle had excluded only the works of the law, as absolutely perfect, or as wrought in our own strength without the aid of grace, or as meritorious; yet having generally excluded all works from our justification, ver. 20, without distinction or limitation, it might well be expected, and ought to have been so, that upon the full declaration which he gives us of the nature and way of our justification in all the causes of it, he should have assigned the place, and consideration which our own personal righteousness had in our justification before God; the first or second, or continuation of it, somewhat or other; or at least, made some mention of it, under the qualification of gracious, sincere, or evangelical, that it might not seem to be absolutely excluded. It is plain the Apostle thought of no such thing, nor was at all solicitous about any reflection that might be made on his doctrine, as though it overthrew the necessity of our own obedience. Take in the consideration of the Apostle's design, with the circumstances of the context, and the argument from his utter silence about our own personal righteousness in our justification before God is unanswerable. But this is not all; we shall find in our progress, that it is expressly and directly excluded by him.

All unprejudiced persons must needs think that no words could be used more express and emphatical, to secure the whole of our justification to the free grace of God, through the blood, or mediation of Christ, wherem it is faith alone that gives us an interest, than these used here by the Apostle. And for my part, I shall only say, that I know not how to express myself in this matter, in words and terms more express or significant of the conception of my mind. And if we could all but subscribe the answer here given by the Apostle; how, by what means, on what grounds, or by what causes, are we justified before God, namely, that we are "justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood," &c., there might be an end of this controversy.

But the principal passages of this testimony must be distinctly

considered. (1) The principal efficient cause is first expressed with a peculiar emphasis; "being justified freely by his grace." God is the principal efficient cause of our justification, and his grace is the only moving cause thereof. I shall not stay upon the exception of those of the Roman church, namely, that by $\epsilon\eta\ \chi\alpha\rho\iota\tau\iota\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ which their translation renders *per gratiam Dei*, the internal inherent grace of God, which they make the formal cause of justification, is intended. For they have nothing to prove it, but that which overthrows it; namely, that it is added to $\delta\omega\rho\epsilon\alpha\upsilon$ "freely," which were needless, if it signify the free grace or favour of God. For both these expressions *gratis per gratiam*, "freely by grace," are put together to give the greater emphasis to this assertion, wherein the whole of our justification is vindicated to the free grace of God; so far as they are distinguishable, the one denotes the principle from whence our justification proceeds, namely, grace; and the other, the manner of its operation, it works freely. Besides, the "grace of God" in this subject, every where constantly signifies his goodness, love, and favour, as has been undeniably proved by many. See Rom. v. 15; Eph. ii. 4, 8, 9; 2 Tim. i. 9; Tit. iii. 4, 5.

Being justified $\delta\omega\rho\epsilon\alpha\upsilon$, so the LXX. render the Hebrew particle עַל־ "without price," without merit, without cause; and sometimes it is used for "without end," that is, what is done in vain; as $\delta\omega\rho\epsilon\alpha\upsilon$ is used by the Apostle, Gal. ii. 21, without price or reward, Gen. xxix. 15; Exod. xxi. 22; 2 Kings xxiv. 25; without cause or merit, or any means of procurement, 1 Sam. xix. 5; 2 Sam. xxiv. 24; Psal. lxix. 4; cii. In this sense it is rendered by $\delta\omega\rho\epsilon\alpha\upsilon$, John xv. 25. The design of the word is to exclude all consideration of any thing in us that should be the cause or condition of our justification. $\chi\alpha\rho\iota\varsigma$, *favour*, absolutely considered, may have respect to somewhat in him towards whom it is showed; so it is said that "Joseph found grace," or favour $\chi\alpha\rho\iota\upsilon$, in the eyes of Potiphar, Gen. xxix. 4; but he found it not $\delta\omega\rho\epsilon\alpha\upsilon$, "without any consideration" or cause; for he saw that the Lord was with him and made all that he did to prosper in his hand, ver. 3. But no words can be found out to free our justification before God from all respect to any thing in ourselves, (but only what is added expressly as the means of its participation on our part, "through faith in his blood,") more emphatical than these here used by the Apostle; $\delta\omega\rho\epsilon\alpha\upsilon\ \epsilon\eta\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \chi\alpha\rho\iota\tau\iota$, "freely by his grace." And to those who do not admit this as exclusive of all works or obedi-

ence of our own, of all conditions, preparations and merit, I shall despair of ever expressing my conceptions about it intelligibly.

Having asserted this righteousness of God as the cause and means of our justification before him, in opposition to all righteousness of our own; and declared the cause of the communication of it to us on the part of God, to be mere free sovereign grace, the means on our part whereby, according to the ordination of God, we receive or are really made partakers of that righteousness of God whereon we are justified, is by faith; *διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν ἁπορίᾳ ἀμάρτιαι*; that is by faith alone. Nothing else is proposed, nothing else required to this end. It is replied, that there is no intimation that it is by faith *alone*, or that faith is asserted to be the means of our justification exclusively to other graces or works. But there is such an exclusion directly included in the description given of that faith whereby we are justified with respect to its especial object "by faith in his blood." For faith respecting the blood of Christ, as that whereby propitiation was made for sin, in which respect alone, the Apostle affirms that we are justified through faith, admits of no association with any other graces or duties. Neither is it any part of their nature to fix on the blood of Christ, for justification before God: wherefore they are all here directly excluded. And those who think otherwise, may try how they can introduce them into this context without an evident corrupting of it and perverting of its sense. Neither will the other evasion yield our adversaries the least relief: namely, that by faith not the single grace of faith is intended, but the whole obedience required in the new covenant, faith and works together. For as all works whatever, as our works, are excluded in the declaration of the causes of our justification on the part of God, "freely by his grace," by virtue of that great rule, Rom. xi. 6, "if it be of grace, then no more of works, otherwise grace is no more grace;" so the determination of the object of faith in its act or duty whereon we are justified, namely, the blood of Christ, is absolutely exclusive of all works from an interest in that duty. For whatever looks to the blood of Christ, for justification, is faith and nothing else. And as for the calling of it a single act or duty, I refer the reader to our preceding discourse about the nature of justifying faith.

Three things the Apostle infers from the declaration he had made of the nature and causes of our justification before God, all of them further illustrating the meaning and sense of his words:

1. That boasting is excluded, Rom. xi. 27. Apparent it is from

hence, and from what he affirms concerning Abraham, chap. iv. 2, that a great part, at least, of the controversy he had about justification; was whether it admitted of any *καυχῆσις* or *καυχῆμα* *boasting*, in those that were justified. And it is known that the Jews placed all their hopes in those things whereof they thought they could boast, namely their privileges and their righteousness. But from the declaration made of the nature and causes of justification, the Apostle infers that all boasting whatever is utterly shut out of doors; *ἐξεκαλεσθη*. Boasting in our language is the name of a vice; and is never used in a good sense. But *καυχῆσις* and *καυχῆμα*, the words used by the Apostle, are of an indifferent signification, and as they are applied may denote a virtue as well as a vice. So they do, Heb. iii. 6.

But always, and in all places, they respect something that is peculiar in or to them to whom they are ascribed. Wherever any thing is ascribed to one and not to another, with respect to any good end, there is *fundamentum καυχῆσιως*, a foundation for boasting. All this, says the Apostle in the matter of our justification, is utterly excluded. But wherever respect is had to any condition or qualification in one more than another, especially if it be of works, it gives a ground of boasting, as he affirms, chap. iv. 2. And it appears from comparing that verse with this, that wherever there is any influence of our own works upon our justification, there is a ground of boasting; but in evangelical justification, no such boasting in any kind can be admitted. Wherefore there is no place for works in our justification before God: for if there were, it is impossible but that a *καυχῆμα* in one kind or other before God or man must be admitted.

2. He infers a general conclusion, "that a man is justified by faith without the works of the law," verse 28. What is meant by the "law," and what by the "works of the law" in this discourse of the Apostle about our justification, has been before declared. And if we are justified freely through faith in the blood of Christ, that faith which has the propitiation of Christ for its especial object, or as it has so, can take no other grace nor duty into partnership with itself therein: and being so justified that all such boasting is excluded as necessarily results from any differencing graces or works in ourselves, wherein all the works of the law are excluded, it is certain that it is by faith alone in Christ that we are justified. All works are not only excluded, but the way to their return is so shut up by the method of the Apostle's discourse, that all the reinforcements

which the wit of man can give to them, will never introduce them into our justification before God.

3. He asserts from hence, that "we do not make void the law through grace," but establish it, verse 31. How this is done, and how alone it can be done, has been before declared.

This is the substance of the resolution the Apostle gives to that great inquiry, how a guilty convinced sinner may come to be justified in the sight of God. The sovereign grace of God, the mediation of Christ, and faith in the blood of Christ, are all that he requires thereto. And whatever notions men may have about justification in other respects, it will not be safe to venture on any other resolution of this case and inquiry; nor are we wiser than the Holy Ghost.

Romans, chap. iv.—In the beginning of the fourth chapter he confirms what he had before doctrinally declared, by a signal instance; and this was of the justification of Abraham, the father of the faithful, whose justification is proposed as the pattern of ours, as he expressly declares, verses 22—24. And some few things I shall observe on this instance in our passage to the fifth verse; where I shall fix our discourse.

1. He denies that Abraham was justified by works, verse 2. And (1) These works were not those of the Jewish law, which alone some pretend to be excluded from our justification in this place. For they were the works he performed some hundreds of years before the giving of the law at Sinai; wherefore they are the works of his moral obedience to God that are intended. (2) Those works must be understood which Abraham had then, when he is said to be justified, in the testimony produced to that purpose; but the works that Abraham then had, were works of righteousness, performed in faith and love to God, works of new obedience under the conduct and aids of the Spirit of God; works required in the covenant of grace. These are the works excluded from the justification of Abraham. And these things are plain, express, and evident, not to be eluded by any distinctions or evasions. All Abraham's evangelical works are expressly excluded from his justification before God.

2. He proves by the testimony of Scripture, declaring the nature and grounds of the justification of Abraham, that he was justified no other way, but that which he had before declared, namely, by grace through faith in Christ Jesus, verse 3. "Abraham believed God (in the promise of Christ and his mediation) and it was counted unto him for righteousness," ver. 3.

He was justified by faith in the way before described (for other justification by faith there is none) in opposition to all his own works, and personal righteousness thereby.

3. From the same testimony he declares how he came to be partaker of that righteousness whereon he was justified before God, which was by imputation; it was "counted" or imputed "to him for righteousness." The nature of the imputation has been before declared.

4. The especial nature of this imputation, namely, that it is of grace without respect to works, he asserts and proves, verse 4, from what is contrary thereto. "Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt." Where works are of any consideration, there is no room for that kind of imputation whereby Abraham was justified, for it was a gracious imputation, and that is not of what is our own antecedently thereto, but what is made our own by that imputation. For what is our own cannot be imputed to us in a way of grace, but only reckoned ours in a way of debt. That which is our own with all the effects of it, is due to us. And therefore they who plead that faith itself is imputed to us, to give some countenance to an imputation of grace, say it is imputed not for what it is, for then it would be reckoned of debt, but for what it is not. So Socinus, *Cum fides imputatur nobis pro justitia, ideo imputatur quia nec ipsa fides justitia est, nec vere in se eam continet.* De Servat. part. iv. cap. 2; which kind of imputation, being indeed only a false imagination, we have before disproved. But all works are inconsistent with that imputation whereby Abraham was justified. It is otherwise with him that works, so as thereon to be justified, than it was with him. Yea, say some, all works that are meritorious, that are performed with an opinion of merit, that make the reward to be of debt, are excluded, but other works are not. This distinction is not learned from the Apostle. For according to him, if this be merit and meritorious, that the reward be reckoned of debt, then all works in justification are so. For without distinction or limitation he affirms, that "unto him that worketh, the reward is not reckoned of grace, but of debt." He does not exclude some sort of works, or works in some sense, because they would make the reward of debt, but affirms that all would do so to the exclusion of gracious imputation. For if the foundation of imputation be in ourselves, imputation by grace is excluded. In the fifth verse the sum of the Apostle's doctrine, which he had contended for, and what he had

proved, is expressed. "But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness." It is granted on all hands, that the close of the verse "his faith is counted for righteousness," expresses the justification of the person intended. He is justified, and the way of it is, "his faith is counted" or imputed. Wherefore the foregoing words declare the subject of justification, and its qualification, or the description of the person to be justified, with all that is required on his part thereto.

And first it is said of him, that he is, *ὁ μὴ ἐργαζόμενος*; "who worketh not." It is not required to his justification that he should not work, that he should not perform any duties of obedience to God in any kind, which is working. For every person in the world is always obliged to all duties of obedience, according to the light and knowledge of the will of God, the means whereof is afforded to him. But the expression is to be limited by the subject matter treated of. He who worketh not, with respect to justification; though not the design of the person, but the nature of the thing is intended. To say, "he who worketh not is justified" through believing, is to say that his works whatever they be, have no influence on his justification, nor has God in justifying of him any respect to them. Wherefore he alone who worketh not, is the subject of justification, the person to be justified; that is, God considers no man's works, no man's duties of obedience in his justification; seeing we are justified "freely by his grace." And when God affirms expressly, that he justifies him "who worketh not," and that, "freely by his grace," I cannot understand what place our works or duties of obedience can have in our justification. For why should we trouble ourselves to discover of what consideration they may be in our justification before God, when he himself affirms, that they are of none at all? Neither are the words capable of any evading interpretation. "He that worketh not," is "he that worketh not," let men say what they please, and distinguish as long as they will. And it is a boldness not to be justified, for any to rise up in opposition to such express divine testimonies, however they may be harnessed with philosophical notions and arguings, which are but as thorns and briars, which the word of God will pass through and consume.

But the Apostle further adds in the description of the subject of justification, that God "justifieth the ungodly." This is that expression which has stirred up so much wrath amongst many, and on account whereof, some seem to be much dis-

pleased with the Apostle himself. If any other person dares but say that "God justifieth the ungodly," he is presently reflected on, as one that by his doctrine would overthrow the necessity of godliness, holiness, obedience, or good works. For what need can there be of any of them, if God justifies the "ungodly?" Howbeit this is a periphrasis of God that he is $\delta \delta \iota \kappa \alpha \iota \omega \nu \tau \omega \nu \alpha \sigma \epsilon \delta \eta$, "he that justifieth the ungodly." This is his prerogative and property, as such will he be believed in and worshipped, which adds weight and emphasis to the expression. And we must not forego this testimony of the Holy Ghost, let men be as angry as they please.

But the difference is about the meaning of the words. Some say, "those who formerly were ungodly, not those who continue ungodly when they are justified." And this is most true. All that are justified were before ungodly; and all that are justified are at the same instant made godly. But the question is, whether they are godly or ungodly antecedently in any moment of time to their justification; if they are considered as godly, and are so indeed, then the Apostle's words are not true, "that God justifieth the ungodly;" for the contradictory proposition is true, "God justifieth none but the godly." For these propositions, God justifieth the ungodly, and God justifieth none but the godly, are contradictory.

Wherefore, although in and with the justification of a sinner, he is made godly, for he is endowed with that "faith which purifieth the heart," and is a vital principle of all obedience, and the conscience is purged from dead works by the blood of Christ; yet antecedently to this justification he is ungodly and considered as ungodly, as one that "worketh not," as one whose duties and obedience contribute nothing to his justification. As he "worketh not," all works are excluded from being the *causa per quam*; and as he is "ungodly," from being the *causa sine qua non* of his justification.

The qualification of the subject, or the means on the part of the person to be justified, and whereby he becomes actually so, is faith or believing. "But believeth on him who justifieth the ungodly." That is, it is faith alone. For it is the faith of him who worketh not; and not only so, but its especial object, God as justifying the ungodly, is exclusive of the concomitancy of any works whatever. This is faith alone, or it is impossible to express faith alone, without the literal use of that word *alone*. But faith being asserted, in opposition to all works of ours, "unto him that worketh not," and its especial nature de-

clared in its especial object, "God as justifying the ungodly," that is, "freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus," no place is left for any works to make the least approach towards our justification before God, under the covert of any distinction whatever. And the nature of justifying faith is here also determined. It is not a mere assent to divine revelations; it is not such a firm assent to them, as should cause us to yield obedience to all the precepts of the Scripture, though these things are included in it; but it is a believing on, and trusting to him that justifieth the ungodly, through the mediation of Christ.

Concerning this person, the Apostle affirms that his "faith is counted for righteousness," that is, he is justified in the way and manner before declared. But there is a difference about the sense of these words. Some say, the meaning of them is, that faith as an act, a grace, a duty, or work of ours, is so imputed. We say, that it is faith as it apprehends Christ and his righteousness, which is properly imputed to us, that is intended. So faith, say we, justifies, or is counted for righteousness relatively, not properly, with respect to its object; and so we acknowledge a trope in the words. And this is fiercely opposed, as though we denied the express words of the Scripture, when yet we do but interpret this expression once only used by many others, wherein the same thing is declared. But those who are for the first sense, all affirm that faith here is to be taken as including obedience or works, either as the form and essence of it, or as such necessary concomitants as have the same influence with it on our justification, or are in the same manner the condition of it. But as herein they admit also of a trope in the words which they so fiercely blame in us, so they give this sense of the whole, "to him that worketh not, but believeth in him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith and works are counted to him for righteousness;" which is not only to deny what the Apostle affirms, but to assign to him a plain contradiction.

And I do a little marvel that any unprejudiced person should expound the solitary expression in such a sense, as is contradictory to the design of the Apostle, the words of the same period, and the whole ensuing context. For that which the Apostle proposes to confirmation, which contains his whole design, is, that we are justified by the righteousness which is of God by faith in the blood of Christ. That this cannot be faith itself, shall immediately be made evident; and in the

words of the text, all works are excluded, if any words be sufficient to exclude them. But faith absolutely as a single grace, act and duty of ours, is a work; much more as it includes obedience in it, it is all works. And in the ensuing context, he proves that Abraham was not justified by works. But not to be justified by works, and to be justified by some works, (as faith itself is a work, and if as such it be imputed to us for righteousness, we are justified by it as such) are contradictory. Wherefore I shall oppose some few arguments to this feigned sense of the Apostle's words.

1. To believe absolutely, as faith is an act and duty of ours, and works, are not opposed; for faith is a work, an especial kind of working. But faith as we are justified by it, and works, or to work, are opposed; "to him that worketh not but believeth." So Gal. ii. 16; Eph. ii. 8.

2. It is the righteousness of God that is imputed to us. For "we are made the righteousness of God in Christ," 2 Cor. v. 21. "The righteousness of God upon them that believe," Rom. iii. 21, 22. But faith absolutely considered, is not the righteousness of God. God imputes to us "righteousness without works," Rom. iv. 6. But there is no intimation of a double imputation of two sorts of righteousness, of the righteousness of God, and that which is not so. Now faith absolutely considered, is not the righteousness of God. For

1. That whereto the righteousness of God is revealed, whereby we believe and receive it, is not itself the righteousness of God. For nothing can be the cause or means of itself: but the righteousness of God is "revealed unto faith," Rom. i. 16. And by it is it received, Rom. iii. 22; v. 11.

2. Faith is not the righteousness of God which is by faith: but the righteousness of God which is imputed to us is "the righteousness of God which is by faith," Rom. iii. 22; Phil. iii. 9.

3. That whereby the righteousness of God is to be sought, obtained, and submitted to, is not that righteousness itself. But such is faith, Rom. ix. 30, 31; x. 30.

4. The righteousness which is imputed to us, is not our own antecedently to that imputation. "That I may be found in him, not having my own righteousness," Phil. iii. 9. But faith is a man's own. Show me "thy faith," I will show thee "my faith," James ii. 18.

5. God imputes righteousness to us, Rom. iv. 6. And that righteousness which God imputes to us, is the righteousness whereby we are justified, for it is imputed to us that we may

be justified. But we are justified by the obedience and blood of Christ. "By the obedience of one we are made righteous," Rom. v. 19. "Much more now being justified by his blood," ver. 9. "He hath put away sin by the sacrifice of himself," Heb. ix. 26. "By his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many, for he shall bear their iniquities." Isa. liii. 11. But faith is neither the obedience, nor the blood of Christ.

6. Faith, as we said before, is our own. And that which is our own may be imputed to us. But the discourse of the Apostle is about that which is not our own antecedently to imputation, but is made ours thereby, as we have proved; for it is of "grace." And the imputation to us of what is really our own antecedently to that imputation, is not of grace in the sense of the Apostle. For what is so imputed, is imputed for what it is, and nothing else. For that imputation is but the judgment of God concerning the thing imputed, with respect to them whose it is. So the fact of Phineas was imputed to him for righteousness. God judged it, and declared it to be a righteous rewardable act. Wherefore if our faith and obedience be imputed to us, that imputation is only the judgment of God that we are believers and obedient. "The righteousness of the righteous, (saith the prophet,) shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him," Ezek. xviii. 20. As the wickedness of the wicked is upon him, or is imputed to him, so the righteousness of the righteous is upon him, or is imputed to him. And the wickedness of the wicked is on him, when God judges him wicked as his works are. So is the righteousness of a man upon him, or imputed to him, when God judges of his righteousness as it is. Wherefore if faith absolutely considered, be imputed to us as it contains in itself, or as it is accompanied with works of obedience: then it is imputed to us, either for a perfect righteousness which it is not, or for an imperfect righteousness which it is; or the imputation of it, is the accounting of that to be a perfect righteousness, which is but imperfect; but none of these can be affirmed.

1. It is not imputed to us for a perfect righteousness, the righteousness required by the law, for so it is not. Episcopius confesses in his disputation, Disput. xlv. § 7, 8, that "the righteousness which is imputed unto us must be *absolutissima et perfectissima*, "most absolute and most perfect." And thence he thus defines the imputation of righteousness to us, namely, that it is, *gratiosa divinæ mentis æstimatio, qua credentem in Filium suum, eo loco reputat ac si perfecte justus esset, ac*

legi et voluntati ejus per omnia semper paruisset; “a gracious judgment of the divine mind, by which the believer in Christ is regarded as perfectly righteous, as if he had, at all times and in all respects, obeyed the law and will of God.” And no man will pretend, that faith is such a most absolute and most perfect righteousness, that by it the righteousness of the law should be fulfilled in us, as it is by that righteousness which is imputed to us.

2. It is not imputed to us for what it is, an imperfect righteousness. For (1) This would be of no advantage to us. For we cannot be justified before God by an imperfect righteousness, as is evident in the prayer of the Psalmist, Psa. cxliii. 2. “Enter not into judgment with thy servant, for in thy sight no man living, (no servant of thine who has the most perfect, or highest measure of imperfect righteousness) shall be justified.” (2) The imputation of any thing to us, that was ours antecedently to that imputation, for what it is, and no more, is contrary to the imputation described by the Apostle, as has been proved.

3. This imputation pleaded for cannot be a judging of that to be a perfect righteousness which is imperfect. For the judgment of God is according to truth. But without judging it to be such, it cannot be accepted as such. To accept of any thing, but only for what we judge it to be, is to be deceived.

Lastly, if faith, as a work, be imputed to us, then it must be as a work wrought in faith. For no other work is accepted with God. Then must that faith also wherein it is wrought be imputed to us; for that also is faith and a good work. That therefore must have another faith from whence it must proceed. And so *in infinitum*.

Many other things there are in the ensuing explication of the justification of Abraham, the nature of his faith and his righteousness before God, with the application of them to all that believe, which may be justly pleaded to the same purpose with those passages of the context which we have insisted on. But if every testimony should be pleaded which the Holy Ghost has given to this truth, there would be no end of writing. One thing more I shall observe and put an end to our discourse on this chapter.

Vers. 6—8. The Apostle pursues his argument to prove the freeness of our justification by faith, without respect to works, through the imputation of righteousness, in the instance of pardon of sin, which essentially belongs thereto. And this he does

by the testimony of the Psalmist, who places the blessedness of a man in the remission of sins. His design is not thereby to declare the full nature of justification, which he had done before, but only to prove the freeness of it from any respect to works in the instance of that essential part of it. "Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works (which was the only thing he designed to prove by this testimony) saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven." He describes their blessedness by it, not that their whole blessedness consists therein; but this concurs to it, wherein no respect can possibly be had to any works whatever. And he may justly from hence describe the blessedness of a man, in that the imputation of righteousness, and the non-imputation of sin, (both which the Apostle mentions distinctly) wherein his whole blessedness as to justification consists, are inseparable. And because remission of sin is the first part of justification, and the principal part of it, and has the imputation of righteousness always accompanying it, the blessedness of a man may be well described thereby. Yea, whereas all spiritual blessings go together in Christ, Eph. i. 3; a man's blessedness may be described by any of them. But yet the imputation of righteousness, and the remission of sin are not the same, no more than righteousness imputed, and sin remitted, are the same. Nor does the Apostle propose them as the same, but mentions them distinctly, both being equally necessary to our complete justification, as has been proved.

