

A RE-ASSERTION OF GRACE

OR, VINDICIAE EVANGELII.

A Vindication of the Gospel-truths, from the unjust censure and undue aspersions of Antinomians. In a modest Reply to Anthony Burgess: VINDICIAE LEGIS.

Also Samuel Rutherford's TRIAL AND TRIUMPH OF FAITH, from which also Mr. Geerie and Mr. Bedford may receive a satisfactory answer.

By ROBERT TOWNE

"They shall put you out of the synagogues; yea, the time cometh, that whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service." John 16:2.

"Ye are of God, little children, and have overcome them; because greater is he that is in you, than he that is in the world." I John 4:4.

ORIGINALLY PRINTED IN 1654

COMPLETE & UNABRIDGED

Supralapsarian Press

2014 EDITION

THE PREFACE

The written Papers of this Book, originally under the Authors own hand, did accidentally fall under my view, by means of a faithful friend and brother, who first gave me intelligence that there was such a work in hand but not as yet perfected; and afterward obtaining a sight of it in its primary engrossing, he borrowed the same for a time, in which he might peruse and read them over, and so in the interim, before they were returned to the owner, they came to me, the which when I had considered, I found therein a composure of very excellent matter, the doctrine of the Law of God truly published in its lightning lustre, and native purity, drawn forth from under the veiling glosses with which it lay a covered {the mere inventions of Satan transformed into an angel of light} and restored to its former integrity, and proper use; as silver, tried in a furnace of earth purified seven times; so that Sinai's thunderclaps, or the bolts of Horeb do here appear shot out, the clouds and pharisaical expositions {darkening the counsel of God by words without knowledge} being dissolved and broken asunder.

And moreover, that the fainting sinner might not utterly be excluded, I found comprised therein, the bringing to light of life and immortality through the Gospel, the opening of the kingdom of heaven, the doors being largely expanded in Christ's own way and method of preaching; which reason, and the seeds of the Serpent sown therein {the enemy to the simple truth of God} hath endeavored by all subtle workings, and secret insinuations, either wholly to shut, or else to open, and but only halfway, by the key of such legal qualifications, that there is no possibility for any heart sensibly discovered, by the doors so opened, to enter in. Only the hypocrite, who lives in a fool's paradise

{feigned with a vain imagination of his own conditional goodness} doth concededly seem to himself to enter into the kingdom of heaven, by that way which Satan hath prepared, and cast up, but the issues thereof are the issues of death, leading to Jericho, the accursed city; so that this he shall have in the end, he shall lie down in sorrow; and because he thinks that he seeth, therefore his sin remaineth; for the end cannot be enjoyed but only in God's own way, appointed by Himself, which way thou shalt find most clearly held out, and convincingly proved in these ensuing treatises, to be Christ Himself, by whom the believing heart hath access to God, and comes with boldness to the throne of grace, no man coming to the Father but by Him; and also that he is the Door, ready to entertain and receive into peaceable habitations and sure dwellings, all such as are wounded with the invenomed arrows of their hidden abominations, and stand trembling under the hand of God, fearful of His fiery wrath, and justly deserved indignation; which none may abide, nor otherwise can avoid. And that Christ is the Truth of the brazen serpent which is lifted up upon the pole in the wilderness, not for the whole, but for the mortally wounded to look unto; and the Water of Life to cool and refresh the withered heart, parched with the heat of sin; at the which, as still waters the weak sheep may drink, which otherwise were not able to stand in, or withstand the boisterous streams, and hold its footing in the clashing waves; so that out of His belly flows the rivers of Living Water. And the good Shepherd, who fully manages that relation for the good of his tender ones, he feeds his flock, like a Shepherd he gathers the lambs with his arm, and carries them in his bosom, and gently leads those that are with young. The Vine, in which the branches live, and in whom His people enjoy their life by faith, being dead in themselves through the Law, so that what they have or

enjoy doth proceed and issue forth from that Root so full of moisture of which fullness they receive, and grace for grace. They live, but it is in Him who is their Life; they are righteous, and that completely, but it is through His Robes; they are cleansed and washed, but it is by His blood; they are accepted, but it is in the Beloved; they are adopted, but it is in the first begotten amongst many brethren; their hearts are purified, but it is by the faith of the Son of God; they are free from condemnation, but it is because they are in Christ Jesus, for to such there is no condemnation. Nay, reckon up all their participations, and we shall find that they are in and proceed from Him who is the Head; that in all things He might have the preeminence. So that, what have they, but what they have received? And a believing man may say most truly, "in Christ I have and am all things, but out of Him I am nothing, less than nothing and vanity."

And why should this doctrine be so impugned; when as it ought rather to be highly extolled and magnified in heart, press, and pulpit, seeing it lifts up and establisheth the mountain of the house of the Lord in the top of the mountains, and exalts it above the hills, and does but fulfill this saying of Isaiah, where the prophet speaks in the Person of God Himself, "behold my servant {meaning Christ} shall deal prudently, He shall be exalted and extolled, and be very high," though many should be astonished at Him; because His visage {not appearing comely to the eye of flesh and blood} was so marred more than any man, and his form more than the sons of men. {Isa.52:13,14} But what God in Himself, or his Word, hath most highly exalted, that Satan, always an enemy to the truth of God and the seed of the woman, does endeavor to depress and strike underfoot. But in spite of all his enmity, the truth will break out from amongst all the thick clouds of slanders, and neither by his power nor policy shall be suppressed

for he can but touch its heel. The Ensign must be lifted up for the distressed of the Nations to repair unto and his rest shall be glorious; and he cannot let it, for its the work of God in which he will be glorified, so that although the enemy come in like a flood, yet the Spirit of the Lord shall lift up a standard against him or put him to flight. But because he is the accuser of the brethren day and night, therefore he will never be quiet, but will return afresh with a new encounter, so that it can never be expected, that a truce shall be stricken, and a real peace concluded between the seed of the Woman and of the Serpent, or that the child of the flesh will be at rest and sit still whilst he is in the recovery and view of the promised seed, or the child that is borne after the spirit. But what matter? For he that keeps Israel neither slumbers nor sleeps, and these do but crack the shell {if so much} but cannot reach to the kernel. And the greatest enemies are those within, of a man's own household which solace themselves with the outward, but are a bane to the inner man, which daily accompany us, and are our bosom companions, nourished up together in and with us, and yet little do we perceive them.

I having lighted upon this work, and perceiving the main scope thereof to tend to a vindication and clearing of the bare and naked truth of God from aspersions of obloquie cast thereon, and such glosses under which it lay obscured, and a plain unwavering and free publishing of the Gospel, as the vein of good tidings, through which the blood of Christ runs freely to sinners, did set pen to paper, and copy it out; and having so done, I returned the original draught to the owner, but expecting a good while its coming forth in another garment to public view under the Author's own papers, and not hearing anything of it, and the Author living at a distance from me, I was afraid lest the child,

through these national cumbers and troubles of late, should have been smothered in the womb, and not have been produced to light in a current hue to the Judgment of all, that men might try all things, but hold fast that which is good. And thereupon, I endeavored that thou mightest have a sight thereof in this habit, in which it is now presented to thee, by making use of my own papers. From the which if thou shalt {through God's giving of the increase} receive the least profit, though but as a grain of mustard-seed, or satisfaction by the clear light of the truth itself, in any one of the controversies agitated in the ensuing discourse, I know that the Author will therein exceedingly rejoice; delighting if in anything he may be beneficial to the Church, or the least in the Church of God. And I shall also receive the full recompense of my labor, if in the least manner I or rather God by me {as a weak instrument} should be pleased to do any good, who am less than the least of all his mercies.

**Thine in the Lord,
Seth Bushell.**

AN ADMONITION TO THE READER

Gentle Reader,

I Could not but give mine attest concerning this Author, and Book; he being a person known unto me for many years, and I can justly witness that he hath been, and is, a godly and faithful Minister, one whom I believe hath for many years tasted of, and enjoyed the truth, as it is in Jesus, and walked blamelessly in the simplicity and power thereof. Having been made, through the grace of God, a constant, and zealous instrument to bear forth his testimony against all unrighteousness of men, fleshly wisdom, carnal forms, and legal worship {though through much persecution, scandal, and suffering} wherein I judge him a faithful steward of the talent committed to his charge, being upheld through faith by the mighty power of God; and I cannot but much rejoice that God hath at this season drawn forth his spirit to oppose that Antichristian darkness, and fleshly wisdom that reigns in the children of disobediences, and I hope and pray that the Lord will bless it to the same end, unto which purpose he commends it to all that know and love the Lord in truth and sincerity; I am he who remains the lowest and least of Saints,

John Webster, December, 26, 1653.

SECOND PREFACE

Christian and Courteous Reader,

There is a little book called The Assertion of Grace, printed without my privity by some well-wishers to the truth as it is in Jesus, {if yet thou hast seen it;} that, with Dr. Crisp's Sermons and Eaton's Honeycombe of Free Justification by Christ Alone, being thronged with pikes of despite ever since their publication, have occasioned this Re-Assertion, to rescue and vindicate {if it be possible} the credit and truth of each, wherein they have too long suffered.

The times are so frowning, and the fiery spirit of indignation so over-swaying, that I cannot promise, but rather do fear the not printing of it. The Author is {as that faithful Martyr, England's Apostle, as Mr. Fox calls him, said of himself} ill-favored to the world-ward, much despised; yet he casteth it upon the venture, as was Moses cast upon the water. Providence may so over-rule and order, that something of God appearing in it, with which being enamored, one or other may befriend it with a Printed-publication. But if it have not free passage, let it shame the Adversaries, being a witness of my confidence, but of their fear.

This is the grand Controversy in our Land this day. The bloody sword hath passed through it. The Prerogative Royal, our Subject-liberties, estates, lives, are laid at the stake; but Free-grace is the richest and chief-Diamond belonging to the Crown of our King Jesus; and what are all these that we hazard or can lose, to our spiritual freedom, peace of conscience, everlasting life, and that exceeding glorious condition in God's Kingdom! The loss of one soul, the damnation of it in hell, is more considerable than all these; yea, if thou add the whole world's worth, it cannot by them all be

ransomed. Church-government is a fair flower, in its native and original purity, if so it could be happily planted and made to grow; but this is the Prime-rose of the Church-garland. What is Discipline to Doctrine? The moral and temporary education, to the spiritual regeneration, and endless blessedness? Indeed, I am in the lowest Classis, the weakest and un-fittest of all to undertake and manage this quarrel. I could wish it were done with far more dexterity, by one furnished with better gifts and leisure. But I see a Providence herein; for no man shows himself willing; and I have been engaged; and so it seems ordinary with the Lord to perfect his power in human weakness. The instrument can want no virtue or efficacy, which he will use, to effect what he is pleased. Besides, there is a prevalent, yea omnipotent power in Truth itself, when it shows forth its native lustre. All his adversaries could not resist the wisdom in which Stephen spoke. These men came forth Goliath-like, full of stomach, and with resolution to lay all level with the earth; down with them, down with these Antinomians, and sons of Belial, even to the ground they cry out. But like some Meteors, that give a fiery flash of light a short time, and for want of matter are forthwith spent and extinguished; so these champion spirits are now much cooled, and their courage abated. Look now on them whom being at a distance defied the invincible Verity, how presently upon the first onset their eyes be sore dazzled, and their minds dazed, with the glory and presence thereof! Like them, Psal.48:4-6, they seem half vanquished already. What may a few more rays and beams effect? I hope ere long to see my desire, viz. the Truth cleared, and received in love by both sides, and our selves happily thought to be friends. O our God! This is easy with thee; in the interim, do they not decline the battle, and yield in great part what was contended for? For, now they

assert not that the Law is without a condemning power, but that it doth not actually condemn a believer. So, the Covenant {though opposed at first} is now not properly conditional, saith Mr. Rutherford, "the whole of it lieth on God, and is given and wrought of mere free grace." Likewise, the Law was said to be the instrument of Regeneration and Conversion, but now Mr. Burgess is brought to this, that it is a practical and operative means appointed to work, at least in some degree, that which is commanded. Mr. Rutherford giveth it a tender touch, as if he were afraid or unwilling to meddle much with it.

And they are pleased to mistake the controverted points, and so to quarrel for what we never asserted, nor questioned; as, 1, they contend for the inherency of sin after justification. Who denied it? 2. That Christ was not intrinsically and actively a sinner. But whoever affirmed so horrid a blasphemy? 3. That believers are subject to the Cross. 4. Believers are to hate sin, as sin, though freed from the peril of condemnation, &c., now who fight they against? They may seek their adversaries. 5. We decry duties, say they; are against Repentance; teach that the Law is of no use; would cast it out of the Church. But where do they read or find these? The Accuser of the brethren can help them to enough of the like stamp.