Rom. v. 12—21. "Wherefore as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned. For until the law sin was in the world; but sin is not imputed when there is no law. Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come. But not as the offence, so also is the free gift. For if through the offence of one, many be dead, much more the grace of God and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many. And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift. For the judgment was by one to condemnation; but the free gift is of many offences unto justification. For if by one man's offence death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace, and of the gift of righteousness,

shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ. Therefore as by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners; so by the obedience of one, shall many be made righteous. Moreover the law entered that the offence might abound; but where sin abounded, grace did much more abound: that as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord."

The Apostle, Rom. iii. 27, affirms, that in this matter of justification, all boasting is excluded. But here in the verse foregoing, he grants a boasting. Οὐ μόνον δὲ ἀλλὰ καυχώμεθα ἐν τῷ Θεῷ; "and not only so, but we also glory in God." He excludes boasting in ourselves, because there is nothing in us to procure or promote our own justification. He allows it us, "in God," because of the eminency and excellency of the way and means of our justification, which in his grace he has provided. And the "boasting" in God here allowed us, has a peculiar respect to what the Apostle had in prospect further to discourse of. "Not only so," includes what he had principally treated of before, concerning our justification so far as it consists in the pardon of sin. For although he supposes, yea, and mentions the imputation of righteousness also to us; yet principally he declares our justification by the pardon of sin, and our freedom from condemnation, whereby all boasting in ourselves is excluded. But here he designs a further progress, as to that whereon our glorying in God, on a right and title freely given us to eternal life, depends. And this is the imputation of the righteousness and obedience of Christ to the justification of life, or the reign of grace, through righteousness, to eternal life.

Great complaints have been made by some concerning the obscurity of the discourse of the Apostle in this place, by reason of sundry figures of speech, which either are, or are feigned to be therein. Howbeit I cannot but think, that if men acquainted with the common principles of Christianity, and sensible in themselves of the nature and guilt of our original apostasy from God, would without prejudice read ταυτην την περιοχην της γραφης, "this place of the Scripture," they will grant that the design of the Apostle is to prove, that as the sin of Adam was imputed to all men to condemnation, so the righteousness and obedience of Christ is imputed to all that believe to the justification

of life. The sum of it is given by Theodoret:* "See how the things which are Christ's are compared with those which are Adam's, the medicine with the disease, the plaster with the wound, righteousness with sin, the blessing with the curse, forgiveness with condemnation, obedience with transgression, life with death, a kingdom with hell, Christ with Adam, man with man."

The differences that are among interpreters about the exposition of these words relate to the use of some particles, prepositions, and the dependence of one passage upon another; on none of which the confirmation of the truth pleaded for depends. But the plain design of the Apostle, and his express propositions are such as, if men could but acquiesce in them, might put an end to this controversy.

Socinus acknowledges that this place of Scripture gives, as he speaks, "the greatest occasions" to our opinion in this matter: for he cannot deny, but, at least, a great appearance of what we believe is represented in the words of the Apostle. He therefore uses his utmost endeavour to wrest and deprave them: and yet, although most of his artifices are since transferred into the annotations of others upon the place, he himself produces nothing material, but what is taken out of Origen, and the comment of Pelagius on this epistle, which is extant in the works of Jerome, and was urged before him by Erasmus. The substance of what he pleads for is, "that the actual transgression of Adam is not imputed to his posterity, nor a depraved nature from thence communicated to them. Only whereas he had incurred the penalty of death, all that derive their nature from him in that condition are rendered subject to death also. And as for that corruption of nature which is in us, or a proneness to sin, it is not derived from Adam, but is a habit contracted by many continued acts of our own. So also on the other hand, that the obedience or righteousness of Christ is not imputed to us. Only when we make ourselves to become his children by our obedience to him; he having obtained eternal life for himself by his obedience to God, we are made partakers of the benefits thereof." This is the substance of his long disputation on this subject, *De Servator. lib. iv. cap. 6.* But this is not to expound the words of the Apostle, but ex-

* Vide quomodo quæ Christi sunt cum iis quæ sunt Adami conferantur, cum morbo medicina, cum vulnere emplastrum, cum peccato justitia, cum execratione benedictio, cum condemnatione remissio, cum transgressionem obedientia, cum morte vita, cum inferis regnum, Christus cum Adam, homo cum homine. *Dial. iii.*

pressly to contradict them, as we shall see in the ensuing consideration of them.

I intend not an exposition of the whole discourse of the Apostle, but only of those passages in it which evidently declare the way and manner of our justification before God.

A comparison is here proposed and pursued between the first Adam, by whom sin was brought into the world, and the second Adam, by whom it was taken away. And a comparison it is *ἐκ τῶν ἐναντίων*, of things contrary, wherein there is a similitude in some things, and a dissimilitude in others, both sorts illustrating the truth declared in it. The general proposition of it is contained in ver. 12: "As by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed on all men, for that all have sinned." The entrance of sin and punishment into the world, was "by one man;" and that "by one" sin as he afterwards declares. Yet were they not confined to the person of that one man, but belouged equally to all. This the Apostle expresses, inverting the order of the effect and cause. In the entrance of it, he first mentions the cause or sin, and then the effect or punishment. "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin;" but in the application of it to all men, he expresses first the effect, and then the cause; "death passed on all men, for that all have sinned." Death, on the first entrance of sin, passed on all; that is, all men became liable and obnoxious to it, as the punishment due to sin. All men that ever were, are, or shall be, were not then existent in their own persons. But yet were they all of them, then, upon the first entrance of sin, made subject to death, or liable to punishment. They were so by virtue of divine constitution upon their federal existence in the one man that sinned. And actually they became obnoxious in their own persons to the sentence of it, upon their first natural existence, being born children of wrath.

It is hence manifest what sin it is that the Apostle intends, namely, the actual sin of Adam; the one sin of that one common person whilst he was so. For although the corruption and depravation of our nature, necessarily ensues thereon, in every one that is brought forth actually in the world by natural generation; yet is it the guilt of Adam's actual sin alone, that rendered them all obnoxious to death upon the first entrance of sin into the world. So death entered by sin, the guilt of it, obnoxiousness to it, and that with respect to all men universally.

Death here comprises the whole punishment due to sin, be it what it will, concerning which we need not here to dispute.

“The wages of sin is death,” Rom. vi. 23, and nothing else. Whatever sin deserves in the justice of God, whatever punishment God at any time appointed or threatened to it, it is comprised in death: “In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt die the death.” This therefore the Apostle lays down as the foundation of his discourse, and of the comparison which he intends; namely, that in and by the actual sin of Adam, all men are made liable to death, or to the whole punishment due to sin. That is, the guilt of that sin is imputed to them. For nothing is intended by the imputation of sin to any, but the rendering them justly obnoxious to the punishment due to that sin; as the not imputing of sin is the freeing of men from being subject or liable to punishment. And this sufficiently evidences the vanity of the Pelagian gloss that death passed upon all, merely by virtue of natural propagation from him who had deserved it, without any imputation of the guilt of sin to them; which is a contradiction to the plain words of the Apostle. For it is the guilt of sin, and not natural propagation, that he affirms to be the cause of death.

Having mentioned sin and death, the one as the only cause of the other, the guilt of sin, of the punishment of death, sin deserving nothing but death, and death being due to nothing but sin, he declares how all men universally became liable to this punishment, or guilty of death, ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον, *in quo omnes peccaverunt*; “in whom all have sinned.” For it relates to the one man that sinned, in whom all sinned; which is evident from the effect thereof, in as much as “in him all died,” 1 Cor. xv. 22. Or, as it is here, on his sin “death passed on all men.” And this is the evident sense of the words, ἐτα being put for ἐν, which is not unusual in the Scripture. See Matt. xv. 5; Rom. iv. 18; v. 2; Phil. i. 3; Heb. ix. 17. And it is so often used by the best writers in the Greek tongue: so Hesiod μετρον δ' ἐτι πασιν ἀριστον, *modus in omnibus rebus optimus*. So ἐφ' ἡμῖν ἐστω, *in vobis situm est*, τούτο ἐπ' ἐμοὶ γέγραται, *hoc in me situm est*. And this reading of the words is contended for by Austin against the Pelagians, rejecting their *eo quod* or *propterea*. But I shall not contend about the reading of the words. It is the artifice of our adversaries to persuade men, that the force of our argument to prove from hence the imputation of the sin of Adam to his posterity, depends solely upon interpreting these words, ἐφ' ᾧ, “in whom.” We shall therefore grant them their desire, that they are better rendered by *eo quod*, *propterea*, or *quatenus*; “in as much as,” “because.” Only

we must say, that here is a reason given, why "death passed on all men, in as much as all have sinned," that is, in that sin whereby death entered into the world.

It is true. Death by virtue of the original constitution of the law, is due to every sin, whenever it is committed. But the present inquiry is, how death passed at once on all men, how they came liable and obnoxious to it upon its first entrance by the actual sin of Adam; which cannot be by their own actual sin. Yea, the Apostle in the next verses affirms, that death passed on them also, who never sinned actually, or as Adam did, whose sin was actual. And if the actual sins of men in imitation of Adam's sin were intended, then should men be made liable to death, before they had sinned. For death upon its first entrance into the world, passed on all men, before any one man had actually sinned, but Adam only. But that men should be liable to death, which is nothing but the punishment of sin, when they have not sinned, is an open contradiction. For although God by his sovereign power might inflict death on an innocent creature, yet that an innocent creature should be guilty of death is impossible. For to be guilty of death, is to have sinned. Wherefore this expression, "in as much as all have sinned," expressing the desert and guilt of death, at that time when sin and death first entered into the world, no sin can be intended in it, but the sin of Adam, and our interest therein; *eramus enim omnes ille unus homo*. And this can be no otherwise, but by the imputation of the guilt of that sin to us. For the act of Adam not being ours inherently and subjectively, we cannot be concerned in its effect, but by the imputation of its guilt. For the communication of that to us which is not inherent in us, is that which we intend by imputation.

This is the *παρασις* of the intended comparison, which I have insisted the longer on, because the Apostle lays in it the foundation of all that he afterwards infers, and asserts in the whole comparison. And here some say there is an *ἀνατροπὸν* in his discourse, that is, he lays down the proposition on the part of Adam, but does not show what answers to it on the contrary in Christ. And Origen gives the reason of the silence of the Apostle herein, namely, "Lest what is to be said therein, should be abused by any to sloth and negligence." For whereas he says *ὡςπερ*, "as," which is a note of similitude, "by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin;" so the *ἀνατροπὴ* or reddition should be, "So, by one, righteousness entered into the world, and life by righteousness."

This he acknowledges to be the genuine filling up of the comparison, but it was not expressed by the Apostle, "Lest men should abuse it to negligence or security," supposing that to be done already, which should be done afterwards. But as this plainly contradicts and averts most of what he further asserts in the exposition of the place; so the Apostle concealed not any truth upon such considerations. And as he plainly expresses that which is here intimated, verse 19, so he shows how foolish and wicked any such imaginations are, as suppose that any countenance is given hereby to any to indulge themselves in their sins.

Some grant, therefore, that the Apostle conceals the expression of what is ascribed to Christ, in opposition to what he had affirmed of Adam and his sin, to ver. 19. But the truth is, it is sufficiently included in the close of ver. 14, where he affirms of Adam, that in those things whereof he treats, he "was the figure of him that was to come." For the way and manner whereby he introduced righteousness and life, and communicated them to men, answered the way and manner whereby Adam introduced sin and death which passed on all the world. Adam being the figure of Christ, look how it was with him, with respect to his natural posterity as to sin and death; so it is with the Lord Christ, the second Adam and his spiritual posterity, with respect to righteousness and life. Hence we argue,

If the actual sin of Adam was so imputed to all his posterity, as to be accounted their own sin to condemnation, then is the actual obedience of Christ, the second Adam, imputed to all his spiritual seed, that is, to all believers, to justification. I shall not here further press this argument, because the ground of it will occur to us afterwards.

The two next verses containing an objection and an answer returned to them, wherein we have no immediate concernment, I shall pass by.

Verses 15, 16. The Apostle proceeds to explain his comparison in those things, wherein there is a dissimilitude between the things compared.

"But not as the offence, so is the free gift; for if through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, by one man Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many."

The opposition is between *παράπτωμα* on the one hand, and *χαρισμα* on the other; between which, a dissimilitude is asserted, not as to their opposite effects of death and life, but only as to the

degrees of their efficacy, with respect to those effects. Παράπτωμα, "the offence, the fall, the sin, the transgression;" that is του ἑνὸς παραπτώματος, "the disobedience of one," verse 19. Hence the first sin of Adam, is generally called the *fall*, το παραπτωμα. That which is opposed hereto, is το χαρισμα; *donum, donum gratuitum, beneficium, id quod Deus gratificatur*; that is, χαρις του Θεου, και δωρεα εν χαριτι τη του ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου Ἰησοῦ Χριστου, as it is immediately explained; "the grace of God, and the free gift by grace, through Jesus Christ." Wherefore, although this word, in the next verse, precisely signifies the righteousness of Christ, yet here it comprehends all the causes of our justification, in opposition to the fall of Adam, and the entrance of sin thereby.

The consequence and effect του παραπτώματος of the offence, the fall, is, that "many be dead." No more is here intended by *many*, but only that the effects of that one offence were not confined to one: and if we inquire who, or how many those many are, the Apostle tells us, that they are "all men" universally, that is, all the posterity of Adam. By this one offence, because they all sinned, therein they are all dead; that is, rendered obnoxious and liable to death, as the punishment due to that one offence. And hence also it appears, how vain it is to wrest those words of ver. 12, "In as much as all have sinned," to any other sin, but the first sin in Adam; seeing it is given as the reason why death passed on them, it being here plainly affirmed, that they are dead, or that death passed on them by that one offence.

The efficacy του χαρισματος, of the "free gift," opposed hereto, is expressed, as that which "abounded much more." Besides the thing itself asserted, which is plain and evident, the Apostle seems to me to argue the equity of our justification by grace, through the obedience of Christ, by comparing it with the condemnation that befel us by the sin and disobedience of Adam. For if it were just, meet, and equal that all men should be made subject to condemnation for the sin of Adam; it is much more so, that those who believe, should be justified by the obedience of Christ, through the grace and free donation of God. But wherein, in particular, the gift by grace abounded to many, above the efficacy of the fall to condemn, he declares afterwards. And, that whereby we are freed from condemnation, more eminently than we are made obnoxious to it by the fall and sin of Adam, by that alone we are justified before God. But this is by the grace of God, and the gift by grace,

through Jesus Christ alone, which we plead for, ver. 16. Another difference between the things compared is expressed, or rather the instance is given in particular of the dissimilitude asserted in general before.

“And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift; for the judgment was by one to condemnation; but the free gift is of many offences unto justification.”

Δι' ἑνος ἁμαρτησαντος, “by one that sinned,” is the same with δι' ἑνος παραπτώματος, “by one sin, one offence,” the one sin of that one man. Κριμα, we render “judgment.” Most interpreters do it by *reatus*, guilt, or *crimen*, which is derived from it. So רשע *judicium*, is used in the Hebrew for guilt, Jer. xxvi. 11. “The judgment of death is to this man,” this man is guilty of death, has deserved to die. First therefore there was παραπτωμα “the sin, the fall,” του ἑνος ἁμαρτησαντος “of one man that sinned,” it was his actual sin alone. Thence followed κριμα, *reatus*, “guilt;” this was common to all. In and by that one sin, guilt came upon all. And the end hereof, that which it rendered men obnoxious to, is κατακριμα, “condemnation;” “guilt to condemnation;” and this guilt to condemnation which came upon all, was ἐξ ἑνος “of one” person, or sin. This is the order of things on the part of Adam. (1) Παραπτωμα the one sin. (2) Κριμα the guilt that thereon ensued to all. (3) Κατακριμα the condemnation which that guilt deserved. And their antitheta or opposites in the second Adam, are (1) χαρισμα the free donation of God. (2) Δωρημα the gift of grace itself, or the righteousness of Christ. (3) Δικαιωμα or δικαιωσις ζωης, justification of life. But yet though the Apostle thus distinguishes these things to illustrate his comparison and opposition, yet that which he intends by them all, is the righteousness and obedience of Christ, as he declares, ver. 18, 19. This in the matter of our justification, he (1) calls χαρισμα with respect to the free gratuitous grant of it by the grace of God, Δωρεα της χαριτος; and (2) Δωρημα with respect to us who receive it: a free gift it is to us; and (3) Δικαιωμα, with respect to its effect of making us righteous.

Whereas therefore, by the sin of Adam imputed to them, “guilt came on all men unto condemnation,” we must inquire wherein the free gift was otherwise. “Not as by one that sinned, so was the gift.” And it was so in two things: for (1) condemnation came upon all by one offence. But being under the guilt of that one offence, we contract the guilt of many more, innumerable. Wherefore if the free gift had respect

only to that one offence, and extended itself no further, we could not be delivered; wherefore it is said to be of "many offences," that is, of all our sins and trespasses whatever. (2) Adam and all his posterity in him, were in a state of acceptance with God, and placed in a way of obtaining eternal life and blessedness, wherein God himself would have been their reward. In this estate by the entrance of sin, they lost the favour of God, and incurred the guilt of death or condemnation, for they are the same. But they lost not an immediate right and title to life and blessedness. For this they had not, nor could have before the course of obedience prescribed to them was accomplished. That therefore, which came upon all by the one offence, was the loss of God's favour in the approbation of their present state, and the judgment or guilt of death and condemnation. But an immediate right to eternal life by that one sin was not lost. The free gift is not so. For as by it we are freed, not only from one sin, but from all our sins, so also by it we have a right and title to eternal life. For therein "grace reigns through righteousness unto eternal life," ver. 22.

The same truth is further explained and confirmed, ver. 17. "For if by one man's offence death reigned by one, much more they which receive abundance of grace, and of the gift of righteousness, shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ." The design of the Apostle having been sufficiently manifested in our observations on the former verses, I shall from this only observe those things which more immediately concern our present subject. And (1) it is worth observation, with what variety of expressions the Apostle set forth the grace of God in the justification of believers. *δικαιωμα, δωρημα, χαρις, χαρισμα, περισσεια χαριτος, δωρεα της δικαιοσυνης*. Nothing is omitted that may any way express the freeness, sufficiency, and efficacy of grace to that end. And although these terms seem some of them to be coincident in their signification, and to be used by him promiscuously, yet every one includes something that is peculiar, and all of them set forth the whole work of grace. *δικαιωμα* seems to me to be used in this argument for *δικαιολογημα*, which is the foundation of a cause in trial, the matter pleaded, whereon the person tried is to be acquitted and justified. And this is the righteousness of Christ, "of one." *δωρημα*, or a free donation is exclusive of all desert and conditions on our part, who receive it. And it is that whereby we are freed from condemnation, and have a right to the justification of life. *χαρις* is the

free grace and favour of God, which is the original or efficient cause of our justification, as was declared chap. iii. 23. *Χαρισμα* has been explained before. *Περσσεια χαριτος* "the abundance of grace," is added to secure believers of the certainty of the effect. It is that whereto nothing is wanting to our justification. *Δωρεα της δικαιοσυνης* expresses the free grant of that righteousness which is imputed to us to the justification of life, afterwards called the obedience of Christ. Be men as wise and learned as they please, it becomes us all to learn to think and speak of those divine mysteries from this blessed Apostle, who knew them better than we all, and, besides, wrote by divine inspiration.

And it is marvellous to me, how men can break through the fence that he has made about the grace of God, and obedience of Christ in the work of our justification before God, to introduce their own works of obedience, and to find a place for them therein. But the design of Paul and that of some men in declaring this point of our justification before God, seem to be very opposite and contrary. His whole discourse is concerning the grace of God, the death, blood, and obedience of Christ, as if he could never sufficiently satisfy himself in the setting out and declaration of them, without the least mention of any works or duties of our own, or the least intimation of any use that they are of herein. But all their pleas are for their own works and duties; and they have invented as many terms to set them out by, as the Holy Ghost has used for the expression and declaration of the grace of God. Instead of the words of wisdom before mentioned, which the Holy Ghost has taught, wherewith he fills up his discourse, theirs are filled with conditions, preparatory dispositions, merits, causes, and I know not what trappings for our own works. For my part I shall choose rather to learn of him, and accommodate my conceptions and expressions of gospel mysteries, and of this, in especial, concerning our justification, to his who cannot deceive me; than trust to any other conduct, how specious soever its pretences may be.

2. It is plain in this verse that no more is required of any one to justification, but that he receive "the abundance of grace and the gift of righteousness." For this is the description that the Apostle gives of those that are justified, as to any thing that on their part is required. And as this excludes all works of righteousness which we do; for by none of them do we receive the abundance of grace, and the gift of righteousness; so

it does also the imputation of faith itself to our justification, as it is an act and duty of our own; for faith is that whereby we receive the gift of righteousness, by which we are justified. For it will not be denied, but that we are justified by the gift of righteousness, or the righteousness which is given to us; for by it have we right and title to life. But our faith is not this gift; for that which receives, and that which is received, are not the same.

3. Where there is *περισσεια χαριτος*, and *χαρις υπερπερισσευουσα*, "abounding grace, superabounding grace," exerted in our justification, no more is required thereto. For how can it be said to abound, yea, to superabound, not only to the freeing of us from condemnation, but the giving of us a title to life, if in any thing it is to be supplied, and eked out by works and duties of our own? The things intended fill up these expressions, although to some they are but an empty noise.

4. There is a gift of righteousness required to our justification, which all must receive who are to be justified. And all are justified who do receive it; for they that receive it, shall "reign in life by Jesus Christ." And hence it follows, (1) that the righteousness whereby we are justified before God, can be nothing of our own, nothing inherent in us, nothing performed by us. For it is that which is freely given us, and this donation is by imputation. "Blessed is the man unto whom the Lord imputeth righteousness," chap. iv. 6. And by faith we receive what is so given and imputed, and otherwise we contribute nothing to our participation of it. This it is to be "justified" in the sense of the Apostle. (2) It is such a righteousness as gives right and title to eternal life. For they that receive it "shall reign in life." Wherefore it cannot consist in the pardon of sin alone. For (1) the pardon of sin can in no tolerable sense be called "the gift of righteousness." Pardon of sin is one thing, and righteousness another. (2) Pardon of sin does not give right and title to eternal life. It is true, he whose sins are pardoned, shall inherit eternal life; but not merely by virtue of that pardon, but through the imputation of righteousness, which inseparably accompanies it, and is the ground of it.

The description which is here given of our justification by grace in opposition to the condemnation, that we were made liable to by the sin of Adam, and in exaltation above it, as to the efficacy of grace above that of the first sin, in that thereby not one but all sins are forgiven, and not only so, but a right to life eternal is communicated to us, is this, That we receive

the grace of God, and the gift of righteousness, which gives us a right to life by Jesus Christ. But this is to be justified by the imputation of the righteousness of Christ received by faith alone.

The conclusion of what has been evinced in the management of the comparison insisted on, is fully expressed and further confirmed in verses 18, 19.

Verse 18. "Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men unto condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto the justification of life." So we read the words. "By the offence of one;" the Greek copies vary here. Some read *τω ἐν παραπτώματι*, whom Beza follows, and our translation in the margin; "by one offence;" most by *τω του ἑνος παραπτώματι*, "by the offence of one;" and so afterwards as to righteousness; but both are to the same purpose. For the one offence intended, is the offence of one, that is, of Adam: and the one righteousness, is the righteousness of one, Jesus Christ.

The introduction of this assertion by *αρα ουν*, the note of a syllogistical inference, declares what is here asserted to be the substance of the truth pleaded for. And the comparison is continued, *ὡς* "so, after the same manner."

That which is affirmed on the one side, is *δι' ἑνος παραπτώματος εἰς παντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς κατακριμα*; "by the sin or fall of one, on all men unto condemnation," that is, judgment, say we, repeating *κριμα* from the foregoing verse. But *κριμα εἰς κατακριμα* is guilt, and that only. By the sin of one, all men became guilty, and were made obnoxious to condemnation. The guilt of it is imputed to all men. For no otherwise can it come upon them to condemnation, no otherwise can they be rendered obnoxious to death and judgment on account thereof. For we have evinced that by death and condemnation in this disputation of the Apostle, the whole punishment due to sin is intended. This therefore is plain and evident on that hand.