Also, in many other of the main things they strangely shuffle and shift in the business; for though they make a fair flourish in the eyes of the simpler sort, who are not able to look thoroughly into them; yet a judicious spirit seeth their arguments without nerves, or their grounds to be sandy and failing. And Mr. Burgess {above all} hath devised unheard-of distinctions, and much quaint divinity, all to support their rotten and tottering tenets. And it is no sin with them to bely, disguise us, and with open mouth to declaim against us,

as Antinomians, sons of Belial, Seducers, Libertines, disobedient, unholy, profane, &c., which are our genuine epithets, and right characters, saith their prime Doctor. Such lies, indignities, and falsehoods, either are no breaches of their law, or it wanteth power to condemn them; as they are privileged for impunity. But this is to beget and breed misconception and undeserved hatred of our persons in the minds of people, that so the truth of doctrine may be suspected and despised. But whoso is wise will see with his own eyes, and not receive all by tradition. When shalt thou learn the pure and genuine Protestant doctrine, of a faithless Papist?

Lastly, the manor of their proceeding against us doth convincingly argue their great diffidence in their Cause. For, 1, motions for a loving and brotherly meeting and conference, or to write pro & con, or to set down the chief tenets of both sides, that so they might be seen and examined, have still been refused; whereas for number they were ten to one. Either we must go in their way without question or scruple of anything, or "out with us." These are their own words.

2. Being written unto, they would not answer. Yet certain of their noted disciples have with oily words come and urged me, as the Jews did Christ, to speak many things, still saying they intended me no harm; I must not have such a thought of them; and at our parting gave me the hand never to open their mouth more against me. And yet the next news was that out of our Conference, misconstruing and perverting what was said, they had compiled and exhibited to the Bishop eighteen Propositions or Articles. By this kind of Ministers and Professors {who can set a fair gloss on all their doings, pretending much of God, and for his Law} I have been brought into divers Courts, and into the High-Commission-Court, where I was twice imprisoned, my Ministry restrained, and I compelled to attend the Court

two years together; and all that while, nothing was proved, no adversary would show his face. At last, I was dismissed, nothing worthy the least punishment being found in me. Afterward, a Minister in Lancashire excepted against my Sermon, termed it a dish of poison; and being much pressed, through the importunity of one year, a Gentleman prevailed so far, that I should know my error before four divines of his own choosing, so that they might be Judges. Motion was made, that I might name one; but it would not be granted. And the error was, that I said the Covenant of Grace was absolute and free in respect of man. The divines were of his mind; {and he knew that beforehand,} and thus they unanimously concluded that I was in the error. I desired to know the Condition; and thus, the gravest and prime of them answered, that good works was the condition of the Covenant of Grace. Then I demanded, what was the condition of the covenant of Works; or wherein they differed? So in some passion and discontent they arose, and we parted. This was in the Prelates time; so not long after, I was cited again to Chester, where I found an odious black Bill exhibited by Sir John Lucifuga. Since that, I was summoned before the Ministers at Manchester, where they charged me with old things. I told them, that I was falsely accused; and that I had already given satisfaction to the Court. But that should not serve to acquit me, said they; and a Minister, unknown to me, informed them, that he heard me deliver many Antinomian errors in Stopworth. Where prove that ever I preached, I would lose my head. But I desired to know some one error, and could not. They voted me out of my place and ministry, and by virtue of a pretended Ordinance of Parliament, commanded me to leave Lancashire, and would not let me stay out my Quarter; yet I did; and then a letter was procured from the Colonel to

apprehend and imprison me. My offer was, to let me have justice, and I would justify what I taught and held, and let them see their errors, {an easy thing to do;} but they refused. Then I went to London, with intention to Petition the Parliament; but friends who had better intelligence and experience, dissuaded and deterred me. So finding little hope of relief, I returned, and removed my family into Yorkshire; so giving place to their fiery zeal.

Gentle Reader, I have presumed on thy patience, in setting down these passages; by which it is clear, that they seek themselves, and not Christ and his Truth; and chose rather to use Club-law, as did Cain, the false Prophets, Pharisees, and Hypocrites in all times of persecution, to extinguish or suppress the light of heaven, then that it should discover their nakedness and shame. If thou ask, why are they bent and enraged more against you, that they call Antinomians, than any other Sect?

Answer, they can tell thee great things; and would have thee believe we are unworthy to live in any Commonwealth. But the truth is, and many of them cannot be ignorant of it, we teach only what is Orthodox, and the old-received truths of God; and do desire no more favor, than what Justice can deny to none; namely, permission to speak for ourselves, before we be condemned. Only they see the inconsistency of divers of our Tenets with theirs; and Dagon or the Ark must fall; and how questionable and unjustifiable their assertions are to any indifferent capacity, viewing and considering them in the true light, and therefore would put out our candle. It would make a Christian face to blush, or his heart rather to bleed, to hear what stuff they can put off and vent in their Sermons. I resorted to their Exercises divers years, yet never heard one doctrine of Free-grace, of Christ, Faith, or Justification.

Legal Reformation is taken for Regeneration and Evangelical Sanctification, &c. I have spoken with old and zealous professors, who knew not what it was to be justified by faith, except this was the meaning of it, that God would accept of them for their good works and duties. If anyone {which yet nature is principled for} be framed and brought somewhat into a Legal way, and to performances, he is judged a true Convert, and may set up his rest. If they do well, they tell you they can believe sufficiently; upon their kind of works they build their faith. The Law is not preached as the ministry of death, to cast down and to kill, that Christ may be the life and spiritual resurrection; but the life that most speak of, is to live and walk in the Law; yet Paul saith, "I by the Law am dead to the Law, that I may live to God." {Gal.2:19} I am resolved of this, that if people had experience of a sensible death working in them by the Law, and that nothing but the curse and wrath could be had in their works and ways; and had felt as sensibly a reviving and quickening in the faith and apprehension of Christ, there would be little ground of difference remaining; but till that be, or at least, that the Law be preached for death, and not for life and peace, as too many do, how can the controversy be ended?

But flesh and blood may object, what good success can I promise to this my enterprise? I go against the full tide and violent current of human policy and learning of such a religious multitude, all being combined and conspiring against me. Are not my adversaries in number infinite, better qualified, admired for sanctity and zeal, backed and invested with worldly Authority, countenanced by the times, and the sole-esteemed pillars of the Church? What am I? How dare I oppose them? Who is my Patron?

My answer is that, 1, I do not come forth in mine own name or strength, nor measure myself with them;

for then hope of prevailing is gone. But when God is set against them, and his invincible Truth, so opposed by them, how vain and light then are all these powers and excellencies? 2. I have been carried against the stream almost these twenty years, yet they could not prevail, by reason of the Lord's strength and presence. 3. However the voyage fall out, I have not much left to lose, only my outward liberty in part, and a few days, it may be, of my natural life can be in jeopardy. And hath the sacred Truth of God, and the desired good of his Church been so prevalent, that for their sakes I have sustained such loss, suffered so many things already; and shall I now shrink, or be unwilling to sacrifice the loan of what is remaining? The Lord leave me not to that temptation. 4. In all their opposition, I see nothing to convince, but am rather thereby confirmed. They would see a mote in Dr. Crisp's eye, but will not see a beam in their own. If to myself I were guilty of any their unworthy imputations, or of doing or yet offering a hundredth part of that wrong I received from them; or if my conscience did not witness with me, that I had sought to give unto them all possible satisfaction, more than was desired, or would be accepted of; then I should not have that inward peace and contentment which now I enjoy in Christ. And, 5, lastly, why should I desire a Patron, and so become injurious to any in engaging them, or rendering them to be suspected? I know the Truth is able to protect itself, and the servant of it; and further than I am found in the way of Verity, I seek no shelter. "The name of the LORD is a strong tower; the righteous runneth into it, and is safe." {Prov.18:10} "Thou hast seen it; for thou beholdest mischief and spite, to requite it with thy hand; the poor committeth himself unto thee; thou art the helper of the fatherless." {Psal.10:14}

Robert Towne

VINDICIAE EVANGELII

SIR,

Your other Advantages are many; but God and his Truth are with us, therefore we may be confident in our just Cause and Quarrel, and the Victory is certainly ours. Your whole College and Assembly approve of and commend your Book; that is, I confess, cause of sadness and grief to my spirits, but not one jot of terror? Truth is of more weight and authority with me than the Consent and Judgment of all the Learning and Principalities in the world; and as Luther wrote, "I prefer one Paul before the writings of a thousand others, &c."

You anticipate our expectation of your future Reply, in your Preface to the Reader; I hope you will not; for I perceive by this, that the light of Truth hath almost overcome you; a little more glory of it may happily both convince and convert also. But your Ground or Reason of not Replying is a presumptuous conceit, over-confidence and overly high esteem of this your elaborate and profound Treatise, which is become as a Sun, newly risen in our Church; the which, if it let us not see what is Truth, what is Error, a thousand Suns cannot. It had been well, if you had brought one of the least beams of the true Sun. In Job we read of one who darkened knowledge; and I am sure the true Sun of Righteousness doth not shine forth to the world any more clearly by these Lectures. To say no more.

I could reduce all your Exceptions and the Points in controversy to a few heads, which I find disspread and infinitely repeated; but then perhaps you would think yourself somewhat wronged, or else the Reader would not be so fully satisfied. Therefore, as you do, so I am forced to set before him the same dish of twice-sodden

cabbage, a sure way to sickness; and yet leisure will not serve {as would prove too tedious} to speak to all your Book; for my intent then is only to examine what you wrote against your special eye-sore, the Antinomian, how candidly you deal with him, and how solidly you confute his Positions or Tenets.

LECTURE I

Objection: Mr. Burgess, and his Text, I Tim.1:8,9, "we know that the law is good, if a man use it lawfully, &c."

Assertion: In Page 3 & 4, you say, the Law is good in three several Respects; in the prosecution of all which, I could except against divers things, but that I shall have often occasion, and a more proper place to speak them all afterwards.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, page.4, "if Law is good in respect of the Sanction of it; for it is accompanied with Promises, &c., and therefore the Law doth include Christ secondarily and occasionally, though not primarily."

Assertion: I stand musing at this your novel assertion that the Moral Law {for of this you will have us to understand not the Ceremonial} doth include Christ; whereas the Apostle saith, Rom.3:21, "now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested;" and, Gal. 3.12, "the Law is not of Faith." Now if the Doctrine of Christian Righteousness and Faith be not contained in the Law, I see not how Christ should be there included. And yet you presently add, it's true, the righteousness of the Law and that of the Gospel differ entirely, we must place one in the highest part of heaven and the other in the bottom end of the earth, as Luther. Now I thus argue that Christ and his Righteousness are inseparable. If Christ's Righteousness {which is the only Righteousness of the Gospel} be as

far above, and out of the bounds of the Law, as the highest part of Heaven is distant from the lowest part of the Earth, then it is impossible that Christ should any way be included in the Law. Or, if you will make the Law more capacious, and of far larger extent than is the righteousness of it; so that the righteousness of the Law must be kept below, but the Law itself filleth Heaven and Earth, or is above as well as below, even where Christ is. This is your New Divinity, a late upstart indeed; for it is strange to see what shifts you are often put unto and how you do strain your wits {if not conscience also;} for as you want no good-will to maintain and uphold the tottering Ministry and Doctrine of your Party, so perceiving Dr. Taylor and others in a way scarce justifiable, and to use Arguments and distinctions not solid, and ineffectual to convince the Adversary or to confirm your Opinions, you are thus resolved to go in an un-beaten and new-found path, in hope to affect your desire. But to proceed; for know also that your said Author, Dr. Luther, saith, "that Christ is no more in the Law, nor yet the Christian, than Christ is now in the grave, or Peter in the Prison." Again, saith he, "a believer is out of the limits of the Law, in another Kingdom, &c." How far your secondarily and occasionally shall be made to extend, or how you will expound them, I know not; for you promise more hereafter, &c.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "it's the hardest task in Divinity, to give them {Law and Gospel} their bounds."

Assertion: Yet you have undertaken that most difficult task, and presume to have done it, though failed in your bold attempts.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "it's true, if we take Law and Gospel in this strict difference, as some divines do, that all the Precepts wherever they are, must be under the Law and all the Promises be reduced to the Gospel, whether in the Old or New Testament; in which sense

divines then say, that which the Law requires is obtained by faith, and the Law can have no Sanction by the Promise, but where can this be showed in Scripture?"

Assertion: What struggling is here to evade? Your reading exceeds mine; for I remember none who so reduced and marshaled Precepts and Promises? If I credit you in this, it is not material, for I am sure, that all Orthodox divines that I've read, and the Scripture, do witness, that there be legal Promises which be conditional; as, he that doth these things, shall live in them, Gal.3:12; and to them who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory, and honor, and immortality, is promised eternal life, Rom.2:7; and that the Gospel-Promises are absolute and free, being only founded in Christ, in whom they have their sanction and establishment. "For all the promises of God in him are yea, and in him Amen, unto the glory of God by us." {II Cor.1:20} Secondly, Augustine, Luther, Calvin, Zanchy, Melancthon, with others, in whom we read those expressions, and the like, viz., that what is only propounded and commanded in the Law, is obtained, wrought and established by the grace and faith of the Gospel; according to that in Rom.3:31; we through faith establish the Law. These Authors, I say, do yet make a clear difference between Evangelical and Legal Promises, and therefore cannot be understood in this your sense. But lastly, if the Spirit do convert, quicken, and give power by the Precepts, and in and by commanding, God do convey his grace of Regeneration, {which is your Opinion,} then this question is to no purpose, whether all the Promises be reduced to the Gospel, or not; for neither can it be truly affirmed then, that the Law is established by the Grace and Faith of the Gospel, which yet is both according to the verity of Scripture, and the testimonies of all sound Authors, as is already showed.