In answer hereto, the *δικαιωμα* of one as to the causality of justification, is opposed to the *παραπτωμα* of the other, as to its causality to, or of condemnation. *δι' ἑνος δικαιωματος*, "By the righteousness of one;" that is, the righteousness that is pleadable *εἰς δικαιωσιν* to justification. For that is *δικαιωμα* a righteousness pleaded for justification. By this, say our translators, "the free gift came upon all;" repeating *χαρισμα* from the foregoing verse, as they had done *κριμα* before on the other hand. The Syriac translation renders the words without the aid of

any supplement: "Therefore as by the sin of one, condemnation was unto all men, so by the righteousness of one, justification unto life shall be unto all men." And the sense of the words is so made plain without the supply of any other word into the next. But whereas in the original the words are not *κατακριμα εις παντας ανθρωπους*, but *εις παντας ανθρωπους εις κατακριμα*, and so in the latter clause, somewhat from his own foregoing words is to be supplied to answer the intention of the Apostle. And this is *χαρισμα gratiosa donatio*, the free grant of righteousness; or *δωρημα* the free gift of righteousness unto justification. The righteousness of one, Christ Jesus, is freely granted to all believers to the justification of life. For the "all men" here mentioned are described by, and limited to them that "receive the abundance of grace, and the gift of righteousness by Christ," verse 17.

Some vainly pretend from hence a general grant of righteousness and life to all men, whereof the greatest part are never made partakers; than which nothing can be more opposite nor contradictory to the Apostle's design. Men are not made guilty of condemnation from the sin of Adam, by such a divine constitution, as that they may, or on some conditions may not be obnoxious thereto. Every one so soon as he actually exists, and by virtue thereof, is a descendant from the first Adam, is actually in his own person liable thereto, and the wrath of God abides on him. And no more are intended on the other side, but those only who by their relation through faith to the Lord Christ, the second Adam, are actually interested in the justification of life. Neither is the controversy about the universality of redemption by the death of Christ herein concerned. For those by whom it is asserted, do not affirm that it is thence necessary that the free gift to the justification of life should come on all, for that they know it does not do. And of a provision of righteousness and life for men in case they believe, although it be true, yet nothing is spoken in this place. Only the certain justification of them that believe, and the way of it is declared. Nor will the analogy of the comparison here insisted on, admit of any such interpretation. For the all on the one hand are all, and only those who derive their being from Adam by natural propagation. If any man might be supposed not to do so, he would not be concerned in his sin or fall. And so really it was with the man Christ Jesus. And those on the other hand, are only those who derive a spiritual life from Christ. Suppose a man not to do so, and

he is no way interested in the righteousness of one to the justification of life. Our argument from the words is this: As the sin of one that came on all to condemnation, was the sin of the first Adam imputed to them, so the righteousness of the one to justification of life that comes on all believers, is the righteousness of Christ imputed to them. And what can be more clearly affirmed or more evidently confirmed than this is by the Apostle, I know not. Yet is it more plainly expressed, verse 19. "For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners; so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous."

This is well explained by Cyrillus Alexandrinus.* "As by the transgression of the first man, in the origin of our race, we were doomed to death, so by the obedience and righteousness of Christ, inasmuch as he subjected himself to the law, of which he himself was the author, blessing and vivification through the Spirit have reached to our whole nature." And by Leo.† "In order to restore life to all, he undertook the cause of all, that as by the guilt of one, all have been made sinners, so by the innocence of one, all might be made innocent; that righteousness might flow to men from him who assumed the nature of man."

That which he before called *παραπτώμα* and *δικαιώμα* he now expresses by *παρακοή* and *ἑπακοή*, "disobedience and obedience." The *παρακοή* of Adam or his disobedience was his actual transgression of the law of God. Hereby, saith the Apostle, "many were made sinners;" sinners in such a sense as to be obnoxious to death and condemnation. For liable to death they could not be made, unless they were first made sinners or guilty. And this they could not be, but that they are esteemed to have sinned in him, whereon the guilt of his sin was imputed to them. This therefore he affirms, namely, that the actual sin of Adam was so the sin of all men, as that they were made sinners thereby, obnoxious to death and condemnation.

* *Quemadmodum prævaricatione primi hominis ut in primitiis generis nostri, morti addicti fuimus; eodem modo per obedientiam et justitiam Christi, in quantum seipsum legi subjecit, quamvis legis author esset, benedictio et vivificatio quæ per Spiritum est, ad totam nostram penetravit naturam. In Joan. lib. 11. cap. 25.*

† *Ut autem repararet omnium vitam, recepit omnium causam; ut sicut per unius reatum omnes facti fuerunt peccatores, ita per unius innocentiam omnes fierent innocentes; inde in homines manaret justitia, ubi est humana suscepta natura. Epist. 12. ad Juvenalem.*

That which he opposes hereto, is ἡ ὑπακοή "the obedience of one," that is, of Jesus Christ. And this was the actual obedience that he yielded to the whole law of God. For as the disobedience of Adam was his actual transgression of the whole law; so the obedience of Christ was his actual accomplishment or fulfilling of the whole law. This the antithesis requires.

Hereby "many are made righteous." How? By the imputation of that obedience to them. For so and no otherwise, are men made sinners by the imputation of the disobedience of Adam. And this is that which gives us a right and title to eternal life; as the Apostle declares, verse 21. "That as sin reigned unto death; so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life." This righteousness is no other but the "obedience of one," that is, of Christ, as it is called, verse 18. And it is said to "come upon" us, that is, to be imputed to us; for blessed is the man to whom God imputeth righteousness. And hereby we have not only deliverance from that death and condemnation whereto we were liable by the sin of Adam, but the pardon of many offences, that is, of all our personal sins, and a right to life eternal through the grace of God; for we are justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.

And these things are thus plainly and fully delivered by the Apostle, to whose sense and expressions also (so far as may be) it is our duty to accommodate ours. What is offered in opposition hereto is so made up of exceptions, evasions, and perplexed disputes, and leads us so far off from the plain words of the Scripture, that the conscience of a convinced sinner knows not what to fix upon to give it rest and satisfaction, nor what it is that is to be believed to justification.

Piscator in his *Scholia* on this chapter and elsewhere, insists much on a specious argument against the imputation of the obedience of Christ to our justification. But it proceeds evidently on an open mistake and false supposition, and is contradictory to the plain words of the text. It is true, as he observes and proves, that our redemption, reconciliation, pardon of sin, and justification are often ascribed to the death and blood of Christ in a signal manner. The reasons of it have partly been intimated before, and a further account of them shall be given immediately. But it does not thence follow, that the obedience of his life wherein he fulfilled the whole law, being made under it for us, is excluded from any causality

therein, or is not imputed to us. But in opposition thereto he thus argues.*

“If the obedience of Christ’s life was imputed to us for righteousness, it was not necessary that Christ should die for us; for it was our being unrighteous that made his death necessary, 1 Peter iii. 18. If therefore we were justified by his life, there remained no reason why he should die for us; for the justice of God does not allow of the punishment of the righteous. But he punished us in Christ; or, what is equivalent, he punished Christ for us and in our stead, after he had lived a holy life, as is evident from Scripture. Therefore we were not justified by the holy life of Christ. Again, Christ died to procure for us that righteousness of God, 2 Cor. v. 21. He had not therefore procured it before his death.”

But this whole argument I say, proceeds upon an evident mistake. For it supposes such an order of things, as that the obedience of Christ or his righteousness in fulfilling the law, is first imputed to us, and then the righteousness of his death is afterwards to take place, or to be imputed to us, which on that supposition he says would be of no use. But no such order or divine constitution is pleaded or pretended in our justification. It is true, the life of Christ, and his obedience to the law preceded his sufferings and undergoing the curse thereof; neither could it otherwise be. For this order of these things between themselves was made necessary from the law of nature; but it does not thence follow that it must be observed in the imputation or application of them to us. For this is an effect of sovereign wisdom and grace, not respecting the natural order of Christ’s obedience and suffering, but the moral order of the things whereto they are appointed. And although we need not assert, nor do I so do, different acts of the imputation of the obedience of Christ to the justification of life, or a right and title to life eternal, and of the suffering of Christ to the pardon of our sins and freedom from condemnation; but by both we have both, according to the ordinance of God, that

* Si obedientia vitæ Christi nobis ad justitiam imputaretur, non fuit opus Christum pro nobis mori; mori enim necesse fuit pro nobis injustis, 1 Pet. iii. 18. Quod si ergo justi effecti sumus per vitam illius, causa nulla relicta fuit cur pro nobis moreretur; quia justitia Dei non patitur ut puniat justos. At pavit nos in Christo, seu quod idem valet, punivit Christum pro nobis et loco nostri, posteaquam ille sancte vixisset, ut certum est e scriptura. Ergo non sumus justi effecti per sanctam vitam Christi. Item, Christus mortuus est ut justitiam illam Dei nobis acquireret. 2 Cor. v. 21. Non igitur illam acquisiverat ante mortem.

Christ may be all in all; yet as to the effects themselves, in the method of God's bringing sinners to the justification of life, the application of the death of Christ to them to the pardon of sin and freedom from condemnation, is in order of nature, and in the exercise of faith, antecedent to the application of his obedience to us for a right and title to life eternal.

The state of the person to be justified is a state of sin and wrath, wherein he is liable to death and condemnation. This is that which a convinced sinner is sensible of, and which alone in the first place he seeks for deliverance from. What shall we do to be saved? This in the first place is presented to him in the doctrine and promise of the gospel, which is the rule and instrument of its application. And this is the death of Christ. Without this no actual righteousness imputed to him, not the obedience of Christ himself will give him relief. For he is sensible that he has sinned, and thereby come short of the glory of God, and is under the condemnatory sentence of the law. Until he receives a deliverance from hence, it is to no purpose to propose that to him which should give him right to life eternal. But upon a supposition hereof, he is no less concerned in what shall yet further give him title thereto, that he may "reign in life through righteousness." Herein I say in its order, conscience is no less concerned than in deliverance from condemnation. And this order is expressed in the declaration of the fruit and effects of the mediation of Christ; Dan. ix. 24, "to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness." Neither is there any force in the objection against it, that actually the obedience of Christ preceded his suffering. For the method of their application is not prescribed thereby; and the state of sinners to be justified, with the nature of their justification, requires it should be otherwise, as God also has ordained. But because the obedience and sufferings of Christ, were concomitant from first to last, both equally belonging to his state of exinanition, and cannot in any act or instance be separated, but only in notion or imagination, seeing he suffered in all his obedience, and obeyed in all his suffering, Heb. v. 8; and neither part of our justification, in freedom from condemnation, and right to life eternal, can be supposed to be or exist without the other according to the ordinance and constitution of God; the whole effect is jointly to be ascribed to the whole mediation of Christ, so far as he acted towards God in our behalf, wherein he fulfilled the whole law both as to the penalty exacted of sinners, and the righteousness it requires to

life as an eternal reward. And there are many reasons why our justification is in the Scripture by way of eminency ascribed to the death and blood-shedding of Christ.

For, (1) The grace and love of God, the principal efficient cause of our justification, are therein made most eminent and conspicuous. For this is most frequently in the Scripture proposed to us as the highest instance and undeniable demonstration of divine love and grace. And this is that which principally we are to consider in our justification, the glory of them being the end of God therein. "He made us accepted in the Beloved to the praise of the glory of his grace," Eph. i. 6. Wherefore this being the fountain, spring and sole cause, both of the obedience of Christ, and of the imputation thereof to us, with the pardon of sin and righteousness thereby, it is every where in the Scripture proposed as the prime object of our faith in our justification, and opposed directly to all our own works whatever. The whole of God's design herein is, that "grace may reign through righteousness unto eternal life." Whereas therefore this is made most evident and conspicuous in the death of Christ, our justification is in a peculiar manner assigned thereto.

2. The love of Christ himself and his grace are peculiarly exalted in our justification; that all men may "honour the Son even as they honour the Father." Frequently are they expressed to this purpose, 2 Cor. viii. 9; Gal. ii. 20; Phil. iii. 6, 7; Rev. i. 5, 6. And those also are most eminently exalted in his death, so that all the effects and fruits of them are ascribed thereto in a peculiar manner; as nothing is more ordinary than, among many things that concur to the same effect, to ascribe it to that which is most eminent among them, especially if it cannot be conceived as separated from the rest.

3. This is the clearest testimony, that what the Lord Christ did and suffered was for us, and not for himself. For without the consideration hereof, all the obedience which he yielded to the law, might be looked on as due only on his own account, and himself to have been such a Saviour as the Socinians imagine, who should do all with us from God, and nothing with God for us. But the suffering of the curse of the law by him who was not only an innocent man, but also the Son of God, openly testifies that what he did and suffered was for us, and not for himself. It is no wonder therefore if our faith as to justification be in the first place and principally directed to his death and blood-shedding.

4. All the obedience of Christ had still respect to the sacrifice of himself, which was to ensue, wherein it received its accomplishment, and whereon its efficacy to our justification depended. For as no imputation of actual obedience would justify sinners from the condemnation that was passed on them for the sin of Adam; so although the obedience of Christ was not a mere preparation or qualification of his person for his suffering; yet its efficacy to our justification depended on his suffering that was to ensue, when his soul was made an offering for sin.

5. As was before observed, reconciliation and the pardon of sin through the blood of Christ, do directly in the first place respect our relief from the state and condition whereinto we were cast by the sin of Adam, in the loss of the favour of God, and liableness to death; this therefore is that which principally and in the first place a lost convinced sinner, such as Christ calls to himself, looks after. And therefore justification is eminently and frequently proposed as the effect of the blood-shedding and death of Christ, which are the direct cause of our reconciliation and pardon of sin. But yet from none of these considerations does it follow that the obedience of the one man Christ Jesus is not imputed to us, whereby "grace might reign through righteousness unto eternal life."

The same truth is fully asserted and confirmed Rom. viii. 1—4. But this place has been of late so explained and so vindicated by another in his learned and judicious exposition of it, (namely Dr. Jacombe,) that nothing remains of weight to be added to what has been pleaded and argued by him. And indeed the answers, which he subjoins to the arguments whereby he confirms the truth, to the most usual and important objections against the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, are sufficient to give just satisfaction to the minds of unprejudiced, unengaged persons. I shall therefore pass over this testimony, as that which has been so lately pleaded and vindicated; and not press the same things, it may be, as is not unusual, to their disadvantage.

Romans x. 3, 4.—"For they (the Jews who had a zeal for God, but not according to knowledge) being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves to the righteousness of God. For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth."

What is here determined, the Apostle enters upon the propo-

sition and declaration of, chap. ix. 30. And because what he had to propose was somewhat strange, and unsuited to the common apprehensions of men, he introduces it with that prefatory interrogation, *τι ουν εποιησεν*; which he uses on the like occasions, chap. iii. 5; vi. 1; vii. 7; ix. 14. "What shall we then say?" that is, is there in this matter unrighteousness with God? as verse 14, or what shall we say to these things, or what is that which is to be said herein? That which hereon he asserts is, that "the Gentiles which followed not after righteousness have attained to righteousness, even the righteousness which is of faith; but Israel which followed after the law of righteousness hath not attained unto the law of righteousness," that is, to righteousness itself before God.

Nothing seems to be more contrary to reason, than what is here made manifest by the event. The Gentiles who lived in sin and pleasures, not once endeavouring to attain to any righteousness before God, yet attained to it upon the preaching of the gospel. Israel on the other hand which followed after righteousness, diligently in all the works of the law and duties of obedience to God thereby, came short of it, attained not to it. All preparations, all dispositions, all merit as to righteousness and justification are excluded from the Gentiles. For in all of these there is more or less a following after righteousness which is denied of them all. Only by faith in him who justifies the ungodly, they attain righteousness, or they attained the righteousness of faith. For to attain righteousness by faith, and to attain the righteousness which is of faith, are the same. Wherefore all things that are comprised any way in following after righteousness, such as are all our duties and works, are excluded from any influence upon our justification. And this is expressed to declare the sovereignty and freeness of the grace of God herein; namely, that we are justified freely by his grace, and that on our part all boasting is excluded. Let men pretend what they will, and dispute what they please, those who attain to righteousness and justification before God, when they follow not after righteousness, do it by the gratuitous imputation of the righteousness of another to them.

It may be it will be said: it is true in the time of their heathenism they did not at all follow after righteousness, but when the truth of the gospel was revealed to them, then they followed after righteousness and attained it. But (1) This is directly to contradict the Apostle, in that it says, that they attained not

righteousness, but only as they followed after righteousness, whereas he affirms the direct contrary. (2) It takes away the distinction which he puts between them and Israel; namely, that the one followed after righteousness, and the other did not. (3) To follow after righteousness in this place, is to follow after a righteousness of our own; to establish their own righteousness, chap. x. 3. But this is so far from being a means of attaining righteousness, that it is the most effectual obstruction thereof.

If therefore those who have no righteousness of their own, who are so far from it, that they never endeavoured to attain it, do yet by faith receive that righteousness wherewith they are justified before God, they do so by the imputation of the righteousness of Christ to them; or let some other way be assigned.

In the other side of the instance concerning Israel, some must hear whether they will or not, that wherewith they are not pleased. Three things are expressed of them: 1. Their attempt. 2. Their success. 3. The reason of it.

Their attempt or endeavour was in this, that they followed after the law of righteousness. *Διωκω*, the word whereby their endeavour is expressed, signifies that which is earnest, diligent and sincere. By it the Apostle declares what his was, and what ours ought to be, in the duties and exercise of gospel obedience, Phil. iii. 12. They were not indiligent in this matter, but "instantly served God day and night." Nor were they hypocritical; for the Apostle bears them record in this matter, that they had "a zeal of God," chap. x. 2. And that which they thus endeavour after was *νομος δικαιοσυνης* "the law of righteousness;" that law which prescribed a perfect personal righteousness before God; the things "which if a man do, he shall live in them," chap. x. 5. Wherefore the Apostle has no other respect to the ceremonial law in this place, but only as it was branched out from the moral law by the will of God, and as the obedience to it belonged thereto. When he speaks of it separately he calls it "the law of commandments contained in ordinances," but it is no where called the law of righteousness, the law whose righteousness is fulfilled in us, chap. viii. 4. Wherefore their following after this law of righteousness was their diligence in the performance of all duties of obedience, according to the directions and precepts of the moral law.

2. The issue of this attempt is, that they attained not to the

law of righteousness, *εις νομον δικαιοσυνης εκ ηρθασε*, that is, they attained not a righteousness before God hereby. Though this was "the end of the law," namely, a righteousness before God, wherein a man might live, yet could they never attain it.

3. An account is given of the reason of their failing in attaining that which they so earnestly endeavoured after. And this was in a double mistake that they were under; first, in the means of attaining it; secondly, in the righteousness itself that was to be sought after. The first is declared, ver. 32, "Because not by faith, but as it were by the works of the law." Faith and works are the two only ways whereby righteousness may be attained, and they are opposite and inconsistent; so that none do or can seek after righteousness by them both. They will not be mixed and made one entire means of attaining righteousness. They are opposed as grace and works; what is of the one, is not of the other, Rom. xi. 6. Every composition of them in this matter, is *Male sarta gratia nequicquam coit et rescinditur*, "a patched up reconciliation, no sooner made than broken." And the reason is, because the righteousness which faith seeks after, or which is attainable by faith, is that which is given to us, imputed to us, which faith alone receives. "It receives the abundance of grace, and the gift of righteousness." But that which is attainable by works, is our own, inherent in us, wrought out by us, and not imputed to us; for it is nothing but those works themselves, with respect to the law of God.

And if righteousness before God be attainable alone by faith, and that in contradistinction to all works, which if a man do them according to the law, he shall even live in them, then is it by faith alone that we are justified before God, or nothing else, on our part, is required thereto. And of what nature this righteousness must be, is evident.

Again, if faith and works are opposed as contrary and inconsistent, when considered as the means of attaining righteousness or justification before God, as plainly they are, then is it impossible we should be justified before God by them, in the same sense, way and manner. Wherefore, when the Apostle James affirms, that a man is justified by works, and not by faith only, he cannot intend our justification before God, where it is impossible they should both concur. For not only are they declared inconsistent by the Apostle in this place, but it would introduce several sorts of righteousness to justification, that are inconsistent and destructive of each other. This was the first mistake of the Jews, whence this miscarriage ensued; they

“sought not after righteousness by faith, but as it were by the works of the law.”

Their second mistake was as to the righteousness itself, whereon a man might be justified before God. For this they judged was to be their own righteousness, chapter x. 3. Their own personal righteousness consisting in their own duties of obedience, they looked on as the only righteousness, whereon they might be justified before God. This therefore they went about to establish as the Pharisees did, Luke xviii. 11, 12. And this mistake, with their design thereon to establish their own righteousness, was the principal cause that made them reject the righteousness of God, as it is with many at this day.

Whatever is done in us, or performed by us, as obedience to God, is our own righteousness. Though it be done in faith, and by the aids of God's grace; yet is it subjectively ours, and so far as it is a righteousness, it is our own. But all righteousness whatever which is our own is so far diverse from the righteousness by which we are to be justified before God, that the most earnest endeavour to establish it, that is, to render it such as may justify us, is an effectual means to cause us to refuse a submission to, and an acceptance of that whereby alone we may be so.

This ruined the Jews, and will be the ruin of all that shall follow their example in seeking after justification; yet is it not easy for men to take any other way, or to be taken off from this. So the Apostle intimates in that expression, “they submitted not themselves unto the righteousness of God.” This righteousness of God is of that nature, that the proud mind of man is altogether unwilling to bow and submit itself to; yet can it no otherwise be attained, but by such a submission or subjection of mind, as contains in it a total renunciation of any righteousness of our own. And those who reproach others for affirming, that men endeavouring after morality or moral righteousness, and resting therein, are in no good way for the participation of the grace of God by Jesus Christ, do expressly deride the doctrine of the Apostle, that is, of the Holy Ghost himself.

Wherefore, the plain design of the Apostle is to declare, that not only faith, and the righteousness of it, and a righteousness of our own by works, are inconsistent, that is, as to our justification before God; but also that the intermixture of our own works, in seeking after righteousness, as the means thereof, wholly diverts us from the acceptance of, or submission to the

righteousness of God. For the righteousness which is of faith, is not our own; it is the righteousness of God, that which he imputes to us. But the righteousness of works is our own, that which is wrought in us, and by us. And as works have no aptitude nor meetness in themselves to attain or receive a righteousness, which because it is not our own, is imputed to us, but are repugnant to it, as that which will cast them down from their legal dignity of being our righteousness; so faith has no aptitude nor meetness in itself to be an inherent righteousness, or so to be esteemed, or as such to be imputed to us, seeing its principal faculty and efficacy consists in fixing all the trust, confidence, and expectation of the soul, for righteousness and acceptance with God, upon another.

Here was the ruin of those Jews; they judged it a better, a more probable, yea, a more righteous and holy way for them, constantly to endeavour after a righteousness of their own by duties of obedience to the law of God, than to imagine that they could come to acceptance with God by faith in another. For tell them, and such as them, what you please, if they have not a righteousness of their own that they can set upon its legs, and make to stand before God, the law will not have its accomplishment, and so will condemn them.

To demolish this last fort of unbelief, the Apostle grants that the law must have its end, and be completely fulfilled, or there is no appearing for us as righteous before God; and withal shows them how this is done, and where alone it is to be sought after. "For Christ, (says he) is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth," ver. 4. We need not trouble ourselves to inquire in what various senses Christ may be said to be *τελος νομου*, "the end, the complement, the perfection of the law." The Apostle sufficiently determines his intention, in affirming not absolutely that he is the "end of the law," but he is so *εις δικαιοσυνην* "for righteousness" unto every one that believeth. The matter in question is a righteousness to justification before God. And this is acknowledged to be the righteousness which the law requires. God looks for no righteousness from us, but what is prescribed in the law. The law is nothing but the rule of righteousness; God's prescription of a righteousness, and all the duties of it to us. That we should be righteous herewith before God, was the first original end of the law. Its other ends at present of the conviction of sin, and judging or condemning for it, were accidental to its primitive constitution. This righteousness, which the law requires, which

is all and only that righteousness which God requires of us, the accomplishment of this end of the law, the Jews sought after by their own personal performance of the works and duties of it. But hereby in the utmost of their endeavours they could never fulfil this righteousness, nor attain this end of the law, which yet if men do not, they must perish for ever.

Wherefore the Apostle declares, that all this is done another way; that the righteousness of the law is fulfilled, and its end, as to a righteousness before God, attained, and that is in and by Christ. For what the law required, that he accomplished, which is accounted to every one that believes.

Herein the Apostle issues the whole disquisition about a righteousness wherewith we may be justified before God, and in particular how satisfaction is given to the demands of the law. That which we could not do, that which the law could not effect in us, in that it was weak through the flesh, that which we could not attain by the works and duties of it, that Christ has done for us, and so is "the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth."

The law demands a righteousness of us; the accomplishment of this righteousness is the end which it aims at, and which is necessary to our justification before God. This is not to be attained by any works of our own, by any righteousness of our own. But the Lord Christ is this for us, and to us; which, how he is or can be but by the imputation of his obedience and righteousness in the accomplishment of the law, I cannot understand; I am sure the Apostle does not declare.