Now let the Reader judge, or yourself, whether the Law can have Sanction by promise, or no.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "I wonder much at an Antinomian Author, saying that it cannot be a Law, unless it also be a cursing Law; for besides that, the same Author doth acknowledge the Moral Law to be a Rule to a Believer; and this rule has the force of precept as well as doctrine."

Assertion: The Author you mention doth grant the Law to be a perpetual and inviolable Rule of Righteousness; but that it is a Rule to a Believer as such, he will not grant. 2. It is true, it hath the force of precept as well as doctrine, and so it hath the power of condemnation, a power to curse, as he there affirms, and you neither have nor can refute.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "what will he say to the Law given to Adam, who yet was righteous and innocent, and therefore could not be cursing or condemning of him?"

Assertion: You mean not, that the Law had no power to curse and condemn, because Adam was innocent; for you grant it had that potentially, though not actually. If then it did not actually curse, it was not because the Law lacked that power, but in that state of innocency there was no place, nor reason actually to curse. Henceforth wonder not at the Author for saying the Law hath power to curse {which is denied by Dr. Taylor and yourself,} but wonder at your own oversight, who while you would oppose and confute your Adversary, do grant and affirm all he requireth; and yet in your Lecture 6, you deny this power to curse to be any essential part of the Law. When Adam had sinned, whether did the Law actually condemn or no? If yes, I demand then, whether it were by that authority and power it had before, or some new and further power was given it upon the fall. Did not the Law say to him, yet in

innocency, "in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die?" {Gen.2:17} How was it that it threatened death, and forbad the eating under such a fearful penalty, if it had yet no power to execute and inflict the same? You must now yield and cease, or fight on with your own shadow.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "in respect of the Use of the Law to Believers, it hath this Use; namely, to excite and quicken them against all sin and corruption, &c., because none of the godly are perfectly righteous, and there is none but may complain of his dull love, and his faint delight in holy things; therefore the Law of God by commanding doth quicken him, &c. Have not Believers much crookedness, hypocrisy and much lukewarmness?"

Assertion: The love of God in Christ revealed and shed abroad in the heart, doth quicken; but the simple Command of the Moral Law, can never effect what you say. He that loveth the Lord, truly hates sin; but we love the Lord, not by reason of the Law requiring it, but because he hath loved us first, I Jn.4:19, and that we be born of God, and know God in his Son. It is strange divinity, that the flesh and wickedness of our nature should be cured or weakened by the Law; for the Law may indeed discover the malady or disease, but not remedy it. Put the Law to the old man, it will revive and quicken it indeed, but not to godliness in Christ; for if we may believe either Scripture or our own experience, we be brought to the realization that "the strength of sin is the Law," I Cor.15:56; and "when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died." {Rom.7:9} Such is the poisonous enmity in us by the first Adam, that it maketh head against the plaster of the Law, being applied unto it. The old man or flesh is enmity to God and to all godliness, Rom.8:7, and the more it is stirred and quickened by the Law, the more it is enraged; but

contrarily, the Head of the Body {that is, the Church} is Christ, from whom it hath nourishment ministered, and so increaseth with the increase of God; and by this means the body of sin is weakened and abolished. "For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." {Col.2:9} Our Sanctification is not begun nor perfected by legal precepts and pressings, but by our true and effectual union with Christ. "The branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye, except ye abide in me. I am the vine, ye are the branches; he that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit; for without me ye can do nothing." {Jn.15:4,5}

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "in the third Use of the Law, page 9, how absurd then are they, that say the preaching of the Law is to make men trust in themselves, and to adhere to their own righteousness?"

Assertion: It may be truly said, that too many so preach the Law, that they establish man's righteousness; for this is in the mouth of divers; as the minister saith, "do well, and have well;" and we are taught, that the way to come to glory in Heaven is to glorify God on Earth by good works, for {as they say} Christ saves none but those that are holy, &c. If the Law were used to discover sin, not to cover it; to weaken and destroy, not to strengthen and build up; to bind and cast out, not to loose, release and admit; and if the veil were taken from the face of Moses, and the glory of God in his fiery and terrible Law did break forth, so that all found it to be a Ministration of death and condemnation; this would be a means to kill and overthrow all self-confidence and boasting; but who doth make that use of it? Not one of twenty; and yourself cannot receive the Law and digest it under such a terrifying and damning notion.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "the Antinomian, page 11, before he speaks anything against or about the Law, must show in what sense the Apostle useth it."

Assertion: Your Antinomian is as good a friend to the Law as yourself; for neither do you, nor yet can you, make it appear, that he speaks one word against the Law. You are too bold in saying that the Apostle argues against the Law in any sense; but if you so charge him, your conscience may give way to slander us.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "be cautious, page 13, to distinguish between a believer and his personal acts; for the sins of believers are condemned, as they are guilty of God's wrath, though not their persons."

Assertion: This nice and groundless distinction of yours was likewise Dr. Taylor's shift, as it is yours; for you might have seen the vanity of it in my Assertion of Grace; or at least have considered how to satisfy the Objections against it, before you present the world with it afresh. 1. The Scripture maketh the guilt and curse to redound upon the person, Gal.3:10, for "cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them." 2. In your daily repentance or confession you make in your prayers, do you not judge and condemn yourself for your sins, whereof conscience doth accuse you? What a strange expression is it, that sins are guilty of God's wrath, but not our persons? 3. If no guilt redound upon the person, there is no more need of Christ's blood to cleanse, acquit and justify, and to be a continual propitiation for sin; the Promise is vain and Faith of no effect, unless you will say, that you believe daily to secure, not your person, but your sins from wrath. 4. And the true reason why the sin, guilt and curse redound upon any person, is, because he is put and placed under the Law, which revealeth wrath; and why all is kept off the believer, it is not because the Law hath lost its power to accuse and

condemn, as you would have us to believe, but because a child of God is not under the Law, but under Grace. "Sin shall not have dominion over you; for ye are not under the law, but under grace." {Rom.6:14} "But if ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not under the law." {Gal.5:18} Christ hath fully satisfied for him, taking all his sins, all guilt and every curse unto and upon himself, and God hath justified and set him free; so he liveth in peace, and is at rest by Faith in Christ, who loved him, and gave himself to redeem him. Also the grace and benefit of his Justification doth in some sort redound upon the actions of the believer; for was it not by his Faith that Abel's sacrifice pleased God? Heb.11:4. There is no such purity, perfection or dignity in the best thing you can do, which of itself, simply considered, can procure or find acceptance with God. The Scripture and all Orthodox Divinity do hold forth Christ alone as the ground and reason of all acceptance of man, his works and ways. "Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ." {I Pet.2:5} "Being filled with the fruits of righteousness, which are by Jesus Christ, unto the glory and praise of God." {Phil.1:11} You say that Dr. Crisp is wide, and see not yourself out of the way of Truth and Charity. A man under grace is no more under the Law; he is dead to the Law, that he may live to God. "For I through the law am dead to the law, that I might live unto God." {Gal.2:19}

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "Law is not to be decried, because we have no power to keep the Law."

Assertion: Who is crying down or speaking against the Law? You cannot show or name any. And who are so much against the Law as your selves, who are become vain and needless Advocates for it? The blind Pharisees pretended most zeal for God and his

Law, who were yet in the state of enmity; and by reason of their inward malice and envy against Christ, opposition and hatred of the truth of his Doctrine, false accusations, and seeking to entangle and bring him into danger, they lived in the continual breach of the Law. Well, it is too evident, that you, with thousand others of your Fraternity, cease not to quarrel with, dispute against, and to condemn us for Antinomians, and yet no demonstrative proof is extant of any such error or guilt. It is easy to lay on a load of accusation upon innocence itself, {hence were such aspersions and indignities cast upon David, Paul, and that immaculate Lamb Christ himself,} if the corrupt heart within give way, and be bent thereunto. How weak is thy heart, seeing thou hast done all these things! The weakest and worst sort have been the most zealous and confident accusers. We know, say the Jews that this man Christ, is a sinner, Jn.9:24, yet they knew no such thing by him. "What accusation {saith Pilate} bring you against this man? They answered and said unto him, if he were not a malefactor, we would not have delivered him up unto thee." {Jn.18:29,30} If so many of that Religion say it, it is unquestionably true, though there be no reality nor jot of verity in the accusation; yet know it, that it is an Antinomian part to slander and miscall, and to make no crime to appear. Thus may the greatest delinquency and guilt of Antinomianism be laid at yours and your fellows doors. "There is one that accuseth you, even Moses, in whom ye trust." {Jn.5:45}

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "it is an expression that an Antinomian; namely, Dr. Crisp, useth; that the Law, {saith he} speaketh to thee, if troubled for sin, do this, and live. Now this is as if a Judge should bid a Malefactor, if thou wilt not be hanged, take all England, and carry it upon your shoulders into the West Indies. What comfort is this? Now doth not the Gospel, when it

bids a man believe, speak as impossible a thing to a man's power?"

Assertion: Doth the Doctor in this saying decry the Law? Your own words and judgment too, do import the like impossibility. What a sinister mind is this? But all, if void of prejudice and partiality, may clearly see by this his expression, that Doctor Crisp's main desire, design and scope was to instruct, erect and comfort a poor distressed and troubled soul, and that therefore he so applied and ministered Gospel-Cordials. Observe the ground and reason of his words, "if thou be troubled for sin," and then you have no cause so to reprove and censure him as you do. 2. His counsel and direction differ much from theirs of your legal way, who in such a case bid the dejected man to promise and endeavor his utmost to do and walk according to the Law, and so put him in hope of mercy, in that {as it is taught} the Law is mitigated, evangelized, and God accepts the will for the deed, &c. The Doctor wisely tells him of the impossibility of making his peace that way {knowing also how apt everyone is to take that course} that so he may utterly despair of himself, self-doings and active righteousness, and more readily hearken to the voice and tidings of the Gospel only. And ,3, though to believe be as impossible to man's natural power, yet it followeth not, but that he is rightly put upon the believing the Gospel; as Paul did bid the Jailor, Acts 16:31, to believe in the Lord Jesus, that he might be saved. The believing way is the only way of life, peace, and salvation; and the Gospel is to be preached for the obedience of Faith. {Rom.1:5} How vainly do you seek a knot in a rush, while you cavil at such an expression.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "I much wonder at one speaking thus; that the Law doth not only deprive us of comfort, but it will let nobody else speak a word of comfort, because it is a rigid keeper; and he confirmed it

by that place. {Gal.3:23} But how short this is, appears, because what the Apostle calleth the Law here, is that which he called the Scripture in general before. Furthermore, he speaks it generally of all under that form of Moses, {as such under his Regiment,} so that not even the fathers should have any comfort by that means."

Assertion: Your margin might have directed us to the Author or Book, if not to the page and place where that statement may be found; for the circumstances there would have given much light. Many sentences of your own, if singled and separated from what precedes, would speak strangely, and make a harsh sound. I think that the expression which occasions so much admiration in you is either Dr. Crisp's, or some other reputed Antinomian, and that his words are Allegorical. Though Paul's friends had free access, and might minister unto him, Acts 24:23, yet many a Martyr in Queen Mary's time had not that favor; and so the Law, being a spiritual Jailor to the Conscience, suffereth none in a legal way to comfort it; no work, no duty, performance, or reformation; nor man, nor Angel. The Law came by Moses, but Grace, Pardon, Peace, Favor, Life, Consolation, by Jesus Christ. {Jn.1:17} 2. That place, Gal.3:23, doth sufficiently confirm it, and hath been used for that purpose by such divines as you have no exception against. 3. Your reasons are invalid; for first, that Scripture in general is the Law, or nothing in the Scripture but the Law, which concludes all under sin; secondly, grant that it is meant of all, even the fathers also under that regiment, according to the History, and it is true that they had no comfort in that legal way, but by that hope to be brought in afterward. "For the law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did; by the which we draw nigh unto God." {Heb.7:19} Therefore the phrase is that "they waited

for the Consolation," Lk.2:25, and "looked for Redemption." {Lk.2:38} Yet besides that, there is a mystical and spiritual meaning of that place, as is granted by most; and therefore it was alleged.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "the Law is good, if used lawfully, &c."

Assertion: And is this a lawful use of it, to nickname and miscall your Brother, slander and falsely accuse him, saying that he is against the Law, destroys the Law and makes it contrary to Christ and his Gospel? Look on your inward disposition, frame of spirit, and such outward expressions as these, wherewith you have so presented men's eyes and ears, by Pulpit and Press, in this crystal glass; and shame may cover your face, and you be brought to such silence, that you dare never open your mouth in this way.

LECTURE II

"But we know that the law is good, &c." {I Tim.1:8}

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "in his first way of abusing the Law; he preaches the Law unprofitably, not only that darkeneth it with obscure questions, but that doth not teach Christ by it; and I see not but that Ministers may be humbled, that they have pressed religious duties, but not so as to set up Christ; and hereby people have been content with Duties and Sacraments, though no Christ in them."