The way whereby we attain to this end of the law, which we cannot do by our utmost endeavours to establish our own righteousness, is by faith alone, for "Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that *believeth*." To mix any thing with faith herein, as it is repugnant to the nature of faith and works, with respect to their aptitude and meetness for the attaining of a righteousness, so it is as directly contradictory to the express design and words of the Apostle, as any thing that can be invented.

Let men please themselves with their distinctions, which I understand not; (and yet perhaps should be ashamed to say so, but that I am persuaded they understand them not themselves, by whom they are used,) or with cavils, objections, feigned consequences, which I value not; here I shall for ever desire to fix my soul, and herein to acquiesce; namely, that "Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth."

And I suppose that all they who understand aright what it is that the law of God requires of them, how needful it is that it be complied with, and that the end of it be accomplished, with the utter insufficiency of their own endeavours to those ends, will at least, when the time of disputing is over, betake themselves to the same refuge and rest.

The next place I shall consider in the Epistles of this Apostle is 1 Cor. i. 30. "But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification and redemption."

The design of the Apostle in these words is to manifest that whatever is wanting to us on any account that we may please God, live to him, and come to the enjoyment of him, *that* we have in and by Jesus Christ; and this on the part of God from mere, free, and sovereign grace, as verses 26—29 declare. And we have all these things by virtue of our insertion or implantation in him; $\text{\textit{\xi}}$ *αυτου*, "from, of, or by him." He by his grace is the principal efficient cause hereof. And the effect is, that we are in Christ Jesus; that is engrafted in him, or united to him, as members of his mystical body, which is the constant sense of that expression in the Scripture. And the benefits which we receive hereby are enumerated in the following words. But first the way whereby we are made partakers of them, or they are communicated to us, is declared; "who of God is made unto us." It is so ordained of God, that he himself shall be made or become all this to us. $\text{\textit{\xi}}$ *απο* Θεου, where *απο* denotes the efficient cause, as $\text{\textit{\xi}}$ did before. But how is Christ thus "made unto us of God," or what act of God is it that is intended thereby? Socinus says it is "a general act of the providence of God, whence it is come to pass, or is so fallen out, that one way or other the Lord Christ should be said to be all this to us." But it is an especial ordinance and institution of God's sovereign grace and wisdom, designing Christ to be all this to us, and for us, with actual imputation thereon, and nothing else, that is intended. Whatever interest therefore we have in Christ, and whatever benefit we have by him, it all depends on the sovereign grace and constitution of God, and not on any thing in ourselves. Whereas then we have no righteousness of our own, he is appointed of God to be our righteousness, and is made so to us; which can be no otherwise, but that his righteousness is made ours. For he is made it to us (as he is likewise the other things mentioned) so that all boasting, that is in ourselves, should be utterly excluded, and

“that he that glorieth, should glory in the Lord,” ver. 29, 31. Now there is such a righteousness, or such a way of being righteous whereon we may have somewhat to glory, Rom. iv. 2, and which does not exclude boasting, chap. iii. 27. And this cannot possibly be but when our righteousness is inherent in us. For that, however it may be procured, or purchased or wrought in us, is yet our own, so far as any thing can be our own, whilst we are creatures. This kind of righteousness therefore is here excluded. And the Lord Christ being so made righteousness to us of God, as that all boasting and glorying on our part, or in ourselves, may be excluded, yea, being made so, for this very end, that so it should be, it can be no otherwise, but by the imputation of his righteousness to us. For thereby is the grace of God, the honour of his person and mediation exalted, and all occasion of glorying in ourselves utterly cut off. We desire no more from this testimony, but that whereas we are in ourselves destitute of all righteousness in the sight of God, Christ is by a gracious act of divine imputation made of God righteousness unto us, in such a way as that all our glorying ought to be in the grace of God, and the righteousness of Christ himself. Bellarmine attempts three answers to this testimony, the two first whereof are coincident; and in the third, being on the rack of light and truth, he confesses and grants all that we plead for. (1) He says, “that Christ is said to be our righteousness, because he is the efficient cause of it, as God is said to be our strength; and so there is in the words a metonymy of the effect for the cause.” And I say it is true, that the Lord Christ, by his Spirit, is the efficient cause of our personal inherent righteousness. By his grace it is effected and wrought in us; he renews our natures into the image of God, and without him we can do nothing: so that our habitual and actual righteousness is from him. But this personal righteousness is our sanctification and nothing else. And although the same internal habit of inherent grace, with operations suitable thereto, be sometimes called our sanctification, and sometimes our righteousness with respect to those operations; yet is it never distinguished into our sanctification and our righteousness. But his being made righteousness to us in this place, is absolutely distinct from his being made sanctification to us, which is that inherent righteousness which is wrought in us by the Spirit and grace of Christ. And his working personal righteousness in us, which is our sanctification, and the imputation of his righteousness to us, whereby we are made righteous before God,

are not only consistent, but the one of them cannot be without the other.

2. He pleads, "that Christ is said to be made righteousness to us, as he is made redemption. Now he is our redemption because he has redeemed us. So is he said to be made righteousness to us, because by him we become righteous;" or as another speaks, "because by him alone we are justified." This is the same plea with the former, namely, that there is a metonymy of the effect for the cause in all these expressions; yet what cause they intend it to be, who expound the words "by him alone we are justified," I do not understand. But Bellarmine is approaching yet nearer the truth, for as Christ is said to be made of God, redemption to us, because by his blood we are redeemed, or freed from sin, death, and hell, by the ransom he paid for us, or have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins: so he is said to be made righteousness to us, because through his righteousness granted to us of God, we are justified; as God's making him to be righteousness to us, and our becoming the righteousness of God in him, and the imputation of his righteousness to us, that we may be righteous before God, are the same.

His third answer, as was before observed, grants the whole of what we plead. For it is the same which he gives to Jer. xxiii. 6, which place he conjoins with this, as of the same sense and importance, giving up his whole cause in satisfaction to them, in the words before transcribed.

Socinus prefaces his answer to this testimony with an admiration, that any should make use of it, or plead it in this cause, it is so impertinent to the purpose. And indeed, a pretended contempt of the arguments of his adversaries is the principal artifice he makes use of in all his replies and evasions; wherein I am sorry to see that he is followed by most of them, who together with him, oppose the imputation of the righteousness of Christ. And so of late the use of this testimony which reduced Bellarmine to so great a strait, is admired at, on the only ground and reason wherewith it is opposed by Socinus. Yet are his exceptions to it such, that I cannot also but a little on the other hand wonder, that any learned man should be troubled with them, or seduced by them. For he only pleads, "that if Christ be said to be made righteousness to us, because his righteousness is imputed to us; then is he said to be made wisdom to us, because his wisdom is so imputed; and so of his sanctification; which none will allow; yea, he must be redeem-

ed for us, and his redemption be imputed to us." But there is nothing of force, nor truth in this pretence. For it is built only on this supposition, that Christ must be made to us of God, all these things, in the same way and manner; whereas they are of such different natures, that it is utterly impossible he should so be. For instance, he is made sanctification to us, in that by his Spirit and grace we are freely sanctified. But he cannot be said to be made redemption to us, in that by his Spirit and grace we are freely redeemed. And, if he is said to be made righteousness to us, because by his Spirit and grace he works inherent righteousness in us, then is it plainly the same with his being made sanctification to us. Neither does he himself believe that Christ is made all these things to us in the same way and manner. And therefore he does not assign any special way whereby he is so made them all; but clouds it in an ambiguous expression, that he becomes all these things to us "in the providence of God." But ask him in particular, how Christ is made sanctification to us, and he will tell you that it was by his doctrine and example alone, with some such general assistance of the Spirit of God as he will allow. But now, this is no way at all whereby Christ was made redemption to us; which being a thing external, and not wrought in us, Christ can be no otherwise made redemption to us, than by the imputation to us of what he did, that we might be redeemed, or the reckoning it on our account. Not that he was redeemed for us, as he childishly cavils, but that he did that whereby we are redeemed. Wherefore Christ is made of God righteousness to us in such a way and manner, as the nature of the thing requires. Say some, it is "because by him we are justified." Howbeit the text says not that by him we are justified, but he is of God made righteousness to us, which is not our justification, but the ground, cause and reason whereon we are justified. Righteousness is one thing, and justification is another. Wherefore we must inquire how we come to have that righteousness whereby we are justified. And this the same Apostle tells us plainly is by imputation. "Blessed is the man unto whom the Lord imputeth righteousness," Rom. iv. 6. It follows then, that "Christ being made unto us of God righteousness," can have no other sense, but that his righteousness is imputed to us, which is what this text undeniably confirms.

The truth pleaded for, is yet more emphatically expressed, 2 Cor. v. 21. "For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God

in him." The paraphrase of Austin on these words gives the sense of them.* "He was made sin, that we might be made righteousness, not our own, but of God; not in ourselves, but in him; as he was made sin, not his own, but ours, not in himself, but in us." And the words of Chrysostom upon this place, to the same purpose, have been cited before at large.

To set out the greatness of the grace of God in our reconciliation by Christ, he describes him by that periphrasis *τον μη γνοῦτα ἁμαρτιαν*, "who knew no sin," or who knew not sin. He knew sin in the notion or understanding of its nature; and he knew it experimentally in the effects which he underwent and suffered; but he knew it not, that is, was most remote from it, as to its commission or guilt. So that he "knew no sin," is absolutely no more, but "he did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth," as it is expressed 1 Pet. ii. 22; or, that he "was holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners," Heb. vii. 26. Howbeit, there is an emphasis in the expression which is not to be neglected. For as it is observed by Chrysostom, and by sundry learned persons after him, as containing an auresis; (*ουχι τον μη ἁμαρτανουτα μονον λεγει*) *ἀλλα τον μηδε γνοῦτα ἁμαρτιαν*) "not merely who did not sin, but who did not know sin;" so those who desire to learn the excellency of the grace of God herein, will have an impression or a sense of it on their minds, from this emphatical expression, which the Holy Ghost chose to make use of to that end, and the observation of it is not to be despised.

"He hath made him to be sin;" that is, say many expositors, "a sacrifice for sin."† "As he was offered for sins, he is not without cause said to be made sin, since under the law, even the animal which was offered for sins is called sin." So the sin and trespass offering are often expressed by *ἁμαρτιαν* and *πῶλον* "the sin and trespass," or guilt. And I shall not contend about this exposition, because that signified in it is according to the truth. But there is another more proper signification of the word; *ἁμαρτια* being put for *ἁμαρτωλος*, *sin* for a *sinner*; that is passively not actively, not by inhesion but imputation. For this the phrase of speech, and force of the antithesis, seem to

* Ipse peccatum ut nos justitia, non nostra sed Dei, non in nobis sed in ipso; sicut ipse peccatum non suum sed nostrum, non in se, sed in nobis constitutum. Enchirid. ad Laurent. cap. 4.

† Quemadmodum oblatum est pro peccatis, non immerito peccatum factus dicitur, quia et bestia in lege quæ pro peccatis offerebatur, peccatum nuncupatur. Ambros. in locum.

require. Speaking of another sense, Estius himself on the place adds, as that which he approves:* “The meaning of this passage must be explained according to the comment of Chrysostom and the Greek commentators, who interpret the expression *sin*, emphatically a *great sinner*; as if the Apostle should say, for our sake he treated him as sin and wickedness itself; that is, as a man notoriously wicked, as on whom he laid the iniquities of us all.” And if this be the interpretation of the Greek scholiasts, as indeed it is, Luther was not the first, who affirmed, that “Christ was made the greatest sinner,” namely, by imputation. But we shall allow the former exposition, provided that the true notion of a sin offering, or expiatory sacrifice, be admitted. For although this neither did, nor could consist in the transfusion of the inherent sin of the person to the sacrifice; yet it did consist in the translation of the guilt of the sinner to it, as is fully declared, Lev. xvi. 20, 21. Only I must say, that I grant this signification of the word to avoid contention. For whereas some say, that ἀμαρτία signifies *sin*, and a *sacrifice for sin*, it cannot be allowed. ἁμαρτία in *Kal*, signifies to err, to sin, to transgress the law of God. In *Piel* it has a contrary signification, namely, to cleanse from sin, or to make expiation of sin. Hence ἁμαρτία is most frequently used with respect to its derivation from the first conjugation, and signifies *sin*, *transgression* and *guilt*. But sometimes with respect to the second, and then it signifies a *sacrifice for sin*, to make expiation of it. And so it is rendered by the LXX., sometimes by ἱλασμος, Ezek. xlv. 27, sometimes by ἱλασμος, Exod. xxx. 10; Ezek. xliii. 23; a *propitiation*, a *propitiatory sacrifice*. Sometimes by ἀγνισμα, Num. xix. 19; and ἀγνισμος, *purification* or *cleansing*. But ἀμαρτία absolutely no where in any good author, nor in the Scripture, signifies a *sacrifice for sin*, unless it may be allowed to do so in this one place alone. For whereas the LXX. render ἁμαρτία constantly by ἀμαρτία, where it signifies *sin*: where it denotes an *offering for sin*, and they retain that word, they do it by πρὸς ἀμαρτίας, an elliptical expression which they invented for that which they knew ἀμαρτία of itself neither did, nor could signify, Lev. iv. 3, 14, 32, 35; v. 6—11; vi. 30; viii. 2. And they never omit the preposition, unless they name the sacrifice,

* Hic intellectus explicandus est per commentarium Græcorum Chrysostomi et cæterorum; quia peccatum emphaticus interpretantur magnum peccatorem; ac si dicat Apostolus, nostri causa tractavit eum tanquam ipsum peccatum, ipsum scelus, id est, tanquam hominem insigniter sceleratum, ut in quo posuerit iniquitates omnium nostrum.

as *μοσχος τῆς ἁμαρτίας*. This is observed also by the Apostle in the New Testament. For twice expressing the sin-offering by this word, he uses that phrase *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* Rom. viii. 3; Heb. x. 6. But no where uses *ἁμαρτία* to that purpose. If it be therefore of that signification in this place, it is so here alone. And whereas some think, that it answers *piaculum* in the Latin, it is also a mistake, for the first signification of *ἁμαρτία* is confessed to be sin, and they would have it supposed that thence it is abused to signify a *sacrifice for sin*. But *piaculum* is properly a sacrifice, or any thing whereby sin is expiated or satisfaction is made for it. And very rarely it is abused to denote such a sin or crime as deserves public expiation, and is not otherwise to be pardoned, so Virgil:

Distulit in seram commissa piacula mortem.

But we shall not contend about words, whilst we can agree about what is intended.

The only inquiry is, how God made him to be sin. "He hath made him to be sin;" so that an act of God is intended. And this is elsewhere expressed by his "laying all our iniquities upon him," or causing them to meet on him, Isa. liii. 6. And this was by the imputation of our sins to him, as the sins of the people were put on the head of the goat, that they should be no more theirs but his, so as that he was to carry them away from them. Take "sin" in either sense before mentioned, either of a "sacrifice for sin," or a "sinner," and the imputation of the guilt of sin antecedently to the punishment of it, and in order thereto, must be understood. For in every sacrifice for sin there was an imposition of sin on the beast to be offered antecedent to the sacrificing of it, and therein its suffering by death. Therefore in every offering for sin, he that brought it was to put his hand on the head of it, Lev. i. 4. And that the transferring of the guilt of sin to the offering was thereby signified, is expressly declared, Lev. xvi. 21. Wherefore if God made the Lord Christ a sin-offering for us, it was by the imputation of the guilt of sin to him antecedently to his suffering. Nor could any offering be made for sin, without a typical translation of the guilt of sin to it. And therefore when an offering was made for the expiation of the guilt of an uncertain murder, those who were to make it by the law, namely, the elders of the city that were next to the place where the man was slain, were not to offer a sacrifice, because there was none to confess guilt over it, or to lay guilt

upon it; but whereas the neck of an heifer was to be stricken off, to declare the punishment due to blood, they were to wash their hands over it to testify their own innocency, Deut. xxi. 1—8. But a sacrifice for sin without the imputation of guilt there could not be. And if the word be taken in the second sense, namely, for a *sinner*, that is, by imputation, and in God's esteem, it must be by the imputation of guilt. For none can in any sense be denominated a sinner from mere suffering. None indeed say, that Christ was made sin by the imputation of punishment to him, which has no proper sense; but they say, sin was imputed to him as to punishment, which is indeed to say, that the guilt of sin was imputed to him. For the guilt of sin is its respect to punishment, or the obligation to punishment which attends it. And that any one should be punished for sin without the imputation of the guilt of it to him, is impossible; and were it possible would be unjust. For it is not possible that any one should be punished for sin properly, and yet that sin be none of his. And if it be not his by inhesion, it can be his no other way but by imputation. One may suffer on the occasion of the sin of another, that is no way made his, but he cannot be punished for it; for punishment is the recompense of sin on account of its guilt. And were it possible, where is the righteousness of punishing any one for that which no way belongs to him? Besides, imputation of sin and punishing are distinct acts, the one preceding the other, and therefore the former is only of the guilt of sin; wherefore the Lord Christ was made sin for us by the imputation of the guilt of our sins to him.

But it is said, that "if the guilt of sin were imputed to Christ, he is excluded from all possibility of merit, for he suffered but what was his due; and so the whole work of Christ's satisfaction is subverted. This must be so, if God in judgment reckoned him guilty and a sinner. But there is an ambiguity in these expressions. If it be meant that God in judgment reckoned him guilty and a sinner inherently in his own person, no such thing is intended. But God laid all our sins on him, and in judgment spared him not, as to what was due to them. And so he suffered not what was his due upon his own account, but what was due to our sin, which it is impiety to deny; for if it were not so, he died in vain, and we are still in our sins. And as his satisfaction consists herein, nor could be without it, so it does not in the least derogate from his merit. For supposing the infinite dignity of his per-

son, and his voluntary susception of our sin to answer for it, which altered not his state and condition, his obedience therein was highly meritorious.

In answer hereto, and by virtue hereof, we are "made the righteousness of God in him." This was the end of his being made sin for us. And by whom are we so made? it is by God himself, for it is "God that justifieth," Rom. viii. 33. It is God who imputes righteousness; chap. iv. 6. Wherefore it is the act of God in our justification that is intended. And to be made the righteousness of God, is to be made righteous before God, though emphatically expressed by the abstract for the concrete, to answer what was said before of Christ being made sin for us. To be made the righteousness of God, is to be justified; and to be made it so in him, as he was made sin for us is to be justified by the imputation of his righteousness to us, as our sin was imputed to him.

No man can assign any other way whereby he was made sin, especially his being made so by God, but by God's laying all our iniquities upon him, that is, imputing our sin to him. How then are we made the righteousness of God in him? By the infusion of a habit of grace, say the Papists generally; then by the rule of the antithesis, he must be made sin for us, by the infusion of a habit of sin, which would be a blasphemous imagination. By his meriting, procuring, and purchasing righteousness for us, say others: so possibly we might be made righteous *by* him; but so we cannot be made righteous *in* him. This can only be by his righteousness as we are in him, or united to him. To be righteous in him is to be righteous with his righteousness, as we are one mystical person with him. Wherefore,

To be made the righteousness of God in Christ as he was made sin for us, and because he was so, can be no other but to be made righteous by the imputation of his righteousness to us, as we are in him or united to him. All other expositions of these words are both jejune and forced, leading the mind from the first, plain, obvious sense of them.

Bellarmino excepts to this interpretation, and it is his fifth argument against the imputation of the righteousness of Christ. "If the righteousness of Christ be truly imputed to us, so that through it we are reckoned and esteemed righteous, as if it were properly our own inherent and formal righteousness, we ought to be reckoned and esteemed not less righteous than Christ himself, and consequently ought to be called and es-

teemed redeemers and saviours of the world; which is the height of absurdity.* Lib. vi. cap. 7. de Justificatione. So full an answer has been returned hereto, and that so frequently, by Protestant divines, that I would not have mentioned it, but that divers among ourselves are pleased to borrow it from him, and make use of it. "For," say they, "if the righteousness of Christ be imputed to us, so as thereby to be made ours, then are we as righteous as Christ himself, because we are righteous with his righteousness." Ans. 1. These things are plainly affirmed in the Scripture, that as to ourselves, and in ourselves, "we are all as an unclean thing, and all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags," Isa. lxiv. 6, on the one hand; and that "in the Lord we have righteousness and strength, in the Lord we are justified and do glory," Isa. xlv. 24, 25, on the other: that "if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves:" and yet that "we are the righteousness of God in Christ." Wherefore these things are consistent, whatever cavils the wit of men can raise against them; and so they must be esteemed, unless we will comply with Socinus's rule of interpretation, namely, "that where any thing seems repugnant to our reason, though it be never so expressly affirmed in the Scripture, we are not to admit of it, but find out some interpretation though never so forced to bring the sense of the words to our reason." Wherefore (2) notwithstanding the imputation of the righteousness of Christ to us, and our being made righteous therewith, we are sinners in ourselves, (the Lord knows greatly so, the best of us,) and so cannot be said to be as righteous as Christ, but only to be made righteous in him, who are sinners in ourselves. (3) To say, that we are as righteous as Christ, is to make a comparison between the personal righteousness of Christ, and our personal righteousness, if the comparison be of things of the same kind. But this is foolish and impious; for notwithstanding all our personal righteousness, we are sinful; he knew no sin. And if the comparison be between Christ's personal inherent righteousness, and the righteousness imputed to us, inhesion and imputation being things of diverse kinds, it is groundless and of no consequence. Christ was actively righteous,

* Quinto refellitur, quoniam si vere nobis imputetur justitia Christi ut per eam justii habeamur ac censemur, ac si proprie nostra esset intrinseca formalisque justitia, profecto non minus justii haberi et censei deberemus quam ipse Christus: proinde deberemus dici atque haberi Redemptores, et Salvatores mundi, quod est absurdissimum.

we are passively so. When our sin was imputed to him, he did not thereby become a sinner as we are, actively and inherently a sinner, but passively only, and in God's estimation. As he was made sin, yet knew no sin, so we are made righteous, yet are sinful in ourselves. (4) The righteousness of Christ, as it was his personally, was the righteousness of the Son of God; in which respect it had in itself an infinite perfection and value; but it is imputed to us only with respect to our personal want, not as it was satisfactory for all, but as our souls stand in need of it, and are made partakers of it. There is therefore no ground for any such comparison. (5) As to what is added by Bellarmine that we may hereon be said to be redeemers and saviours of the world, the absurdity of the assertion falls upon himself; we are not concerned in it. For he affirms directly, lib. i. de Purgator. cap. 14, that a "man may be rightly called his own redeemer and saviour," which he endeavours to prove from Dan. iv. And some of his church affirm that the saints may be called the redeemers of others, though improperly. But we are not concerned in these things; seeing from the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, it follows only that those to whom it is imputed are redeemed and saved, not at all that they are redeemers and saviours. It belongs also to the vindication of this testimony to show the vanity of his seventh argument in the same case, because that also is made use of by some among ourselves, and it is this: "If, by the righteousness of Christ imputed to us, we may be truly said to be righteous and the sons of God, then may Christ, by the imputation of our unrighteousness, be said to be a sinner and a child of the devil." Ans. (1) That which the Scripture affirms concerning the imputation of our sins to Christ is that "he was made sin for us." This the Greek expositors, Chrysostom, Theophylact and Oecumenius with many others take for a *sinner*. But all affirm that denomination to be taken from imputation only; he had sin imputed to him, and underwent the punishment due to it, as we have righteousness imputed to us, and enjoy the benefit of it. (2) The imputation of sin to Christ, did not carry along with it any thing of the pollution or filth of sin to be communicated to him by transfusion, a thing impossible; so that no denomination can thence arise which should include in it any respect to them; a thought hereof is impious and dishonourable to the Son of God. But his being made sin through the imputation of the guilt of sin, is his honour and glory. (3) The imputation of

the sin of fornicators, idolaters, adulterers, &c., such as the Corinthians were before their conversion to Christ, does not on any ground bring him under a denomination from those sins. For they were so in themselves actively, inherently, subjectively, and thence were so called. But that he who "knew no sin," voluntarily taking on him to answer for the guilt of those sins, which in him was an act of righteousness and the highest obedience to God, should be said to be an idolater, &c., is a groundless imagination. The denomination of a sinner from sin inherent, actually committed, defiling the soul, is a reproach, and significative of the utmost unworthiness; but even the denomination of a sinner, by the imputation of sin, without the least personal guilt or defilement, being undergone by him to whom it is imputed, in an act of the highest obedience, and tending to the greatest glory of God, is highly honourable and glorious. But (4) the imputation of sin to Christ was antecedent to any real union between him and sinners, whereon he took their sin on him, as he would, and for what ends he would. But the imputation of his righteousness to believers, is consequential in order of nature to their union with him, whereby it becomes theirs in a peculiar manner; so that there is not a parity of reason that he should be esteemed a sinner, as that they should be accounted righteous. And (5) we acquiesce in this, that on the imputation of sin to Christ, it is said that "God made him to be sin for us," which he could not be, but thereby; and he was so by an act transient in its effects, for a time only, that time wherein he underwent the punishment due to it. But on the imputation of his righteousness to us, we are made the righteousness of God with an everlasting righteousness that abides ours always. (6) To be a child of the devil by sin, is to do the works of the devil, John viii. 44. But the Lord Christ in taking our sins upon him, when imputed to him, did the work of God in the highest act of holy obedience, evidencing himself to be the Son of God thereby, and destroying the works of the devil. So foolish and impious is it, to conceive that any absolute change of state or relation in him ensued thereon.

That by the "righteousness of God" in this place, our own faith and obedience according to the gospel, as some would have it, are intended, is so alien from the scope of the place, and sense of the words, that I shall not particularly examine it. The righteousness of God is revealed to faith, and received by faith, and is not therefore faith itself. And the force of the

antithesis is quite perverted by this conceit. For where is it in this, that he was made sin by the imputation of our sin to him, and we are made righteousness by the imputation of our own faith and obedience to ourselves? But as Christ had no concern in sin, but as God made him sin, it was never in him inherently; so have we no interest in this righteousness, it is not in us inherently, but only is imputed to us. Besides, the act of God, in making us righteous, is his justifying of us. But this is not by the infusion of the habit of faith and obedience, as we have proved. And what act of God is intended by them, who affirm, that the righteousness of God which we are made, is our own righteousness, I know not. The constitution of the gospel law it cannot be; for that makes no man righteous. And the persons of believers are the object of this act of God, and that as they are considered in Christ.

The epistle of the same Apostle to the Galatians is wholly designed to the vindication of the doctrine of justification by Christ, without the works of the law, with the use and means of its improvement. The sum of his whole design is laid down in the repetition of his words to the Apostle Peter, on the occasion of his failure, there related, Gal. ii. 16. "Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed on Jesus Christ that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law; for by the works of the law, shall no flesh be justified."

That which he here asserts, was such a known, such a fundamental principle of truth among all believers, that their conviction and knowledge of it was the ground and occasion of their transition, and passing over from Judaism to the gospel, and faith in Jesus Christ thereby.

And in the words the Apostle determines that great inquiry, how, or by what means a man is, or may be justified before God. The subject spoken of is expressed indefinitely; "a man," that is, any man, a Jew, or a Gentile, a believer, or an unbeliever; the Apostle that spake, and they to whom he spake; the Galatians to whom he wrote, who also for some time had believed and made profession of the gospel.

The answer given to the question is both negative and positive, both asserted with the highest assurance, and as the common faith of all Christians, except those who had been carried aside from it by seducers. He asserts, that this is not, this cannot be "by the works of the law." What is intended by

“the law” in these disputations of the Apostle, has been before declared and evinced. The law of Moses is sometimes signally intended; not absolutely, but as it was the present instance of men’s cleaving to the law of righteousness, and not submitting themselves thereon to the righteousness of God. But that the consideration of the moral law, and the duties of it, is in this argument any where excepted by him, is a weak imagination; yea, it would except the ceremonial law itself; for the observation of it, whilst it was in force, was a duty of the moral law.

And “the works of the law,” are the works and duties of obedience which this law of God requires, performed in the manner that it prescribes, namely, in faith, and out of love to God above all, as has been proved. To say, that the Apostle excludes only works absolutely perfect, which none ever did, or could perform since the entrance of sin, is to suppose him to dispute with great earnestness, and many arguments, against that which no man asserted, and which he does not once mention in all his discourse. Nor can he be said to exclude only works that are looked on as meritorious, seeing he excludes all works, that there may be no place for merit in our justification, as has also been proved. Nor did these Galatians, whom he writes to, and convinces of their error, look for justification from any works, but such as they performed then, when they were believers. So that all sorts of works are excluded from any interest in our justification, and so much weight does the Apostle lay on this exclusion of works from our justification, that he affirms that the admittance of it overthrows the whole gospel, ver. 21. “For,” says he, “if righteousness be by the law, then is Christ dead in vain;” and it is dangerous venturing on so sharp a fence.

Not this, or that sort of works; not this, or that manner of the performance of them; not this, or that kind of interest in our justification, but all works of what sort soever, and however performed, are excluded from any kind of consideration in our justification, as our works or duties of obedience. For these Galatians whom the Apostle reproves, desired no more, but that in the justification of a believer, “works of the law,” or duties of obedience, might be admitted into a conjunction or copartnership with faith in Christ Jesus. For that they would exclude faith in him, and assign justification to works without it, nothing is intimated, and it is a foolish imagination. In opposition hereto he positively ascribes our justification to faith

in Christ alone: "not by works, but by faith" is by faith alone. That the particles *εαν μη* are not exceptive, but adversative, has not only been undeniably proved by Protestant divines, but is acknowledged by those of the Roman church, who pretend to any modesty in this controversy. The words of Estius on this place deserve to be transcribed. According to his usual candour and ingenuousness, he remarks,* "The sense of this passage is obscured by the particle *nisi*, (by which the Vulgate renders *εαν μη*, instead of *sed* or *sed tantum*) which according to its strict acceptation, implies an exception to what precedes; as if the meaning were 'a man is not justified by the works of the law unless faith in Christ be added to them, but if faith be added, then he is justified by the works of the law.' But as this sense divides justification, attributing it partly to works and partly to faith, contrary to the clear and positive meaning of the Apostle, it is evident that it should be rejected as opposed to the meaning and object of the Apostle. It is clear that the particle *nisi* is frequently used in Scripture in an adversative sense, as synonymous with *sed tantum*."

It is not probable that we shall have an end of contending in this world, when men will not acquiesce in such plain determinations of controversies given by the Holy Ghost himself.

The interpretation of this place, given as the meaning of the Apostle, that men cannot be justified by those works which they cannot perform, that is, works absolutely perfect; but may be so, and are so, by those which they can, and do perform, if not in their own strength, yet by the aid of grace: and that faith in Christ Jesus which the Apostle opposes absolutely to all works whatever, includes in it all those works which he excludes, and that with respect to that end or effect with respect whereto they are excluded, cannot well be supposed to be suitable to the mind of the Holy Ghost.

Ephes. ii. 8—10. "For by grace ye are saved through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God; not of works, lest any man should boast. For we are his workmanship,

* Sententiam reddit obscuram particula *Nisi*, quæ si proprie ut Latinis auribus sonat accipiatur, exceptionem facit ab eo quod præcedit, ut sensus sit hominem non justificari ex operibus legis, nisi fides in Christum ad ea opera accedat, quæ si accesserit justificari eum per legis opera. Sed cum hic sensus justificationem dividat, partim eam tribuens operibus legis, partim fidei Christi, quod est contra definitam et absolutam Apostoli sententiam, manifestum est, interpretationem illam tanquam apostolico sensui et scopo contrariam omnino repudiandam esse. Verum constat voculam (*nisi*) frequenter in scripturis adversative sumi, ut idem valeat quod *sed tantum*.

created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath fore-ordained that we should walk in them."

Unless it had seemed good to the Holy Ghost to express before hand, and to reject all the evasions and subterfuges which the wit of man in after ages could invent to pervert the doctrine of our justification before God, it is impossible they could have been more plainly anticipated than they are in this context. If we may take a little unprejudiced consideration of it, I suppose what is affirmed will be evident.

It cannot be denied, but that the design of the Apostle from the beginning of this chapter to the end of verse 11, is to declare the way whereby lost and condemned sinners come to be delivered, and translated out of that condition into an estate of acceptance with God, and eternal salvation thereon. And therefore in the first place, he fully describes their natural state, with their being obnoxious to the wrath of God thereby. For such was the method of this Apostle. To the declaration of the grace of God in any kind, he usually, yea, constantly premised the consideration of our sin, misery, and ruin. Others now like not this method so well. Howbeit this hinders not, but that it was his. To this purpose he declares to the Ephesians, that they were "dead in trespasses and sins," expressing the power that sin had on their souls, as to spiritual life, and all the actions of it; but withal that they lived and walked in sin, and on all accounts were the "children of wrath," or subject and liable to eternal condemnation, verses 1—3. What such persons can do towards their own deliverance, there are many terms found out to express, all passing my understanding, seeing the entire design of the Apostle is to prove that they can do nothing at all. But another cause, or other causes of it, he finds out, and that in direct express opposition to any thing that may be done by ourselves to that end. *Ὁ θεὸς πλουσιος ὡς ἐν ἐλέει*, verse 4. It is not a work for us to undertake; it is not what we can contribute any thing to; "but God, who is rich in mercy." The adversative includes an opposition to every thing on our part, and ascribes the whole work to God. Would men have rested on this divine revelation, the church of God had been free from many of those perverse opinions and wrangling disputes, which it has been pestered with. But they will not so easily part with thoughts of some kind of interest in being the authors of their own happiness. Wherefore two things we may observe in the Apostle's assigning of the causes of our deliverance from a state of sin, and acceptance with God.

1. That he assigns the whole of this work absolutely to grace, love, and mercy, and that with an exclusion of the consideration of any thing on our part, as we shall see immediately, ver. 5, 8.

2. He magnifies this grace in a marvellous manner. For (1) He expresses it by all names and titles whereby it is signified as *ἔλεος, ἀγάπη, χάρις, χρηστότης*, "mercy, love, grace, and kindness." For he would have us to look only to grace herein. (2) He ascribes such adjuncts, and gives such epithets, to that divine mercy and grace which is the sole cause of our deliverance in and by Jesus Christ, as render it singular, and herein solely to be adored. *Πλουσιος ἐν ἔλεει; δια τὴν πολλὴν ἀγαπὴν—ἰπερβαλλὼν πλουτος τῆς χάριτος.* "Rich in mercy;" "great love wherewith he loved us;" "the exceeding riches of his grace," in his kindness towards us, ver. 4—7. It cannot reasonably be denied, that the Apostle designs deeply to affect the mind and heart of believers with a sense of the grace and love of God in Christ, as the only cause of their justification before God. I think no words can express those conceptions of the mind, which this representation of grace suggests. Whether they think it any part of their duty to be like minded, and comply with the Apostle in this design who scarce ever mention the grace of God, unless it be in a way of diminution from its efficacy, and to whom such ascriptions to it as are here made by him, are a matter of contempt, is not hard to judge.

But it will be said these are good words indeed, but they are only general; there is nothing of argument in all this adoring of the grace of God in the work of our salvation. It may be, so it seems to many. But yet to speak plainly, there is to me more argument in this one consideration, namely, of the ascription made in this cause to the grace of God in this place, than in a hundred sophisms, suited neither to the expressions of the Scripture, nor the experience of them that believe. He that is possessed with a due apprehension of the grace of God, as here represented, and under a sense that it was therein the design of the Holy Ghost to render it glorious, and alone to be trusted to, will not easily be induced to concern himself in those additional supplies to it from our own works and obedience, which some would suggest to him. But we may yet look further into the words.

The case which the Apostle states, the inquiry which he has in hand, whereon he determines as to the truth, wherein he in-

structs the Ephesians, and in them the whole church of God is, How a lost condemned sinner may come to be accepted with God, and thereon saved. And this is the sole inquiry wherein we are, or intend in this controversy to be concerned. Further we will not proceed, either upon the invitation or provocation of any. Concerning this, his position and determination is, that we are saved by grace.

This first he occasionally interposes in his enumeration of the benefits we receive by Christ, ver. 5. But not content therewith, he again directly asserts it, ver. 8, in the same words; for he seems to have considered how slow men would be in the admission of this truth, which at once deprives them of all boastings in themselves.

What it is that he intends by our being saved, must be inquired into. It would not be prejudicial to, but rather advance the truth we plead for, if by our being saved, eternal salvation were intended. But that cannot be the sense of it in this place, otherwise than as that salvation is included in the causes of it, which are effectual in this life. Nor do I think that in that expression, "by grace ye are saved," our justification only is intended, although it be so principally. Conversion to God and sanctification are also included therein, as is evident from ver. 5, 6. And they are no less of sovereign grace, than is our justification itself. But the Apostle speaks of what the Ephesians, being now believers, and by virtue of their being so, were made partakers of in this life. This is manifest in the whole context. For having in the beginning of the chapter described their condition, what it was in common with all the posterity of Adam by nature, ver. 1—3, he moreover declares their condition in particular, in opposition to that of the Jews, as they were Gentiles, Idolaters, Atheists, ver. 11, 12. Their present delivery by Jesus Christ from this whole miserable state and condition, that which they were under in common with all mankind, and that which was a peculiar aggravation of its misery in themselves, is that which he intends by their being saved. That which was principally designed in the description of this state is, that therein and thereby they were liable to the wrath of God, guilty before him, and obnoxious to his judgment. This he expresses in the declaration of it, ver. 3, answerable to that method and those grounds, he every where proceeds on in declaring the doctrine of justification.

Rom. iii. 19—24; Tit. iii. 3—5. From this state they had

deliverance by faith in Christ Jesus. "For to as many as received him, power is given to be the sons of God," John i. 12. "He that believeth on him, is not condemned," that is, he is saved in the sense of the Apostle in this place. John iii. 15. "He that believeth on the Son of God hath everlasting life, (is saved) but he that believeth not, the wrath of God abideth on him," verse 36. And in this sense, *saved* and *salvation*, are frequently used in the Scripture. Besides he gives us so full a description of the salvation which he intends, from verse 13, to the end of the chapter, that there can be no doubt of it. It is our being "made nigh" by the blood of Christ, verse 13; our "peace with God" by his death, verse 14, 15; our "reconciliation" by the blood of the cross, verse 16; our "access unto God," and all spiritual privileges thereon depending, verse 18—20, &c.

Wherefore the inquiry of the Apostle and his determination thereon, is concerning the causes of our justification before God. This he declares and fixes both positively and negatively. Positively (1) In the supreme moving cause on the part of God. This is that free sovereign grace and love of his, which he illustrates by its adjuncts and properties before mentioned. (2) In the meritorious procuring cause of it, which is Jesus Christ in the work of his mediation, as the ordinance of God for the rendering this grace effectual to his glory, verses 7, 13, 16. (3) In the only means or instrumental cause on our part, which is faith. "By grace are ye saved through faith," verse 8. And lest he should seem to derogate any thing from the grace of God, in asserting the necessity and use of faith, he adds that *epanorthosis*, "and that not of ourselves, it is the gift of God." The communication of this faith to us is no less of grace than is the justification which we obtain thereby. So has he secured the whole work to the grace of God through Christ, wherein we are interested by faith alone.

But not content herewith, he describes this work negatively, or adds an exclusion of what might be pretended to have a concernment therein. And therein three things are stated distinctly. (1) What it is he so excludes. (2) The reason whereon he does so. (3) The confirmation of that reason, wherein he obviates an objection that might arise thereon.

1. That which he excludes is works; "not of works," verse 9. And what works he intends, at least principally, he himself declares. Works, say some, of the law, the law of Moses. But what concernment had these Ephesians therein, that the Apos-

tle should inform them, that they were not justified by those works? They were never under that law, never sought for righteousness by it, nor had any respect to it, but only, that they were delivered from it. But it may be he intends only works wrought in the strength of our own natural abilities, without the aids of grace, and before believing. But what were the works of these Ephesians antecedent to believing, he before and afterwards declares. For "being dead in trespasses and sins, they walked according to the course of this world in the lusts of the flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh, and of the mind," verse 1—3. It is certain enough that these works have no influence upon our justification; and no less certain, that the Apostle had no reason to exclude them from it, as though any could pretend to be advantaged by them, in that which consists in a deliverance from them. Wherefore the works here excluded by the Apostle, are those works which the Ephesians now performed, when they were believers, "quickened with Christ;" even the works "which God hath fore-ordained, that we should walk in them," as he expressly declared, verse 10. And these works he excludes not only in opposition to grace, but in opposition to faith also. "Through faith, not of works." Wherefore he not only rejects their merit, as inconsistent with grace, but their co-interest on our part with, or subsequent interest to faith, in the work of justification before God.

If we are saved by grace through faith in Christ exclusively of all works of obedience whatever, then cannot such works be the whole or any part of our righteousness to the justification of life. Wherefore another righteousness we must have or perish for ever. Many things I know are here offered, and many distinctions coined to retain some interest of works in our justification before God; but whether it be the safest way to trust to them, or to this plain, express, divine testimony, will not be hard for any to determine, when they make the case their own.

2. The Apostle adds a reason of this exclusion of works; "not of works, lest any one should boast." God has ordained the order and method of our justification by Christ in the way expressed, that no man might have ground, reason, or occasion to glory or boast in or of himself. So it is expressed 1 Cor. i. 21, 30, 31; Rom. iii. 32. To exclude all glorying or boasting on our part, is the design of God. And this consists in an ascription of something to ourselves, that is not in others, in order to justification. And it is works alone that can administer any

occasion of this boasting; "For if Abraham were justified by works, he had whereof to glory," Rom. iv. 2. And it is excluded alone "by the law of faith," Rom. iii. 27. For the nature and use of faith, is to find righteousness in another. And this boasting all works are apt to beget in the minds of men, if applied to justification. And where there is any boasting of this nature, the design of God towards us in this work of his grace, is frustrated as far as lies in us.

That which I principally insist on from hence, is, that there are no boundaries fixed in Scripture to the interest of works in justification, so as no boasting should be included in them. The Papists make them meritorious of it, at least of our second justification as they call it. This, say some, ought not to be admitted; for it includes boasting. Merit and boasting are inseparable. Wherefore, say others, they are only *causa sine qua non*, they are the condition of it; or they are our evangelical righteousness before God whereon we are evangelically justified, or they are a subordinate righteousness, whereon we obtain an interest in the righteousness of Christ; or are comprised in the condition of the new covenant whereby we are justified; or are included in faith, being the form of it, or of the essence of it, one way or other: for herein men express themselves in great variety. But so long as our works are hereby asserted in order to our justification, how shall a man be certain that they do not include boasting; or, that they express the true sense of these words, "not of works, lest any man should boast?" There is some kind of ascription to ourselves in this matter, which is boasting. If any shall say, that they know well enough what they do, and know that they do not boast in what they ascribe to works, I must say that in general I cannot admit it. For the Papists affirm of themselves, that they are most remote from boasting; yet I am very well satisfied that boasting and merit are inseparable. The question is not what men think they do, but what judgment the Scripture passes on what they do. And if it be said, that what is in us, is also of the grace and gift of God, and is so acknowledged, which excludes all boasting in ourselves, I say it was so by the Pharisee, and yet was he a horrible boaster. Let them therefore be supposed to be wrought in us in what way men please, if they be also wrought by us and so be "the works of righteousness, which we have done," I fear their introduction into our justification, includes boasting in it, because of this assertion of the Apostle, "not of works, lest any

man should boast." Wherefore because this is a dangerous point, unless men can give us the direct, plain, indisputable bounds of the introduction of our works into our justification, which cannot include boasting in it, it is the safest course utterly to exclude them, wherein I see no danger of any mistake in these words of the Holy Ghost, "not of works, lest any man should boast." For if we should be unadvisedly seduced into this boasting, we should lose all the benefit which we might otherwise expect by the grace of God.

3. The Apostle gives another reason why it cannot be of works, and withal obviates an objection which might arise from what he had declared, verse 10. "For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained, that we should walk in them." And the force of his reason, which the causal conjunction intimates the introduction of, consists in this: that all good works, those concerning which he treats, evangelical works, are the effects of the grace of God in them that are in Christ Jesus, and so are truly justified antecedently in order of nature to them. But that which he principally designed in these words, was that which he is still mindful of, wherever he treats of this doctrine, namely, to obviate an objection that he foresaw some would make against it, and that is this: "If good works be thus excluded from our justification before God, then of what use are they? we may live as we list, utterly neglect them, and yet be justified." And this very objection do some men continue to manage with great vehemency against the same doctrine. We meet with nothing in this cause more frequently, than that if our justification before God be not of works some way or other, if they be not antecedently required thereto, if they are not a previous condition of it, then there is no need of them: men may safely live in an utter neglect of all obedience to God. And on this theme men are very apt to enlarge themselves, who otherwise give no great evidences of their own evangelical obedience. To me it is marvellous, that they heed not to what party they make an accession in the management of this objection; namely, to them, who were the adversaries of the doctrine of grace, taught by the Apostle. It must be elsewhere considered. For the present I shall say no more, but that if the answer here given by the Apostle be not satisfactory to them, if the grounds and reasons of the necessity and use of good works here declared, be not judged by them sufficient to establish them in their proper place and order, I

shall not esteem myself obliged to attempt their further satisfaction.

Phil. iii. 8, 9.—“Yea doubtless, and I account all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord, for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung that I may win Christ, and be found in him, not having mine own righteousness which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith.”

This is the last testimony which I shall insist upon, and although it be of great importance, I shall be the more brief in the consideration of it, because it has been lately pleaded and vindicated by another, whereto I do not expect any tolerable reply. For what has since been attempted by one, is of no weight. He is in this matter *ουτε επιτος ουτε τεταπος*. And the things that I would observe from and concerning this testimony, may be reduced to the ensuing heads.

1. That which the Apostle designs from the beginning of this chapter, and in these verses, is in an especial manner to declare what it is on account whereof we are accepted with God, and have thereon cause to rejoice. This he fixes in general in an interest in and participation of Christ by faith, in opposition to all legal privileges and advantages, wherein the Jews whom he reflected upon boasted and rejoiced. “We rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh,” verse 3.

2. He supposes that in order to that acceptance before God wherein we are to rejoice, there is a righteousness necessary; and whatever it be, that it is the sole ground of that acceptance. And to give evidence hereto,

3. He declares that there is a twofold righteousness that may be pleaded and trusted to for this purpose. (1) “Our own righteousness which is of the law.” (2) That which is “through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith.” These he asserts to be opposite and inconsistent as to the end of our justification and acceptance with God; “not having mine own righteousness, but that which is,” &c. And an intermediate righteousness between these he acknowledges not.

4. Placing the instance in himself, he declares emphatically (so that there is scarce a greater *παθος*, or vehemency of speech in all his writings) which of those it was that he adhered to, and placed his confidence in. And in the handling of this subject, there were some things which engaged his holy mind in an earnestness of expression, in the exultation of one of these,

namely, of the righteousness which is of God by faith, and the depression of the other, or his own righteousness. As,

1. This was the turning point, whereon he and others had forsaken their Judaism and betaken themselves to the gospel. This therefore was to be secured as the main instance, wherein the greatest controversy that ever was in the world was debated. So he expresses it, Gal. ii. 15, 16, "We who are Jews by nature and not sinners of the Gentiles, knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law." (2) Hereon there was great opposition made to this doctrine by the Jews in all places, and in many of them the minds of multitudes were turned off from the truth (which the most are generally prone to in this case) and perverted from the simplicity of the gospel. This greatly affected his holy soul, and he takes notice of it in most of his Epistles. (3) The weight of the doctrine itself, with that unwillingness which is in the minds of men by nature to embrace it, as that which lays the axe to the root of all spiritual pride, elation of mind, and self-pleasing whatever, whence innumerable subterfuges have been, and are sought out to avoid the efficacy of it, and to keep the souls of men from that universal resignation of themselves to sovereign grace in Christ, which they have naturally such an aversion to, did also affect him. (4) He had himself been a great sinner in the days of his ignorance, by a peculiar opposition to Christ and the gospel; this he was deeply sensible of; and therewith of the excellency of the grace of God and the righteousness of Christ whereby he was delivered. And men must have some experience of what he felt in himself as to sin and grace, before they can well understand his expressions about them.

5. Hence it was, that in many other places of his writings, but in this especially, he treats of these things with a greater earnestness and vehemency of spirit than ordinary. Thus (1) On the part of Christ whom he would exalt, he mentions not only the knowledge of him, but *το ὑπερχον της γνωσεως*, "the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord," with an emphasis in every word; and those other redoubled expressions, "all loss for him, that I may win him, that I may be found in him, that I may know him," all argue the working of his affections under the conduct of faith and truth to an acquiescence in Christ alone, as all and in all. Somewhat of this

frame of mind is necessary to them that would believe his doctrine. Those who are utter strangers to the one, will never receive the other. (2) In his expression of all other things that are our own, that are not Christ, whether privileges or duties, however good, useful, excellent, they may be in themselves, yet in comparison of Christ and his righteousness, and with respect to the end of our standing before God, and acceptance with him, with the same vehemency of spirit he casts contempt upon them, calling them, *συνβλατα*, "dogs' meat" to be left for them whom he calls "dogs," that is, "evil workers, the concision;" or the wicked Jews who adhered pertinaciously to the righteousness of the law, verse 2. This account of the earnestness of the Apostle in this argument, and the warmth of his expressions, I thought meet to give as that which gives light to the whole of his design.