Assertion: I dare appeal to any of your constant hearers, or to the diligent reader of this your Book, whether any {though you pretend the contrary} did more darken the Law with obscure questions, and vain-jangling about it. 2. You are singular that will have a Minister teach Christ by the Law; may we all come to

your School to learn Christ in this new way. "But we have not so learned Christ; if so be that ye have heard him, and have been taught by him, as the truth is in Jesus." {Eph.4:20,21} I muse what a Christ the Law setteth forth; it is most likely that you mean the setting up of Christ by pressing religious duties, as your own; and your next expression is, which is most strange, yea and an impossible way to any that knoweth, or ever received Christ truly. 3. I would take you in the best sense, if I could yet make any good and sound sense of your words. Have you perceived indeed any such failing in Ministers, that they may be humbled for pressing duties, so as they have not set up Christ? Your Charge is heavy on whomever it lighteth; but you are so wise as to beware of putting your hand into that hornet's nest, for fear they fly not also about your ears? Save your own skin, and meddle not too much with that "touch me not." "If I yet preach circumcision, why do I yet suffer persecution? Then is the offence of the cross ceased." {Gal.5:11} But you would have religious duties pressed so as a Christ may be in them; what, and not a Christ without them, a naked Christ, but a Christ invested and clothed with works, as Mr. Fox whose complaint was to Queen Elizabeth; and who speaks these words, "Yea first a Christ, and then duties." Let the poor, sinful, miserable and lost soul first be united and married to Him, in whom dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead, and in whom she is then complete, wanting nothing, Col.2:9,10, and then tell of duties. The true Christ will be all, or none; he will be alone, without the joining or mixture of duty; as Christ hath satisfied the Father, so that in Him he is well pleased; so are we to preach Christ and the unsearchable treasures in Him, that He alone may satisfy the conscience, give true rest to the soul, be the way to favor, peace and life; and be the reason and ground of all acceptance. Thus a dejected

and distressed soul may know and receive him aright, and find sure and everlasting consolation; and then may your duties and performances have their due place, ends and praise, with no danger. But if you can make all your duties of pure and mere Christ, you are a strange alchemist; this is such chemical divinity, that I cannot skill of, nor well understand. Lastly, you say that "people have been contented with Duties and Sacraments, though no Christ in them," still laying the blame of this upon the Ministers. What I except against here, is, that your words import that the people should have Christ in duties, as he is in Ordinances, which is dangerous, or at least doubtful in the meaning. As duties do differ much from Ordinances, {duties being our work; what is wrought in and by the Ordinances, is properly God's Act,} so Christ is so present in the Ordinances, that there he is represented and exhibited; which I hope you will not affirm of your duties. You have many such dark and difficult phrases, which the simple by mistaking may be misled.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "when they do oppose it to Christ, &c., and to compound Christ and the Law together, is to make opposition; there can no more be two suns in the firmament than two things to justify; there the reconciliation of the Law and Christ cannot be in matter of justification, by way of mixture."

Assertion: As the Jews error was to oppose the Law to Christ in Justification, so it is your Error to oppose them in sanctification; which you contend to be by the Law. As Christ of God is made unto us Righteousness, so Sanctification. "But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption; that, according as it is written, he that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord." {I Cor.1:30,31} 2. If their composition of Christ and Law was opposition; can your compounding

of them be any other? Yea, you include Christ in the Law, which they never did. 3. As two things cannot justify, so Christ and Law both cannot sanctify; therefore the reconciliation of Christ and the Law cannot be neither in matter of Sanctification by way of mixture.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "in a way thus; and certainly for this twofold end, I may think God suffers this Antinomian Error to grow. That Ministers may humble themselves, inasmuch as they have not set forth Christ and Grace, in all the glory thereof; and how much more may we say, that in many Sermons, in many man's Ministry, the drift and end of all his preaching is not that Christ may be advanced?"

Assertion: The error is yours, who call light darkness, and darkness light. We belong to Christ's barn floor; your loose tongue is not the fan to separate, nor can all this boisterous wind blow us away. The Doctrine is of God {which you have need to take heed how you fight against it} for He hath planted it, and will defend and water it; therefore it shall take root, flourish and prosper; what you imagine or practice against it is a vain thing. There is an election of grace, who shall receive it, though others be blinded and hardened; and for their sakes God will have it preached, despite all malice and spite of man. Therefore ministers may be humbled, that they have so much doted upon the Law of works, inasmuch that Christ, and the riches of His grace, hath been like the Chief Cornerstone, despised by the builders. It seemeth, you know many a man's Ministry guilty herein; and about twenty years ago, there were forty for one now; and so hath God been pleased to cause the Sun of righteousness to come from under the clouds. But be bold, and let them hear it again; they take you to be one of them, a fellow-worker, a friend; your reproof will be well taken, and digested, much rather now than heretofore.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "another end may be to have these truths beaten out more - the grace of justification, because not only of Papists, but Antinomians."

Assertion: And why because of the Antinomians? For their sakes doubtless it is, that the most acceptable Doctrine of free grace doth so gloriously shine forth; and also, if the world have any more insight into that mystical Article of Justification, by these labors of yours, or of others of this kind, thanks may be given to the Antinomians, as you still call them. "Some indeed preach Christ even of envy and strife; and some also of good will; the one preach Christ of contention, not sincerely, supposing to add affliction to my bonds;" {Phil.1:15,16,} but the other of love.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "Luther speaks in his Commentary on Genesis, much against Antinomians."

Assertion: But how unlike are your Antinomians to those? Even as you are to Luther.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "but yet, because people are fallen into a formality of truths, it is good to set up Christ."