6. The question being thus stated, the inquiry is, what any person who desires acceptance with God, or a righteousness whereon he may be justified before him, ought to betake himself to. One of the ways proposed he must close with. Either he must comply with the Apostle in his resolution to reject all his own righteousness, and to betake himself to the righteousness of God, which is by faith in Christ Jesus alone, or find out for himself, or get some to find out for him, some exceptions to the Apostle's conclusion, or some distinctions that may prepare a reserve for his own works, one way or other in his justification before God. Here every one must choose for himself. In the meantime, we thus argue. If "our own righteousness," and the "righteousness which is of God by faith," or that which is through the faith of Christ Jesus, (namely, the righteousness which God imputes to us, Rom. iv. 6; or the abundance of grace and the gift of righteousness thereby, which we receive, Rom. v. 17,) are opposite and inconsistent in the work of justification before God, then are we justified by faith alone through the imputation of the righteousness of Christ to us. The consequence is plain from the removal of all other ways, causes, means, and conditions of it, as inconsistent with it. But the antecedent is expressly the Apostle's; "not my own, but that of God." Again,

That whereby and wherewith we are "found in Christ," is that whereby alone we are justified before God; for to be "found in Christ," expresses the state of the person that is to be justified before God: whereto is opposed to be "found in ourselves." And according to these different states, the judg-

ment of God passes concerning us. And as for those who are found in themselves, we know what will be their portion. But in Christ we are found, by faith alone.

All manner of evasions are made use of by some, to escape the force of this testimony. It is said in general, "that no sober-minded man can imagine the Apostle did not desire to be found in gospel righteousness, or that by his own righteousness he meant *that*." For it is that alone can entitle us to the benefits of Christ's righteousness." *Nollem dictum*. (1) The censure is too severe to be cast on all Protestant writers without exception, who have expounded this place of the Apostle; and all others, except some few of late, influenced by the heat of the controversy wherein they are engaged. (2) If the gospel righteousness intended be his own personal righteousness and obedience, there is some want of consideration in affirming, that he did not desire to be found in it. That wherein we are found, thereon are we to be judged; to be found in our own evangelical righteousness before God, is to enter into judgment with God thereon, which those who understand any thing aright of God and themselves, will not be free to. And to make this to be the meaning of his words, "I desire not to be found in my own righteousness which is after the law, but I desire to be found in mine own righteousness which is according to the gospel," whereas, since they are his own inherent righteousness, they are both the same, does not seem a proper interpretation of his words, and it shall be immediately disproved. (3) That our personal gospel righteousness entitles us to the benefits of Christ's righteousness, that is, as to our justification before God, is *gratis dictum*; not one testimony of Scripture can be produced that gives the least countenance to such an assertion. That it is contrary to many express testimonies, and inconsistent with the freeness of the grace of God in our justification, as proposed in the Scripture, has been proved before. Nor do any of the places which assert the necessity of obedience and good works in believers, that is, justified persons, to salvation, any way belong to the proof of this assertion; or in the least express or intimate any such thing. And in particular, the assertion of it is expressly contradictory to that of the Apostle, Tit. iii. 4, 5. But I forbear, and proceed to the consideration of the special answers, that are given to this testimony, especially those of Bellarmine, whereto I have, as yet, seen nothing added with any pretence of reason in it.

1. Some say, "that by his own righteousness which the Apostle rejects, he intends only his righteousness *ex νόμων*, or 'by the works of the law.' But this was only an outward external righteousness, consisting in the observation of rites and ceremonies, without respect to the inward frame or obedience of the heart." But this is an impious imagination. The righteousness which is by the law, is the righteousness which the law requires, and those works of it, which if a man do, he shall live in them; for "the doers of the law shall be justified," Rom. ii. 16. Neither did God ever give any law of obedience to man, but what obliged him to love the Lord his God with all his heart, and all his soul. And it is so far from being true, that God by the law required an external righteousness only, that he frequently condemns it as an abomination to him, where it is alone.

2. Others say, "that it is the righteousness, whatever it be, which he had during his pharisaism. And although he should be allowed in that state, to have lived in all good conscience, instantly to have served God day and night, and to have had respect as well to the internal as the external works of the law; yet all these works being before faith, before conversion to God, may be, and are to be rejected as to any concurrence to our justification. But works wrought in faith, by the aid of grace, evangelical works, are of another consideration, and together with faith, are the condition of justification."

Ans. 1. That in the matter of our justification the Apostle opposes evangelical works, not only to the grace of God, but also to the faith of believers, was proved in the consideration of the foregoing testimony.

2. He makes no such distinction, as that pretended, namely, that works are of two sorts; whereof one is to be excluded from any interest in our justification, but not the other; neither does he any where else, treating of the same subject, intimate any such distinction; but on the contrary, declares that use of all works of obedience in them that believe, which is exclusive of the supposition of any such distinction, but he directly expresses, in this rejection, his own righteousness, that is, his personal inherent righteousness whatever it be, and however it be wrought.

3. He makes a plain distinction of his own twofold estate, namely, that of his Judaism which he was in before his conversion, and that which he had by faith in Christ Jesus. In the first state, he considers the privileges of it, and declares

what judgment he made concerning them upon the revelation of Jesus Christ to him; "I counted," Phil. iii. 7, referring to the time past, namely, at his first conversion. I considered them with all the advantages, gain, and reputation, which I had by them, but rejected them all for Christ, because the esteem of them and continuance in them as privileges, were inconsistent with faith in Christ Jesus. Secondly, he proceeds to give an account of himself and his thoughts, as to his present condition. For it might be supposed, that although he had parted with all his legal privileges for Christ; yet now being united to him by faith, he had something of his own, wherein he might rejoice, and on the account whereof he might be accepted with God, (the thing inquired after,) or else he had parted with all for nothing. Wherefore he who had no design to make any reserves of what he might glory in, plainly declares what his judgment is concerning all his present righteousness, and the ways of obedience which he was now engaged in, with respect to the ends inquired after, ver. 8. *Αλλα μερουνγε και ηγγουμαι.* The bringing over of what was affirmed before concerning his Judaical privileges into this verse, is an effect of a very superficial consideration of the context. For (1) there is a plain *αυξησης* in these words *Αλλα μερουνγε και*. He could, not more plainly express the heightening of what he had affirmed by a progress to other things, or the consideration of himself in another state. But moreover, beyond what I have already asserted; (2) the change of the time expressed by *ηγγουμαι* which respects what was past, into *ηγγουμαι*, wherein he has respect only to what was present, not what he had before rejected and forsaken, makes evident his progress to the consideration of things of another nature. Wherefore to the rejection of all his former Judaical privileges, he adds his judgment concerning his own present personal righteousness. But whereas it might be objected, that rejecting all both before and after conversion, he had nothing left to "rejoice" in, to "glory" in, to give him acceptance with God; he assures us of the contrary, namely, that he found all these things in Christ, and "the righteousness of God which is by faith." He is therefore in these words, "not having mine own righteousness, which is by the law," so far from intending only the righteousness which he had before his conversion, that he intends it not at all.

The words of Davenant on this passage of the Apostle, being in my judgment not only sober, but weighty also, I shall transcribe them. "Here the Apostle teaches what is that right-

eousness, on which we must rely before God, to wit, that which is apprehended by faith; but this is an imputed righteousness. He also shows why it rightfully becomes ours; to wit, because we are Christ's and are found in Christ. Therefore, because we are ingrafted into his body, and are united with him in one person, his righteousness is accounted ours.* For whereas some begin to interpret our being "in Christ," and being "found in him," so as to intend no more but our profession of the faith of the gospel—the faith of the Catholic church in all ages concerning the mystical union of Christ and believers, is not to be blown away with a few empty words and unproved assertions.

The answer therefore is full and clear to the general exception, namely, that the Apostle rejects our legal, but not our evangelical righteousness. For (1) the Apostle rejects, disclaims, disowns nothing at all, not the one nor the other absolutely, but in comparison of Christ, and with respect to the especial end of justification before God, or a righteousness in his sight. (2) In that sense he rejects all our own righteousness; but our evangelical righteousness, in the sense pleaded for, is our own, inherent in us, performed by us. (3) Our legal righteousness, and our evangelical, so far as an inherent righteousness is intended, are the same, and the different ends and use of the same righteousness are alone intended in that distinction, so far as it has sense in it. That which in respect of motives to it, the ends of it, with the especial causes of its acceptance with God, is evangelical, in respect of its original prescription, rule, and measure, is legal. When any can instance any act or duty, any habit or effect of it, which are not required by that law which enjoins us "to love the Lord our God, with all our heart, soul, and mind, and our neighbour as ourselves," they shall be attended to. (4) The Apostle in this case rejects all the works of righteousness which we have done, Tit. iii. 5. But our evangelical righteousness consists in the works of righteousness which we do. (5) He disclaims all that is our own. And if the evangelical righteousness intended be our own, he sets up another in opposition to it; and which therefore is not our own, but as it

* Hic docet Apostolus quanam illa justitia sit qua nitendum coram Deo, nimirum quæ per fidem apprehenditur, at hæc imputata est. Causam etiam ostendit cur jure nostra fiat, nimirum quia nos Christi sumus et in Christo comperimur; quia igitur insiti sumus in corpus ejus et coalescimus cum ille in unam personam, ideo ejus justitia nostra reputatur. De Justif. Habit cap. 38.

is imputed to us. And I shall yet add some other reasons which render this pretence useless, or show the falseness of it.

1. Where the Apostle does not distinguish or limit what he speaks of, what ground have we to distinguish or limit his assertions? "Not by works," saith he, sometimes absolutely, sometimes the "works of righteousness which we have done;" that is, not by some sort of works, say those who plead the contrary; but by what warrant? (2) The works which they pretend to be excluded, as wherein our own righteousness that is rejected consists, are works wrought without faith, without the aid of grace: but these are not *good works*, nor can any be denominated *righteous* from them, nor is it any righteousness that consists in them alone. For "without faith it is impossible to please God:" and to what purpose should the Apostle exclude evil works and hypocritical from our justification? Who ever imagined, that any could be justified with respect to them? There might have been some pretence for this gloss, had the Apostle said his own works; but whereas he rejects his own righteousness, to restrain it to such works as are not righteous, as will denominate none righteous, as are no righteousness at all, is most absurd. (3) Works wrought in faith, if applied to our justification, give occasion to, or include "boasting," more than any others, as being better and more praiseworthy than they. (4) The Apostle elsewhere excludes from justification the works that Abraham had done when he had been a believer many years; and the works of David when he described the blessedness of a man by the forgiveness of sins. (5) The state of the question which he handles in his Epistle to the Galatians, was expressly about the works of them that *believed*. For he does not dispute against the Jews, who would not be pressed in the least with his arguments, namely, that if the inheritance were by the law, then the promise was of none effect; and if righteousness were by the law, then did Christ die in vain: for these things they would readily grant. But he speaks to them that were believers, with respect to those works which they would have joined with Christ and the gospel, in order to justification. (6) If this were the mind of the Apostle, that he would exclude one sort of works, and assert the necessity of another to the same end, why did he not once say so, especially considering how necessary it was that so he should do, to answer those objections against his doctrine which he himself takes notice

of, and returns answer to on other grounds, without the least intimation of any such distinction?

Bellarmino considers this testimony in three places, Lib. i. cap. 18, Lib. i. cap. 19, Lib. v. cap. 5, De Justificat. And he returns three answers to it, which contain the substance of all that is pleaded by others to the same purpose. (1) He saith, "That the righteousness which is by the law, and which is opposed to the righteousness which is by faith, is not the righteousness written in the law, or which the law requires, but a righteousness wrought without the aid of grace, by the knowledge of the law alone. (2) That the righteousness which is by the faith of Christ, are *opera nostra justa facta ex fide*, our own righteous works wrought in faith, which others call our evangelical works. (3) That it is blasphemous to call the duties of inherent righteousness *ζημιων και ακυβοατα* "loss and dung." But he labours in the fire with all his sophistry. For as to the first, (1) That by the righteousness which is by the law, the righteousness which the law requires, is not intended, is a bold assertion, and expressly contradictory to the Apostle, Rom. ix. 31; x. 5. In both places he declares the righteousness of the law to be the righteousness that the law requires. (2) The works which he excludes, he calls the "works of righteousness that we have done," Tit. iii. 5, which are the works that the law requires. To the second, I say, (1) that the substance of it is, that the Apostle should profess "I desire to be found in Christ, not having my own righteousness, but having my own righteousness:" for evangelical inherent righteousness was properly his own. And I am sorry that some should apprehend that the Apostle in these words desired to be found in his own righteousness in the presence of God, in order to his justification. For nothing can be more contrary, not only to the perpetual tenor and design of all his discourses on this subject, but also to the testimony of all other holy men in the Scripture, to the same purpose, as we have proved before. And I suppose there are very few true believers at present, whom they will find to comply and join with them in this desire of being found in their own personal evangelical righteousness, or the works of righteousness which they have done, in their trial before God, as to their justification. We should do well to read our own hearts, as well as the books of others in this matter. (2) The righteousness which is of God by faith, is not our own obedience or righteousness, but that which is opposed to it; that which God imputes to us, Rom. iv. 6; that which we receive by way of gift, Rom. v. 17

(3) That by the righteousness which is by the faith of Christ Jesus our own inherent righteousness is not intended, is evident from hence, that the Apostle excludes all his own righteousness, as and when he was found in Christ, that is, whatever he had done as a believer. And if there be not an opposition in these words, between a righteousness that is our own, and that which is not our own, I know not in what words it can be expressed. To the third I say, (1) the Apostle does not, nor do we say that he does, call our inherent righteousness "dung," but only that he "accounts" it so. (2) He does not account it so absolutely, which he is most remote from, but only in comparison with Christ. (3) He does not esteem it so in itself, but only as to his trust in it, with respect to one especial end, namely, our justification before God. (4) The prophet Isaiah in the same respect, terms all our righteousnesses "filthy rags," Isa. lxiv. 6. And כִּי עֲרִיב is an expression of as much contempt, as *σκύβαλα*.

5. Some say all works are excluded as meritorious of grace, life, and salvation, but not as the condition of our justification before God. But (1) whatever the Apostle excludes, he does it absolutely, and in all respects, because he sets up something else in opposition to it. (2) There is no ground left for any such distinction in this place: for all that the Apostle requires to our justification is, (1) That we be found in Christ, not in ourselves. (2) That we have the righteousness of God, not our own. (3) That we be made partakers of this righteousness by faith, which is the substance of what we plead for.

CHAPTER XIX.

OBJECTIONS AGAINST THE DOCTRINE OF JUSTIFICATION, BY THE
 IMPUTATION OF THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF CHRIST. PERSONAL
 HOLINESS AND OBEDIENCE NOT OBSTRUCTED, BUT FURTHERED
 BY IT.

THAT which remains to put an issue to this discourse, is the consideration of some things, that in general are laid in objection against the truth pleaded for. Many things of that nature we have occasionally met with, and already removed; yea, the principal of those which at present are most insisted on. The

testimonies of Scripture urged by those of the Roman Church for justification by works, have all of them so fully and frequently been answered by Protestant divines, that it is altogether needless to insist again upon them, unless they had received some new enforcement, which of late they have not done. That which for the most part we have now to do with, are rather sophistical cavils from supposed absurd consequences, than real theological arguments. And some of those who would walk with most wariness between the imputation of the righteousness of Christ and justification by our own works, either are in such a slippery place, that they seem sometimes to be on the one side, sometimes on the other, or else to express themselves with so much caution that it is very difficult to apprehend their minds. I shall not therefore for the future dare to say, that this or that is any man's opinion, though it appear to me so to be, as clear and evident as words can express it; but that this or that opinion, let it be maintained by whom it will, I approve or disapprove; this I shall dare to say. And I will say also, that the declination that has been from the common doctrine of justification before God, on the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, daily proceeds towards a direct assertion of justification by works. Nor indeed has it where to rest, until it comes to that bottom. And this is more clearly seen in the objections which they make against the truth, than in what they plead in defence of their own opinions. For herein they speak as yet warily, and with a pretence of accuracy in avoiding extremes: but in the other, or their objections, they make use of none but what are easily resolved into a supposition of justification by works in the grossest sense of it. To insist on all particulars were endless, and as was said, most of those of any importance have already occasionally been spoken to. There are therefore only two things which are generally pleaded by all sorts of persons, Papists, Socinians, and others, with whom here we have to do, that I shall take notice of. The first and fountain of all others is, that the doctrine of justification by the imputation of the righteousness of Christ renders our personal righteousness needless, and overthrows all necessity of a holy life. The other is, that the Apostle James, in his epistle, plainly ascribes our justification to works, and what he affirms there is inconsistent with that sense of those many other testimonies of Scripture which we plead for.

For the first of these, although those who oppose the truth we contend for, proceed on various different and contradictory

principles among themselves as to what they exalt in opposition to it, yet do they all agree in a vehement urging of it. For those of the church of Rome who renewed this charge, invented of old by others, it must be acknowledged by all sober men, are guilty, in the management of it, of an open calumny. For the wisest of them and those of whom it is hard to conceive but that they knew the contrary, as Bellarmine, Vasquez, Suarez, openly aver that Protestant writers deny all inherent righteousness; (Bellarmine excepts Bucer and Chemnitius;) that they maintain that men may be saved, although they live in all manner of sin, that there is no more required of them but that they believe that their sins are forgiven, and that whilst they do so, although they give themselves up to the most sensual vices and abominations, they may be assured of their salvation.

Tantum religio potuit suadere malorum.

So will men out of a perverse zeal to promote their own interest in the religion they profess, wilfully give up themselves unto the worst of evils, such as false accusation and open calumny, and of no other nature are these assertions, which none of the writings or preachings of those who are so charged, ever gave the least countenance to. Whether the forging and promulgation of such impudent falsehoods be an expedient to obtain justification by works in the sight of God, they who continue in them had best consider. For my part I say again, as I suppose I have said already, that it is all one to me what religious men are of, who can justify themselves in such courses and proceedings. And for those among ourselves who are pleased to make use of this objection, they either know what the doctrine is which they would oppose, or they do not. If they do not, the wise man tells them, "that he who answereth a matter before he hear it, it is folly and shame unto him." If they do understand it, it is evident that they use not sincerity, but artifices, and false pretences for advantage, in their handling of sacred things, which is scandalous to religion. Socinus fiercely manages this charge against the doctrine of the reformed churches; *De Servat. par. 4, cap. 1.* And he made it the foundation whereon, and the reason why, he opposes the doctrine of the imputation of the satisfaction of Christ, if any such satisfaction should be allowed, which yet he peremptorily denies. And he has written a treatise to the same purpose defended by Schlichtingius against Meisnerus. And he takes

the same honest course herein, that others did before him. For he charges it on the divines of the Protestant churches, that they taught that God justifieth the ungodly, not only those that are so, and whilst they are so, but although they continue so; that they required no inherent righteousness or holiness in any, nor could do so on their principles, seeing the imputed righteousness of Christ is sufficient for them, although they live in sin, are not washed nor cleansed, nor give up themselves to the ways of duty and obedience to God whereby he may be pleased, and so bring in libertinism and antinomianism into the church. And he thinks it a sufficient confutation of this doctrine to allege against it that "neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, &c., shall inherit the kingdom of God." And these are some of those ways which have rendered the management of controversies in religion scandalous and abominable, such as no wise or good man will meddle with, unless compelled for the necessary service of the church. For these things are openly false, and made use of with a shameful dishonesty to promote a corrupt design and end. When I find men at this kind of work, I have very little concern in what they say afterwards, be it true or false. Their rule and measure is what serves their own end, or what may promote the design and interest wherein they are engaged, be it right or wrong. And as for this man, there is not any article in religion (the principal whereof are rejected by him) on whose account he with more confidence adjudges us to eternal ruin than this of the satisfaction of Christ and the imputation of it to them that believe. So much darkness is there remaining on the minds of the most of men: so many inveterate prejudices on various occasions are they pestered with, especially if not under the conduct of the same enlightening Spirit, that some will confidently condemn others to eternal flames, for those things whereon they place, on infallible grounds, their hopes of eternal blessedness, and know that they love God and live to him on their account. But this wretched advantage of condemning all those to hell who dissent from them, is greedily laid hold of by all sorts of persons. For they thereby secretly secure their own whole party in persuasion of eternal salvation, be they otherwise what they will. For if the want of that faith which they profess, will certainly damn men whatever else they be, and how good soever their lives be, many will easily suffer themselves to be deceived with a foolish sophism, that then that faith which they profess will assuredly save

them, be their lives what they please, considering how it falls in with their inclinations. And hereby they may happen also to frighten poor simple people into a compliance with them, whilst they peremptorily denounce damnation against them unless they do so. And none for the most part are more fierce in the denunciation of the condemnatory sentence against others for not believing as they do, than those who so live, that if there be any truth in the Scripture, it is not possible they should be saved themselves. For my part I believe that as to Christians in outward profession, all unregenerate unbelievers who obey not the gospel shall be damned, be they of what religion they will, and none else; and all that are born again, truly believe and obey the gospel, shall be saved, be they of what religion they will, as to the differences that are at this day among Christians. That way wherein these things are most effectually promoted, is in the first place to be embraced by every one that takes care of his own salvation. If they are in any way or church obstructed, that church or way is so far as it obstructs them to be forsaken. And if there be any way of profession or any visible church state wherein any thing or things absolutely destructive of or inconsistent with these things are made necessary to the professors of it, in that way, and by virtue of it, no salvation is to be obtained. In other things every man is to walk according to the light of his own mind, for "whatever is not of faith is sin." But I return from this digression occasioned by the fierceness of him with whom we have to do.

For the objection itself, that has fallen under so perverse a management, so far as it has any pretence of sobriety in it, is this and no other:—"If God justify the ungodly merely by his grace through faith in Christ Jesus, so that works of obedience are not antecedently necessary to justification before God, nor are any part of that righteousness whereon any are so justified, then are they no way necessary, but men may be justified and saved without them." For it is said that there is no connection between faith for justification as by us asserted, and the necessity of holiness, righteousness or obedience, but that we are by grace set at liberty to live as we list, yea, in all manner of sin, and yet be secured of salvation. For if we are made righteous with the righteousness of another, we have no need of any righteousness of our own. And it were well if many of those who make use of this plea, would endeavour by some other way also to evidence their esteem of these things; for to dis

pute for the necessity of holiness, and live in the neglect of it, is uncomely.

I shall be brief in the answer that here shall be returned to this objection, for indeed it is sufficiently answered or obviated in what has been before discoursed concerning the nature of that faith whereby we are justified, and the continuation of the moral law in its force, as a rule of obedience to all believers. An unprejudiced consideration of what has been proposed on these heads will evidently manifest the iniquity of this charge, and how not the least countenance is given to it by the doctrine pleaded for. Besides, I must acquaint the reader that some while since I have published an entire discourse concerning the nature and necessity of gospel holiness, with the grounds and reasons thereof in compliance with the doctrine of justification that has now been declared. Nor do I see it necessary to add any thing thereto, nor do I doubt, but that the perusal of it will abundantly detect the vanity of this charge. (Dispensation of the Holy Spirit, book 5.) Some few things may be spoken on the present occasion.

1. It is not pleaded that all who profess or have in former ages professed this doctrine, have exemplified it in a holy and fruitful conversation. Many, it is to be feared, have been found amongst them who have lived and died in sin. Neither do I know but that some have abused this doctrine to countenance themselves in their sins and neglect of duty. The best of holy things or truths cannot be secured from abuse, so long as the sophistry of the old serpent has an influence on the lusts and depraved minds of men. So was it with them of old who "turned the grace of God into lasciviousness;" or from the doctrine of it countenanced themselves in their ungodly deeds. Even from the beginning the whole doctrine of the gospel with the grace of God declared therein, was so abused. Neither were all that made profession of it immediately rendered holy and righteous thereby. Many from the first so walked as to make it evident that their belly was their god, and their end destruction. It is one thing to have only the conviction of truth in our minds, another to have the power of it in our hearts. The former will produce an outward profession, the latter alone effect an inward renovation of our souls. However I must add three things to this concession.

1. I am not satisfied that any of those who at present oppose this doctrine, do in holiness or righteousness, in the exercise of faith, love, zeal, self-denial, and all other Christian graces, sur-

pass those who in the last ages, both in this and other nations, firmly adhered to it, and who constantly testified to that effectual influence which it had upon their walking before God: nor do I know that any can be named amongst us in the former ages, who were eminent in holiness, and many such there were, who did not cordially assent to that imputation of the righteousness of Christ which we plead for. I doubt not in the least, but that many who greatly differ from others in the explication of this doctrine, may be and are eminently holy, at least sincerely so, which is as much as the best can pretend to. But it is not comely to find some others who give very little evidence of their diligent following after that "holiness, without which no man shall see God," vehemently declaiming against that doctrine as destructive of holiness, which was so fruitful in it in former days.

2. It does not appear as yet in general, that an attempt to introduce a doctrine contrary to it has had any great success in the reformation of the lives of men. Nor has personal righteousness or holiness as yet much thrived under the conduct of it, as to what may be observed. It will be time enough to seek countenance to it by declaiming against that which has formerly had better effects, when it has a little more commended itself by its fruits.

3. It were not amiss, if this part of the controversy might amongst us all, be issued in the advice of the Apostle James, chap. ii. 18: "Show me thy faith without thy works, and I will show thee my faith by my works." Let us all labour that fruits may thus far determine of doctrines, as to their use, to the interest of righteousness and holiness. For that faith which does not evidence itself by works, that has not this *εργασίαν*, this *index*, which James calls for, whereby it may be found out and examined, is of no use nor consideration herein. Secondly, the same objection was from the beginning laid against the doctrine of the Apostle Paul, the same charge was managed against it, which sufficiently argues, that it is the same doctrine which is now assaulted with it. This he himself more than once takes notice of, Rom. iii. 31: "Do we make void the law through faith?" It is an objection that he anticipates against his doctrine of the free justification of sinners through faith in the blood of Christ. And the substance of the charge included in these words is, that he destroyed the law, took off all obligation to obedience, and brought in antinomianism. So again, Rom. vi. 1; "What shall we say then? shall we con-

time in sin, that grace may abound?" Some thought this the natural and genuine consequence of what he had largely discoursed concerning justification which he had now fully closed: and some think so still. If what he taught concerning the grace of God in our justification be true, it will not only follow, that there will be no need of any relinquishment of sin on our part, but also a continuance in it must needs tend to the exaltation of that grace which he had so extolled. The same objection he repeats again, verse 15: "What then, shall we sin because we are not under the law, but under grace?" And in sundry other places he obviates the same objection, where he does not absolutely suppose it, especially Ephes. ii. 9, 10. We have therefore no reason to be surprised with, nor much to be moved at this objection and charge, for it is no other but what was insinuated or managed against the doctrine of the Apostle himself, whatever enforcements are now given it by subtlety of arguing or rhetorical exaggerations. However, it is evident, that there are naturally in the minds of men efficacious prejudices against this part of the mystery of the gospel which began betimes to manifest themselves, and ceased not until they had corrupted the whole doctrine of the church herein. And it were no hard matter to discover the principal of them, were that our present business; however it has in part been done before.

3. It is granted that this doctrine both singly by itself, or in conjunction with whatever else concerns the grace of God by Christ Jesus, is liable to abuse by them in whom darkness and the love of sin are predominant. For hence from the very beginning of our religion, some fancied to themselves that a bare assent to the gospel was that faith whereby they should be saved, and that they might be so, however they continued to live in sin, and a neglect of all duties of obedience. This is evident from the epistles of John, James, and Jude, in an especial manner. Against this pernicious evil we can give no relief, whilst men will "love darkness more than light, because their deeds are evil." And it would be a fond imagination in any to think, that their modellings of this doctrine after this manner will prevent future abuse. If they will, it is by rendering it no part of the gospel: for that which is so was ever liable to be abused by such persons as we speak of.

These general observations being premised, which are sufficient of themselves, to discard this objection from any place in the minds of sober men, I shall only add the consideration of

what answers the Apostle Paul returns to it, with a brief application of them to our purpose.

The objection made to the Apostle was that he made void the law, that he rendered good works needless, and that on the supposition of his doctrine, men might live in sin, to the advancement of grace. And as to his sense hereof, we may observe,

1. That he never returns that answer to it, no not once, which some think is the only answer, whereby it may be satisfied and removed: namely, the necessity of our own personal righteousness and obedience or works in order to our justification before God. For that by faith without works he understands faith and works, is an unreasonable supposition. If any yet pretend that he has given any such answer, let them produce it; as yet it has not been made to appear. And is it not strange that if this indeed were his doctrine, and the contrary a mistake of it, (namely, that our personal righteousness, holiness, and works had an influence upon our justification, and were in any sort our righteousness before God therein,) that he who in an eminent manner every where presses the necessity of them, and shows their true nature and use, both in general and in particular duties of all sorts, above any of the writers of the New Testament, should not make use of this truth in answer to an objection wherein he was charged to render them all needless and useless? His doctrine was urged with this objection as he himself acknowledged, and on the account of it rejected by many, Rom. x. 3, 4; Gal. ii. 3. He saw and knew that the corrupt lusts and depraved affections of the minds of many would supply them with subtle arguings against it. Yea, he foresaw by the Holy Spirit, as appears in many places of his writings, that it would be perverted and abused. And surely it was highly incumbent on him to obviate, as far as in him lay, these evils, and so to state his doctrine upon this objection, that no countenance might ever be given to it. And is it not strange that he should not on this occasion, once at least, somewhere or other, give an intimation, that although he rejected the works of the law, yet he maintained the necessity of evangelical works, in order to our justification before God as the condition of it, or that whereby we are justified according to the gospel? If this were indeed his doctrine, and that which would so easily solve this difficulty, and answer this objection, as both of them are by some pretended, certainly neither his

wisdom nor his care of the church under the conduct of the infallible Spirit would have suffered him to omit this reply, were it consistent with the truth which he had delivered. But he is so far from any such plea, that when the most unavoidable occasion was administered to it, he not only waves any mention of it, but in its stead affirms that which plainly evidences that he allowed not of it. See Eph. ii. 9, 10. Having positively excluded works from our justification, "not of works, lest any man should boast," it being natural thereon to inquire, to what end do works serve, or is there any necessity of them? instead of a distinction of works legal and evangelical in order to our justification, he asserts the necessity of the latter on other grounds, reasons, and motives, manifesting that they were those in particular which he excluded, as we have seen in the consideration of the place. Wherefore that we may not forsake his pattern and example in the same cause, seeing he was wiser and holier, knew more of the mind of God, and had more zeal for personal righteousness and holiness in the church than we all, if we are pressed a thousand times with this objection, we shall never seek to deliver ourselves from it, by answering that we allow these things to be the condition, or causes of our justification, or the matter of our righteousness before God, seeing he would not so do.

Secondly, we may observe, that in his answer to this objection, whether expressly mentioned or tacitly obviated, he insists not any where upon the common principle of moral duties, but on those motives and reasons of holiness, obedience, good works alone, which are peculiar to believers. For the question was not, whether all mankind were obliged to obedience to God and the duties thereof by the moral law; but whether there were an obligation from the gospel upon believers to righteousness, holiness and good works, such as was suited to affect and constrain their minds to them. Nor will we admit of any other state of the question but this only; whether upon the supposition of our gratuitous justification through the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, there are, in the gospel, grounds, reasons, and motives making necessary, and efficaciously influencing the minds of believers to obedience and good works. For those who are not believers, we have nothing to do with them in this matter, nor do we plead that evangelical grounds and motives are suited or effectual to work them to obedience; yea, we know the contrary, and that they are apt both to despise them and abuse them. See 1 Cor. i. 23, 24;

2 Cor. iv. 4. Such persons are under the law, and there we leave them to the authority of God in the moral law. But that the Apostle confines his inquiry to believers, is evident in every place wherein he makes mention of it, Rom. vi. 2, 3. "How shall we that are dead to sin, live any longer therein? Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ," &c., Eph. ii. 10. "For we are the workmanship of God, created in Christ Jesus unto good works." Wherefore we shall not at all contend what cogency to duties of holiness, there is in gospel motives and reasons to the minds of unbelievers, whatever may be the truth in that case; but what is their power, force and efficacy towards them that truly believe.

Thirdly, The answers which the Apostle returns positively to this objection wherein he declares the necessity, nature, ends and use of evangelical righteousness, and good works, are large, and many comprehensive of a great part of the doctrine of the gospel. I shall only mention the heads of some of them, which are the same that we plead in the vindication of the same truth.

1. He pleads the ordination of God; "God hath before ordained that we should walk in them;" Eph. ii. 10. God has designed in the disposal of the order of the causes of salvation, that those who believe in Christ should "live in, walk in, abound in" good works and all duties of obedience to God. To this end are precepts, directions, motives and encouragements every where multiplied in the Scripture. Wherefore we say that good works, and that as they include the gradual progressive renovation of our natures, our growth and increase in grace, with fruitfulness in our lives, are necessary from the ordination of God, from his will and command. And what need there any further dispute about the necessity of good works among them that know what it is to believe, or what respect there is in the souls and consciences of believers to the commands of God?

But what force, say some, is in this command or ordination of God, when notwithstanding it, and if we do not apply ourselves to obedience, we shall be justified by the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, and so may be saved without them? I say (1) as was before observed, that it is believers alone concerning whom this inquiry is made, and there is none of them but will judge this a most unreasonable and senseless objection, as that which arises from an utter ignorance of their state and relation to God. To suppose that the minds of believers are

not as much and effectually influenced with the authority and commands of God to duty and obedience, as if they were all given in order to their justification, is to consider neither what faith is, nor what it is to be a believer, nor what is the relation that we stand in to God by faith in Christ Jesus, nor what are the arguments or motives wherewith the minds of such persons are principally affected and constrained. This is the answer which the Apostle gives at large to this exception, Rom. vi. 2, 3. (2) The whole fallacy of this exception is (1) In separating the things that God has made inseparable; that is, our justification and our sanctification. To suppose that the one of these may be without the other, is to overthrow the whole gospel. (2) In confounding those things that are distinct, namely, justification and eternal actual salvation; the respect of works and obedience being not the same to them both, as has been declared. Wherefore this imagination that the commands of God to duty, however given, and to what ends soever, are not equally obligatory on the consciences of believers, as if they were all given in order to their justification before God, is an absurd figment, and which all of them who truly believe do reject. Yea, they have a greater power upon them, than they could have, if the duties required in them were in order to their justification, and so were antecedent thereto. For thereby they must be supposed to have their efficacy upon them before they truly believe. For to say that a man may be a true believer, or truly believe, in answer to the commands of the gospel, and not be thereon in the same instant of time absolutely justified, is not to dispute about any point of religion, but plainly to deny the whole truth of the gospel. But it is faith alone that gives power and efficacy to gospel commands, effectually to influence the soul to obedience. Wherefore this obligation is more powerfully constraining, as they are given to those that are justified, than if they were given them in order to their justification.

Secondly, The Apostle answers, as we do also, "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid; yea, we establish the law." For although the law is principally established in and by the obedience and sufferings of Christ, Rom. viii. 3, 4; x. 3, 4; yet is it not, by the doctrine of faith and the imputation of the righteousness of Christ to the justification of life, made void as to believers. Neither of these exempts them from that obligation to universal obedience, which is prescribed in the law. They are still obliged by virtue thereof "to love

the Lord their God with all their hearts, and their neighbours as themselves." They are indeed freed from the law, and all its commands to duty as it abides in its first consideration, "do this and live," the opposite whereto, is "cursed is every one that continueth not in all things written in the law to do them." For he that is under the obligation of the law in order to justification and life, falls inevitably under the curse of it, upon the supposition of any one transgression. But we are made free to give obedience to it, on gospel motives, and for gospel ends, as the Apostle declares at large, Rom. vi. And the obligation of it is such to all believers, that the least transgression of it has the nature of sin. But are they hereon bound over by the law to everlasting punishment, or, as some phrase it, will God damn them that transgress the law, without which all this is nothing? I ask again what they think hereof; and upon a supposition that he will do so, what they further think will become of themselves? For my part, I say no; even as the Apostle saith, "there is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus." Where then, they will say, is the necessity of obedience from the obligation of the law, if God will not damn them that transgress it? And I say, it were well if some men understood what they say in these things, or would learn, for a while at least, to hold their peace. The law equally requires obedience in all instances of duty, if it require any at all. As to its obligatory power, it is capable neither of dispensation nor relaxation, so long as the essential differences of good and evil remain. If then none can be obliged to duty by virtue of its commands, but that they must on every transgression fall under its curse, either it obliges no one at all, or no one can be saved. But although we are freed from the curse and condemning power of the law by him who has made an end of sin and brought in everlasting righteousness, yet whilst we are *viatores* in order to the accomplishment of God's design for the restoration of his image in us, we are obliged to endeavour after all that holiness and righteousness which the law requires of us.

Thirdly, The Apostle answers this objection, by discovering the necessary relation that faith has to the death of Christ, the grace of God, with the nature of sanctification, excellency, use, and advantage of gospel holiness, and the end of it in God's appointment. This he does at large in the whole sixth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, and that with this immediate design, to show the consistency of justification by faith alone, with the necessity of personal righteousness and holiness. The

due pleading of these things would require a just and full exposition of that chapter wherein the Apostle has comprised the chief springs and reasons of evangelical obedience. I shall only say, that those to whom the reasons of it and motives to it, therein expressed, which are all consistent with the doctrine of justification by the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, are not effectual to their own personal obedience, and do not demonstrate an indispensable necessity of it, are so unacquainted with the gospel, the nature of faith, the genius and inclination of the new creature (for, let men scoff on whilst they please, "he that is in Christ Jesus is a new creature") with the constraining efficacy of the grace of God, and love of Christ, and with the economy of God in the disposition of the causes and means of our salvation, that I shall never trouble myself to contend with them about these things.

Sundry other considerations I thought to have added to the same purpose; and to have showed (1) That to prove the necessity of inherent righteousness and holiness, we make use of the arguments which are suggested to us in the Scripture. (2) That we make use of all of them in the sense wherein, and to the ends for which they are urged therein, in a perfect consistency with what we teach concerning justification. (3) That all the pretended arguments or motives for and to evangelical holiness which are inconsistent with the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, do indeed obstruct and overturn it. (4) That the holiness which we make necessary to the salvation of them that believe, is of a more excellent, sublime and heavenly nature in its causes, essence, operations, and effects, than what is allowed or believed by the most of those by whom the doctrine of justification is opposed. (5) That the holiness and righteousness which is pleaded for by the Socinians and those that follow them, in nothing exceeds the "righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees," nor upon their principles can any man go beyond them. But whereas this discourse has already much exceeded my first intention, and as I said before I have already at large treated on the doctrine of the nature and necessity of evangelical holiness, I shall at present omit the further handling of these things, and acquiesce in the answers given by the Apostle to this objection.

CHAPTER XX.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE APOSTLE JAMES, CONCERNING FAITH
AND WORKS. ITS AGREEMENT WITH THAT OF PAUL.

THE seeming difference that is between the Apostles Paul and James in what they teach concerning faith, works, and justification, requires our consideration of it. For many take advantage from some words and expressions used by the latter, directly to oppose the doctrine fully and plainly declared by the former. But whatever is of that nature pretended has been so satisfactorily already answered and removed by others, that there is no great need to treat of it again. And although I suppose that there will not be an end of contending and writing in these causes, whilst "we know but in part, and prophesy but in part," yet I must say, that, in my judgment, the usual solution of this apparent difficulty, securing the doctrine of justification by faith through the imputation of the righteousness of Christ from any concernment or contradiction in the discourse of James, (chap. ii. 14, to the end,) has not been in the least impeached, nor has had any new difficulty put upon it in some late discourses to that purpose. I should therefore utterly forbear to speak any thing hereof, but that I suppose it will be expected in a discourse of this nature, and hope that I also may contribute some light to the clearing and vindication of the truth. To this purpose it may be observed, that (1) it is taken for granted on all hands, that there is no real repugnancy or contradiction between what is delivered by these two Apostles. For if that were so, the writings of one of them must be falsely ascribed to him whose name they bear and uncanonical, as the authority of the Epistle of James has been by some both of old and of late highly but rashly questioned. Wherefore their words are certainly capable of a just reconciliation. That we cannot attain thereto, or that we do not agree therein, is from the darkness of our own minds, the weakness of our understandings, and with too many, from the power of prejudices.

2. It is taken also for granted on all other occasions, that when there is an appearance of repugnancy or contradiction in any places of Scripture, if some, or any of them, do treat directly, designedly, and largely about the matter concerning

which there is a seeming repugnancy or contradiction, and others, or any other speak of the same things only occasionally, transiently, in order to other ends, the truth is to be learned, stated and fixed from the former places. Or the interpretation of those places where any truth is mentioned only occasionally with reference to other things or ends, is, as to that truth, to be taken from and accommodated to those other places wherein it is the design and purpose of the holy penman to declare it for its own sake, and to guide the faith of the church therein. There is not a more rational and natural rule of the interpretation of Scripture among all those which are by common consent agreed upon.

3. According to this rule, it is unquestionable that the doctrine of justification before God is to be learned from the writings of the Apostle Paul, and from them is light to be taken in all other places of Scripture where it is occasionally mentioned. Especially it is so, considering how exactly this doctrine represents the whole scope of the Scripture, and is witnessed to by particular testimonies, occasionally given to the same truth, without number. For it must be acknowledged that he wrote of this subject of our justification before God, on purpose to declare it for its own sake, and its use in the church, and that he does it fully, largely and frequently, in a constant harmony of expressions. And he owns those reasons that pressed him to fulness, and accuracy herein: (1) The importance of the doctrine itself. This he declares to be such, that thereon our salvation immediately depends; and that it was the hinge whereon the whole doctrine of the gospel turned,—*Articulus stantis aut cadentis Ecclesiæ*, Gal. ii. 16, 21; v. 4, 5. (2) The plausible and dangerous opposition, that was then made to it. This was so managed, and that with such specious pretences, that very many were prevailed on, and turned from the truth by it, as it was with the Galatians, and many detained from the faith of the gospel out of a dislike to it, Rom. x. 3, 4. What care and diligence this requires in the declaration of any truth is sufficiently known to them, who are acquainted with these things; what zeal, care and circumspection it stirred up the Apostle to, is manifest in all his writings. (3) The abuse which the corrupt nature of man is apt to put upon this doctrine of grace, and which some did actually pervert it to. This also he takes notice of, and thoroughly vindicates it from giving the least countenance to such wrestings and impositions. Certainly, never was there a greater necessity incumbent on any

person fully and plainly to teach and declare a doctrine of truth, than was on him at that time in his circumstances, considering the place and duty that he was called to. And no reason can be imagined why we should not principally and in the first place learn the truth herein, from his declaration and vindication of it, if withal we do indeed believe that he was divinely inspired, and divinely guided to reveal the truth, for the information of the church.

As to what is delivered by the Apostle James, so far as our justification is included therein, things are quite otherwise. He does not undertake to declare the doctrine of our justification before God, but having another design in hand, as we shall see immediately, he vindicates it from the abuse that some in those days had put it to, as other doctrines of the grace of God, which they turned into licentiousness. Wherefore it is from the writings of the Apostle Paul that we are principally to learn the truth in this matter, and to what is by him plainly declared is the interpretation of other places to be accommodated.

4. Some of late are not of this mind. They contend earnestly, that Paul is to be interpreted by James, and not on the contrary. And to this end they tell us that the writings of Paul are obscure, that sundry of the ancients take notice thereof, that many take occasion of errors from them, with sundry things of a like nature, indeed scandalous to the Christian religion; and that James writing after him, is presumed to give an interpretation to his sayings, which are therefore to be expounded and understood according to that interpretation. I answer, (1) As to the vindication of the writings of Paul, which begin now to be frequently reflected on with much severity, (which is one effect of the secret prevalency of the atheism of these days,) as there is no need of it, so it is designed for a more proper place. Only I know not how any that can pretend to the least acquaintance with antiquity can plead a passage out of Irenæus wherein he was evidently himself mistaken, or a rash word of Origen, or the like, in derogation from the perspicuity of the writings of this Apostle, when they cannot but know how easy it were to overwhelm them with testimonies to the contrary from all the famous writers of the church in several ages. For instance, Chrysostom in forty places gives an account why some men understood not Paul's writings, which in themselves were so gloriously evident and perspicuous. I shall refer them only to the preface to his Exposition of

his epistles, of which kind they will be directed to more in due season. But Paul needs not the testimony of men, nor of the whole church together, whose safety and security it is to be built on that doctrine which he taught. In the meantime it would not be unpleasant to consider (but that the perverseness of the minds of men is rather a real occasion of sorrow) how those who have the same design do agree in their conceptions about his writings; for some will have it, that if not all, yet the most of his epistles were written against the Gnostics, and in the confutation of their error; others, that the Gnostics took the occasion of their errors from his writings. So bold will men make with things divine, to satisfy a present interest.

Secondly, this was not the judgment of the ancient church for three or four hundred years. For whereas the epistles of Paul were always esteemed the principal treasure of the church, the great guide and rule of the Christian faith, this of James was scarce received as canonical by many, and doubted of by the most, as both Eusebius and Jerome testify.

Thirdly, the design of the Apostle James is not at all to explain the meaning of Paul in his epistles, as is pretended, but only to vindicate the doctrine of the gospel from the abuse of such as used their "liberty for a cloak of maliciousness," and "turning the grace of God into lasciviousness," continued in sin, under a pretence that grace had abounded to that end.

Fourthly, the Apostle Paul does himself, as we have declared, vindicate his own doctrine from such exceptions and abuses. Nor have we any other doctrine in his epistles, than what he preached all the world over, and whereby he laid the foundation of the Christian religion, especially among the Gentiles.

These things being premised, I shall briefly evidence that there is not the least repugnancy or contradiction between what is declared by these two Apostles, as to our justification, with the causes of it. And this I shall do, 1. By some general considerations of the nature and tendency of both their discourses. 2. By a particular explication of the context in that of James. And under the first head I shall manifest, (1) That they have not the same scope, design or end in their discourses; that they do not consider the same question, nor state the same case, nor determine on the same inquiry, and therefore not speaking to the same thing, do not contradict one another. (2) That as *faith* is a word of various signification in the Scripture, and as we have proved before denotes that which is of divers kinds, they speak not of the same faith, or faith of the

same kind, and therefore there can be no contradiction in what the one ascribes to it, and the other derogates from it, seeing they speak not of the same faith. (3) That they do not speak of *justification* in the same sense, nor with respect to the same ends. (4) That as to *works* they both intend the same, namely, the works of obedience to the moral law.

1. As to the scope and design of the Apostle Paul, the question which he answers, the case which he proposes and determines upon, are manifest in all his writings, especially his epistles to the Romans and Galatians. The whole of his purpose is to declare, how a guilty convinced sinner comes, through faith in the blood of Christ, to have all his sins pardoned, to be accepted with God, and obtain a right to the heavenly inheritance, that is, to be acquitted and justified in the sight of God. And as the doctrine hereof belonged eminently to the gospel, whose revelation and declaration to the Gentiles was in a peculiar manner committed to him, as we have lately observed, he had an especial reason to insist much upon it from the opposition that was made to it by the Jews and Judaizing Christians, who ascribed this privilege to the law, and our own works of obedience in compliance therewith. This is the case he states, this the question he determines in all his discourses about justification; and in the explication thereof declares the nature and causes of it, as also vindicates it from all exceptions. For whereas men of corrupt minds and willing to indulge their lusts (as all men naturally desire nothing but what God has made eternally inconsistent, namely, that they may live in sin here, and come to blessedness hereafter) might conclude that if it were as he declared, that we are justified freely through the grace of God by the imputation of a righteousness that originally and inherently is not our own, then was there no more required of us, no relinquishment of sin, no attendance to the duties of righteousness and holiness, he obviates such impious suggestions, and shows the consequence of them on the doctrine that he taught. But this he does not do in any place by intimating or granting that our own works of obedience or righteousness are necessary to, or have any causal influence upon, our justification before God. Had there been a truth herein, were not a supposition thereof really inconsistent with the whole of his doctrine and destructive of it, he would not have omitted the plea of it, nor ought so to have done, as we have shown. And to suppose that there was need that any other should explain and

vindicate his doctrine from the same exceptions which he takes notice of, by such a plea as he himself would not make use of, but rejects, is foolish and impious.

The Apostle James on the other hand had no such scope or design, or any such occasion for what he wrote in this matter. He does not inquire, or give intimation of any such inquiry; he does not state the case how a guilty convinced sinner, whose mouth is stopped as to any plea or excuse for himself, may be justified in the sight of God, that is, receive the pardon of sins, and the gift of righteousness to life. To resolve this question into our own works is to overthrow the whole gospel. But he had in hand a business quite of another nature. For as we have said, there were many in those days who professed the Christian religion or faith in the gospel, whereon they presumed that as they were already justified, so there was nothing more needful to them that they might be saved. A desirable estate they thought they had attained, suited to all the interest of the flesh, whereby they might live in sin, and neglect of all duty of obedience, and yet be eternally saved. Some suppose that this pernicious conceit was imbibed by them from the poisonous opinions that some had then divulged, according as the Apostle Paul foretold that it would come to pass, 2 Tim. iv. 1—3. For it is generally conceived that Simon Magus and his followers had by this time infected the minds of many with their abominations, and amongst them this was one, and not the least pernicious, “that by faith was intended a liberty from the law, and to sin, or unto them that had it, the taking away of all difference between good and evil;” which was afterwards improved by Basilides, Valentinus and the rest of the Gnostics. Or it may be it was only the corruption of men’s hearts and lives, that prompted them to seek after such a countenance to sin. And this latter I judge it was. There were then among professed Christians, such as the world now swarms with, who suppose that their faith, or the religion which they profess, be it what it may, shall save them, although they live in flagitious wickedness, and are utterly barren as to any good works or duties of obedience. Nor is there any other occasion of what he writes intimated in the epistle; for he makes no mention of seducers, as John does expressly and frequently, some while after. Against this sort of persons, or for their conviction he designs two things: (1) In general to prove the necessity of works to all that profess the gospel or faith in Christ thereby. (2) To evidence the vanity and folly of their

pretence to justification, or that they were justified and should be saved, by that faith that was indeed so far from being fruitful in good works, that it was pretended by them only to countenance themselves in sin. To these ends are all his arguings designed and no other. He proves effectually that the faith which is wholly barren and fruitless as to obedience, and which men pretended to countenance themselves in their sins, is not that faith whereby we are justified, and whereby we may be saved, but a dead carcass, of no use nor benefit, as he declares by the conclusion of his whole dispute, in the last verse of the chapter. He does not direct any how they may be justified before God, but convinces some that they are not justified by trusting to such a dead faith, and declares the only way whereby any man may really evidence and manifest that he is so justified indeed. This design of his is so plain, that nothing can be more evident, and they miss the whole scope of the Apostle who observe it not in their expositions of the context. Wherefore the principal design of the Apostles being so distant, there is no repugnancy in their assertions, though their words make an appearance thereof. For they do not speak *ad idem*, nor of things *eodem respectu*. James does not once inquire how a guilty convinced sinner, cast and condemned by the law, may come to be justified before God; and Paul speaks to nothing else. Wherefore apply the expressions of each of them to their proper design and scope, as we must do, or we depart from all sober rules of interpretation, and render it impossible to understand either of them aright, and there is no disagreement or appearance of it between them.

Secondly, they speak not of the same faith. Wherefore there can be no discrepancy in what one ascribes to faith, and the other denies concerning it, seeing they understand not the same thing thereby, for they speak not of the same faith. As if one affirms that fire will burn, and another denies it, there is no contradiction between them, whilst one intends real fire, and the other only that which is painted, and both declare themselves accordingly. For we have proved before that there are two sorts of faith wherewith men are said to believe the gospel, and make profession thereof, as also that which belongs to the one, does not belong to the other; none I suppose will deny but that by faith in the matter of our justification, Paul intends that which is *properly* so called. The faith of God's elect, precious faith, more precious than gold, the faith that purifies the heart, and works by love, the faith whereby Christ dwells in

us, and we abide in him, whereby we live to God, a living faith, is that alone which he intends. For all these things, and other spiritual effects without number, he ascribes to that faith which he insists on, to be on our part the only means of our justification before God. But as to the faith intended by the Apostle James, he assigns nothing of all this to it: yea, the only argument whereby he proves that men cannot be saved by that faith which he treats of, is that nothing of all this is found in it. That which he intends is, what he calls it, a dead faith, a carcass without breath, the faith of devils, a wordy faith, that is no more truly what it is called, than it is true charity to send away naked and hungry persons without relief, but not without derision. Well may he deny justification in any sense to this faith however boasted of, when yet it may be justly ascribed to that faith which Paul speaks of.

Bellarmino uses several arguments to prove that the faith here intended by James, is justifying faith considered in itself; but they are all weak to contempt, as being built on this supposition, that true justifying faith is nothing but a real assent to the catholic doctrine or divine revelation. De Justificat. lib. i. cap. 15. His first is, "that James calls it *faith* absolutely, whereby always in the Scripture true faith is intended." I answer, (1) James calls it a dead faith, the faith of devils, and casts all manner of reproach upon it, which he would not have done on any duty or grace truly evangelical. (2) Not every faith that is true as to the reality of assent which is given by it to the truth, is either living, justifying, or saving, as has been proved. (3) They are said to have faith absolutely or absolutely to believe, who never had that faith which is true and saving, John ii. 23; Act viii. 13. Secondly, he urges "that in the same place and chapter he treats of the faith of Abraham, and affirms that it wrought with his works, verses 22, 23. But this a vain shadow of faith does not do; it was therefore true faith, and that which is most properly called so, that the Apostle intends." Answer. This pretence is indeed ridiculous. For the Apostle does not give the faith of Abraham as an instance of that faith which he had treated with so much severity, but of that which is directly contrary to it, and whereby he designed to prove that the other faith which he had reflected on, was of no use nor advantage to them that had it. For this faith of Abraham produced good works, which the other was wholly without. Thirdly, he urges verse 24, "Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only;"

For the faith that James speaks of justifies with works, but a false faith, the shadow of a faith does not so; it is therefore true saving faith, whereof the Apostle speaks." Answer. He is utterly mistaken; for the Apostle does not ascribe justification partly to works, and partly to faith; but he ascribes justification in the sense by him intended, wholly to works in opposition to that faith concerning which he treats. For there is a plain antithesis in the words between works and faith as to justification in the sense by him intended. A dead faith, a faith without works, the faith of devils is excluded from having any influence upon justification. Fourthly, he adds "that the Apostle compares this faith without works to a rich man that gives nothing to the poor, verse 16, and a body without a spirit, verse 26: wherefore, as that knowledge whereby a rich man knows the wants of the poor is true and real, and a dead body is a body; so is faith without works true faith also, and as such is considered by Saint James." Answer. These things evidently destroy what they are produced to confirm; only the Cardinal helps them out with a little sophistry. For whereas the Apostle compares this faith to the charity of a man that gives nothing to the poor, he suggests in the room thereof his "knowledge" of their poverty. And his knowledge may be true, and the more true and certain it is, the more false and feigned is the charity which he pretends in these words, "be fed or clothed." Such is the faith the Apostle speaks of. And although a dead body is a true body, that is, as to the matter or substance of it, a carcass; yet is it not an essential part of a living man. A carcass is not of the same nature or kind as is the body of a living man. And we assert no other difference between the faith spoken of by the Apostle, and that which is justifying, than what is between a dead breathless carcass and a living animated body, prepared and fitted for all vital acts. Wherefore it is evident beyond all contradiction, if we have not a mind to be contentious, that what the Apostle James here derogates from faith as to our justification, respects only a dead, barren, lifeless faith, such as is usually pretended by ungodly men to countenance themselves in their sins. And herein the faith asserted by Paul has no concern. The consideration of the present condition of the profession of faith in the world, will direct us to the best exposition of this place.

Thirdly, they speak not of justification in the same sense nor to the same end. It is of our absolute justification before God, the justification of our persons, our acceptance with him,

and the grant of a right to the heavenly inheritance, that the Apostle Paul treats and thereof alone. This he declares in all the causes of it, all that on the part of God, or on our part, concurs thereto. The evidence, the knowledge, the sense, the fruit, the manifestation of it in our own consciences, in the church, to others that profess the faith, he treats not of, but speaks of them separately as they occur on other occasions. The justification he treats of, is but one, and at once accomplished before God, changing the relative state of the person justified, and is capable of being evidenced various ways to the glory of God and the consolation of them that truly believe. Hereof the Apostle James does not treat at all; for his whole inquiry is after the nature of that faith whereby we are justified, and the only way whereby it may be evidenced to be of the right kind, such as a man may safely trust to. Wherefore he treats of justification only as to the evidence and manifestation of it, nor had he any occasion to do otherwise. And this is apparent from both the instances, whereby he confirms his purpose. The first, is that of Abraham, ver. 21—23. For he says, that by Abraham being justified by works in the way and manner wherein he asserts him so to have been, “the Scripture was fulfilled, which says that Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness.” And if his intention were to prove that we are justified before God by works and not by faith, because Abraham was so, the testimony produced is contrary, yea directly contradictory to what should be proved by it, and accordingly is alleged by Paul to prove that Abraham was justified by faith without works, as the words plainly import. Nor can any man declare, how the truth of this proposition, “Abraham was justified by works,” intending absolute justification before God, was that wherein that Scripture was fulfilled,” “Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness;” especially, considering the opposition that is made both here and elsewhere between faith and works in this matter. Besides, he asserts that Abraham was justified by works then when he had offered his son on the altar; the same we believe also, but only inquire in what sense he was so justified. For it was thirty years or thereabout after it was testified concerning him, that he “believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness;” and when righteousness was imputed to him, he was justified. And twice justified in the same sense, in the same way, with the same kind of justification, he was

not. How then was he justified by works when he offered his son on the altar? He that can conceive it to be any otherwise, but that he was by his work in the offering of his son evidenced and declared in the sight of God and man to be justified, apprehends what I cannot attain to, seeing that he was really justified long before, as is unquestionable and confessed by all. He was I say then justified in the sight of God, in the way declared, Gen. xxii. 12; and gave a signal testimony to the sincerity of his faith and trust in God, manifesting the truth of that Scripture, "he believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness." And in the quotation of this testimony the Apostle openly acknowledges that he was really accounted righteous, had righteousness imputed to him, and was justified before God (the reasons and causes whereof, he therefore considers not) long before that justification which he ascribes to his works, which therefore can be nothing but the evidencing, proving and manifestation of it: whence also it appears of what nature that faith is whereby we are justified, the declaration whereof is the principal design of the Apostle. In brief, the alleged Scripture that "Abraham believed, and it was imputed to him for righteousness," was fulfilled when he was justified by works on the offering of his son on the altar, either by the imputation of righteousness to him, or by a real efficiency or working righteousness in him, or by the manifestation and evidence of his former justification, or some other way must be found out. (1) That it was not by imputation, or that righteousness to the justification of life was not then first imputed to him, is plain in the text; for it was so imputed to him long before, and that in such a way as the Apostle proves thereby that righteousness is imputed without works. (2) That he was not justified by a real efficiency of a habit of righteousness in him, or by any way of making him inherently righteous, who was before unrighteous is plain also, because he was righteous in that sense long before, and had abounded in the works of righteousness to the praise of God. It remains therefore, that then, and by the work mentioned, he was justified as to the evidencing and manifestation of his faith and justification thereon. His other instance is of Rahab, concerning which he asserts that she was justified by works when she had received the messengers and sent them away. But she received the spies by *faith*, as the Holy Ghost witnesses, Heb. xi. 31; and therefore had true faith before their coming; and if so, was really justified. For that any one

should be a true believer, and yet not be justified, is destructive of the foundation of the gospel. In this condition she received the messengers, and made to them a full declaration of her faith, Josh. ii. 10, 11. After her believing and justification thereon, and after the confession she had made of her faith, she exposed her life by concealing and sending them away. Hereby did she justify the sincerity of her faith and confession, and in that sense alone is said to be justified by works. And in no other sense does the Apostle James in this place make mention of justification, which he does also only occasionally.

Fourthly, as to "works" mentioned by both Apostles, the same works are intended, and there is no disagreement in the least about them. For as the Apostle James intends by works duties of obedience to God according to the law, as is evident from the whole first part of the chapter, which gives occasion to the discourse of faith and works; so the same are intended by the Apostle Paul also, as we have proved before. And as to the necessity of them in all believers, both to other ends, and as evidences of their faith and justification, it is no less pressed by the one than the other, as has been declared.

These things being in general premised, we may observe some things in particular from the discourse of the Apostle James, sufficiently evidencing that there is no contradiction therein, to what is delivered by the Apostle Paul concerning our justification by faith and the imputation of righteousness without works, nor to the doctrine which from him we have learned and declared; as (1) He makes no composition or conjunction between faith and works in our justification, but opposes them the one to the other, asserting the one and rejecting the other in order to our justification. (2) He makes no distinction of a first and second justification, of the beginning and continuation of justification, but speaks of one justification only, which is our first personal justification before God. Neither are we concerned in any other justification in this cause whatever. (3) He ascribes this justification wholly to works in contradistinction to faith, as to that sense of justification which he intended, and the faith whereof he treated. Wherefore (4) he does not at all inquire or determine how a sinner is justified before God, but how professors of the gospel can prove or demonstrate that they are so, and that they do not deceive themselves by trusting to a lifeless and barren faith. All these things will be further evidenced in a brief consideration of the context itself, wherewith I shall close this discourse.

In the beginning of the chapter to verse 14, he reproveth those to whom he wrote for many sins committed against the law, the rule of their sins and obedience, or at least warns them of them; and having showed the danger they were in hereby, he discovers the root and principal occasion of it, verse 14, which was no other but a vain surmise and deceiving presumption that the faith required in the gospel was nothing but a bare assent to the doctrine of it, whereon they were delivered from all obligation to moral obedience or good works, and might without any danger to their eternal state live in whatever sins their lusts inclined them to, chap. iv. 1—4; v. 1—5. The state of such persons which contains the whole cause which he speaks to, and which gives rule and measure to the interpretation of all his future arguings, is laid down, verse 14. "What doth it profit, my brethren, though a man say he hath faith and have not works? can faith save him?" Suppose a man, any one of those who are guilty of the sins charged on them in the foregoing verses, do yet say, or boast of himself, that he has faith, that he makes profession of the gospel, that he has left either Judaism or Paganism, and betaken himself to the faith of the gospel, and therefore although he be destitute of good works, and live in sin, he is accepted with God and shall be saved; will indeed this faith save him? This therefore is the question proposed: Whereas the gospel saith plainly, that "he who believeth shall be saved;" whether that faith which may and does consist with an indulgence in sin, and a neglect of duties of obedience, is that faith whereto the promise of life and salvation is annexed? And thereon, the inquiry proceeds, how any man, in particular he who says he hath faith, may prove and evidence himself to have that faith which will secure his salvation? And the Apostle denies that this is such a faith as can consist without works, or that any man can evidence himself to have true faith any otherwise but by works of obedience only. And in the proof hereof his whole ensuing discourse consists. Not once does he propose to consideration the means and causes of the justification of a convinced sinner before God, nor had he any occasion so to do. So that his words are openly wrested when they are applied to any such intention.

That the faith which he intends and describes, is altogether useless to the end pretended to be attainable by it, namely, salvation, he proves in an instance of, and by comparing it with the love or charity of a like nature, verses 15, 16. "If a brother

or sister be naked and destitute of daily food, and one of you say unto them, Depart in peace, be ye warmed and filled, notwithstanding ye give them not those things which are needful to the body, what doth it profit?" This love of charity is not that gospel grace which is required of us under that name; for he who behaves himself thus towards the poor, "the love of God dwelleth not in him," 1 John iii. 17. Whatever name it may have, whatever it may pretend to, whatever it may be professed or accepted for, *love* it is not, nor has any of the effects of love; it is neither useful nor profitable. Hence the Apostle infers, verse 17, "Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone." For this was what he undertook to prove, not that we are not justified by faith alone without works before God, but that the faith which is alone without works, is dead, useless and unprofitable.

Having given this first evidence to the conclusion which *in thesi* he designed to prove, he resumes the question and states it *in hypothesis*, so as to give it a more full demonstration, verse 15. "Yea a man may say, Thou hast faith, and I have works: show me thy faith without thy works, (that is, which is without works; or by thy works) and I will show thee my faith by my works." It is plain beyond denial, that the Apostle here again proposes his main question only on a supposition that there is a dead useless faith, which he had proved before. For now all the inquiry remaining is how true faith, or that which is of the right gospel kind, may be shown, evidenced or demonstrated, so that their folly may appear, who trust to any other faith whatever. Δείξον μοι τὴν πίστιν σου, "evidence or demonstrate thy faith" to be true by the only means thereof, which is works. And therefore although he says, "thou hast faith," that is, thou professest and boastest that thou hast that faith whereby thou mayest be saved, "and I have works," he does not say, "show me thy faith by thy works, and I will show thee my works by my faith," which the antithesis would require, but "I will show thee my faith by my works," because the whole question was concerning the evidencing of faith and not of works.

That this faith which cannot be evidenced by works, which is not fruitful in them, but consists only in a bare assent to the truth of divine revelation, is not the faith that justifies or will save us, he further proves, in that it is no other but what the devils themselves have; and no man can think or hope to be saved by that which is common to them with devils, and

wherein they do much exceed them, verse 11. "Thou believest there is one God; thou dost well; the devils also believe and tremble." The belief of one God is not the whole of what the devils believe, but is singled out as the principal fundamental truth, and on the concession whereof an assent to all divine revelation necessarily ensues. And this is the second argument, whereby he proves an empty barren faith to be dead and useless.

The second confirmation being given to his principal assertion, herestates it in that way, and under those terms wherein he designed it to its last confirmation. "But wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead?" verse 20. And we may consider in the words, (1) The person with whom he deals whose conviction he endeavoured; him he calls a "vain man," not in general, as every man living is "altogether vanity," but as one who in an especial manner is "vainly puffed up in his own fleshly mind," one that has entertained vain imaginations of being saved by an empty profession of the gospel, without any fruit of obedience. (2) That which he designs with respect to this vain man is his conviction, a conviction of that foolish and pernicious error that he had imbibed; "wilt thou know, O vain man?" (3) That which alone he designed to convince him of is, "that faith without works is dead;" that is, the faith which is without works, which is barren and unfruitful, is dead and useless. That *alone* is *all* that he undertakes to prove by his following instances, and arguings; neither do they prove any more. To wrest his words to any other purpose, when they are all proper and suited to what he expresses as his only design, is to offer violence to them.

This therefore he proves by the consideration of the faith of Abraham, verse 21. "Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar?" Some things must be observed to show the meaning of the Apostle herein. As (1) it is certain that Abraham was justified many years before the work instanced was performed: for long before was that testimony given concerning him, "he believed in the Lord, and he counted it unto him for righteousness," and the imputation of righteousness upon believing is all the justification we inquire after or will contend about. (2) It is certain that in the relation of the story here repeated by the Apostle, there is not any one word spoken of Abraham's being then justified before God, by that or any other work whatever.

But (3) it is plain and evident that in the place referred to, Abraham was declared to be justified by an open attestation to his faith and fear of God as sincere, and that they had evidenced themselves so to be, in the sight of God himself, which God condescends to express by an assumption of human affections, Gen. xxii. 12. "Now I know that thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son, from me." That this is the justification which the Apostle intends cannot be denied, but out of love to strife. And this was the manifestation and declaration of the truth and sincerity of his faith whereby he was justified before God. And hereby the Apostle directly and undeniably proves what he produces this instance for; namely, that "faith without works is dead." (4) It is no less evident that the Apostle had not spoken any thing before, as to our justification before God, and the means thereof; and it is therefore absurdly imagined here to introduce it in the proof of what he had before asserted, which it does not prove at all. (5) The only safe rule of interpreting the meaning of the Apostle, next to the scope and design of his present discourse, which he makes manifest in the reiterated proposition of it, and the scope of the places, is a matter of fact, with its circumstances which he refers to, and takes his proof from, and they were plainly these and no other. Abraham had been long a justified believer, for there were thirty years or thereabout, between the testimony given thereto, Gen. xv., and the story of sacrificing his son related Gen. xxii. All this while he "walked with God, and was upright" in a course of holy fruitful obedience. Yet it pleased God to put his faith, after many others, to a new, his greatest, his last trial. And it is the way of God in the covenant of grace, to try the faith of them that believe by such ways as seem meet to him. Hereby he manifests how precious it is (the trial of faith making it appear to be "more precious than gold," 1 Pet. i. 7,) and raises up glory to himself, which it is in the nature of faith to give to him, Rom. iv. 20. And this is the state of the case as proposed by the Apostle; namely, how it may be tried whether the faith which men profess be genuine, precious, more precious than gold, of the right nature with that whereto the gospel promise of salvation is annexed. 2. This trial was made by works or by one signal duty of obedience prescribed to him for that very end and purpose. For Abraham was to be proposed as a pattern to all that should afterwards believe. And God provided a signal way for the trial of his faith; namely

by an act of obedience, which was so far from being enjoined by the moral law that it seemed contrary to it. And if he be proposed to us as a pattern of justification by works in the sight of God, it must be by such works as God has not required in the moral law, but such as seem to be contrary thereto. Nor can any man receive any encouragement to expect justification by works, by telling him that "Abraham was justified by works, when he offered up his only son to God;" for it will be easy for him to say, that as no such work was ever performed by him, so none such was ever required of him. But 3. Upon Abraham's compliance with the command of God, given him in the way of trial, God himself after the manner of men, declares the sincerity of his faith and his justification thereon, or his gracious acceptance of him. This is the whole design of the place which the Apostle produces to his purpose; and it contains the whole of what he was to prove and no more. Plainly it is granted in it that we are not justified by our works before God, seeing he instances only a work performed by a justified believer many years after he was absolutely justified before God. But this is evidently proved hereby; namely, that faith without works is dead; seeing justifying faith, as is evident in the case of Abraham, is that and that alone, which brings forth works of obedience; for on such a faith alone, is a man evidenced, declared and pronounced to be justified or accepted with God. Abraham was not then first justified; he was not then said to be justified, he was declared to be justified, and that by and upon his works; which contains the whole of what the Apostle intends to prove.

There is therefore no appearance of the least contradiction between this Apostle and Paul, who professedly asserts that "Abraham was not justified before God by works." For James only declares that by the works which he performed after he was justified he was manifested and declared so to be. And that this was the whole of his design, he manifests in the next verses, where he declares what he had proved by this instance, ver. 22. "Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect?" Two things he enforces as proved to the conviction of him, with whom he had to do. (1) That true faith will operate by works; so did Abraham's, it was effective in obedience. (2) That it was "made perfect by works," that is, evidenced so to be. For *τελειος, τελειομαι* no where in the Scripture signify the internal, formal perfecting of any thing, but only the external comple-

ment or perfection of it, or the manifestation of it. It was complete as to its proper effect, when he was first justified; and it was now manifested so to be. See Matt. v. 48; Col. iv. 12; 2 Cor. xii. 9. This, says the Apostle, I have proved in the instance of Abraham; namely, that it is works of obedience alone that can evince a man to be justified, or to have that faith whereby he may be so. (3) He adds in the confirmation of what he had affirmed, ver. 23; "And the Scripture was fulfilled, which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness, and he was called the friend of God."

Two things the Apostle affirms herein. (1) That the Scripture mentioned was fulfilled. It was so in that justification by works which he ascribes to Abraham. But how this Scripture was herein fulfilled, either as to the time wherein it was spoken, or as to the thing itself, any otherwise but as that, which is therein asserted, was evidenced and declared, no man can explain; what the Scripture affirmed so long before of Abraham was then evidenced to be most true, by the works which his faith produced, and so that Scripture was accomplished. For otherwise, supposing the distinctions made between faith and works by himself, and the opposition that he puts between them, adding thereto the sense given of this place by the Apostle Paul, with the direct import of the words, and nothing can be more contradictory to his design; (namely, if he intended to prove our justification before God by works) than the quotation of this testimony. Wherefore this Scripture neither was nor can be otherwise fulfilled by Abraham's justification by works, but only that by and upon them he was manifested so to be. (2) He adds that hereon he was called the friend of God. So he is Isa. xli. 8, as also 2 Chron. xx. 7. This is of the same import with his being justified by works: for he was not thus called merely as a justified person, but as one who had received singular privileges from God, and answered them by a holy walking before him. Wherefore his being called the "friend of God" was God's approbation of his faith and obedience, which is the justification by works that the Apostle asserts.

Hereon he makes a double conclusion (for the instance of Rahab being of the same nature and spoken to before, I shall not insist again upon it,) (1) As to his present argument, verse 24. (2) As to the whole of his design, verse 26. The first is, that "by works a man is justified, and not by faith only."

“Ye see then;” you whom I design to convince of the vanity of that imagination, that you are justified by a dead faith, a breathless carcass of faith, a mere assent to the truth of the gospel and profession of it, consistent with all manner of impiety, and wholly destitute of good fruits, you may see what faith it is that is required to justification and salvation. For Abraham was declared to be righteous, to be justified on that faith which wrought by works, and not at all by such a faith as you pretend to. A man is “justified by works” as Abraham was, when he had offered up his son to God. That is, what he really was by faith long before, as the Scripture testifies, was then and thereby evidenced and declared. And therefore let no man suppose that by the faith which he boasts of, any one is or can be justified, seeing that whereon Abraham was declared to be so, was that which evidenced itself by its fruits. (2) He lays down that great conclusion which he had evinced by his whole disputation, and which at first he designed to confirm, verse 26. “For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also.” A breathless carcass and an unworking faith are alike, as to all the ends of natural or spiritual life. This was that which the Apostle designed from the beginning to convince vain and barren professors of, which accordingly he has given sufficient reason and testimony for.

THE END.