Assertion: Then if other truths were in power, you see no need, nor would have any care to set up Christ. And what avail all other truths besides Christ, who is all in all? The great apostle Paul desired to know nothing amongst the Corinthians, not anything, except Jesus Christ and him crucified. {I Cor.2:2} All other learning will spoil us, if it be not after Christ. "Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ." {Col.2:8} Is there any foundation but Christ? Doth not all light, life, power, peace, consolation, goodness, felicity flow from Christ? What god or idol rather; do you, or your people worship, draw near unto, know and put their confidence in

outside of Christ? All religion and performances be as a dead and stinking carcass, without faith in Him. Paul counted all other things but loss and dung, for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus. {Phil.3:8}

But give ear, you fellow-Ministers, and professors all, to what your champion here saith. If Christ had been truly set up, such falling into formality would have been prevented; and now no remedy against this grievous malady, but the advancing of him. Law and the preaching of works never so zealously, cannot affect the cure. And yet observe how in the closure and first use of this Lecture he saith, how uncharitably and falsely many men charge it generally upon our godly Ministers, that they are nothing but justiciaries and legal-preachers! For do not all sound and godly Ministers hold forth this Christ, this Righteousness, this way of Justification, &c., and may not these things be heard in our Sermons daily? Now, Sir, compare that with this your own charge in this place; also, how then is it you so complain of formality, for which cause you would have Christ set up? How it is with you now, I know not; but let me add this, that where I have been, {and there was no want of outward profession and zeal} your choice professors {even theologians} were so ignorant of justification, the righteousness of faith and Christ, that they said they never heard that Doctrine before. And being examined further, they replied that their duties and serving of God was their faith and way of peace, &c. These were men of greatest note, and long standing; and seeing their error laid open, their foundation sandy, and their Babel like to fall, many of them began to oppose and persecute; some are yet alive to this day, and I continuing, through the good hand of God, in Lancashire, where I frequented their monthly exercises at two places; yet did I never hear one Sermon of Christ or his Righteousness; nor no other way to peace and life, but to Reform and Conform,

attending to the rule and precepts of the Law; and this was for about the space of eight years.

In the same twentieth page, you misinterpret that place, II Pet.3:18, "grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ;" expounding grace to be the effect of grace, or inherent holiness; whereas the Apostle would have them to grow up and increase in that excellent knowledge of Christ, the Son of God, and Savior of the world; and of that grace and favor of God, that is revealed and manifested in him.

LECTURE III

"But we know that the law is good, &c." {I Tim.1:8}

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "while our Protestant Authors were diligent in digging out that precious gold of justification by free-grace, out of the mine of the Scripture; see what Canons the Council of Trent made against them, as Antinomian, you may gather by these their Canons, that we hold such opinions, as indeed, the Antinomian doth."

Assertion: The like is our case now; for, as Luther seemed to have prophesied truly of our times, when he said, that after his days, the Doctrine of free-justification would be lost again, {as we know it so came to pass,} and of late years, through the preaching and writing of some few, it hath been happily revived, and brought out of obscurity to open and clear light again; yet what Cannons have been both made, and shot off against those men? And thousands cease not still to consult how to extinguish and suppress the same; and of what other spirit can you judge your selves to be, than that same

spirit the Council was led by, while you account the same Doctrine of free-justification Antinomian, just as they did, and also practice to your utmost against it? And yet, whereas you grant that you hold such opinions indeed, which they condemned, you confess yourself an Antinomian indeed, and cannot so clear yourself as your Adversaries do.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "but our writers answer, and here they grossly mistake us."

Assertion: And if you do not, yet the world may plainly see how you mistake and scandalize us. And so ignorant are the most of free-grace, and so legally principled, that where the Papists stumble, there they are offended also.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "now if all this were spoken to take men off from that general secret sin, of putting confidence in the good works we do, it were more tolerable."

Assertion: You love not the truth for itself simply, but for some end that you fancy, it may be tolerable. Yet if you hold and teach good works to be necessary to salvation, yea in regard of presence, and that the promise of life is made unto them, as you tell us, I see not how that sin of confidence in them can be avoided. For as my soul thinks anything needful to save me, so far I will trust and lean to it. But the truth is, that Christ hath saved us; the work is finished and done. "Who hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began." {II Tim.1:9} And God sends his Messengers or Ministers forth to call men in, that they may see the salvation of their God; know, all things are made ready; sit down, and rest securely, comfortably, and contentedly in the apprehension and enjoyment of it. Neither touching this matter, can you

find more high expressions in Luther, as you term them, than in the New Testament. "All things are ready; come unto the marriage." {Mt.22:4} "Mine eyes have seen thy salvation, which thou hast prepared before the face of all people." {Lk.2:30,31} "By grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God; not of works, lest any man should boast." {Eph.2:8,9} It is you, that are too low of stature, who cannot reach to salvation by simple believing, and receiving it, unless you be heightened, and the hands of your faith be lengthened by good works; and there is no fault in the highness of the expression; for I would learn of you how good works can be present, when a lost sinner lays hold on salvation in Christ that he may be saved? Or what the presence of good works can avail him? Or what good work was required of the jailor or found in him when trembling {as truly wretched, and undone} and crying what he might do to be saved; Paul bade him to believe in the Lord Jesus, and he should be saved, Acts 16:31, but of this more hereafter, as occasion will be given.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "if this were their ground of many unsavory assertions among them, &c."

Assertion: If you were not too dainty nice, and quick in mis-apprehension, our assertions would not offend you; but be as savory and acceptable as they be to others, of as good judgment as yourself.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "that there may be injudiciousness in them, as a cause in part of some their erroneous passages, will appear, in that they frequently speak contradictions."

Assertion: If you have greater perfection in judgment and other parts, shame not, nor disdain them that want; neither be arrogant in yourself, for you have nothing but what you received. In the undertaking and managing of this quarrel, you betray great weakness of

judgment, as all may perceive; for if speaking of contradictions do argue injudiciousness, this is more than evident in you; for I could give instance in many passages, which I observed. You condemn that assertion, It's no Law, if it have no power, as to command, so to curse; and yet with the same breath do say, that a Law is always condemning potentially, though not actually; if it be condemning potentially always, then it hath always power to condemn; do you not see your contradiction? If it do not actually, it is not because there is no Law to condemn, but for want of occasion. And the like may be seen in your expressions about the Law, and salvation by grace, and by works, &c.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "this is a passage often, but very dangerous, that let a man be a wicked man, even as high as enmity itself can make a man, yet while he is thus wicked, and while he is no better, his sins are pardoned, and he justified; yet in other passages, though a man be never so wicked, yet if he come to Christ, if he will take Christ his sins are pardoned. Now what a contradiction is here? To be wicked and while he is wicked, and while he is no better, and yet to take Christ; unless they hold, that to take Christ, or to come to him, be no good thing at all."

Assertion: If you wanted not charity towards your Adversary, you might have tolerated and accounted of such-like passages, as you do of those high expressions in Luther; and you pass those great mountains in Dr. Taylor's manuscripts, as if no error were in him, and are thus strict to find out a mole-hill or mote in those of Dr. Crisp; and yet can truthfully show none. This is out of no love to truth, or hatred of error. 2. Many things, we say, are tolerated in Luther, for many special reasons; and it is clear to me, that the same grounds of toleration were in this Author you so except against. 3. The

injudiciousness seemeth here to be in you, who see not to put a difference between a wicked man's disposition, and his condition while he is thus wicked, and no better; to wit, in his state and condition. If he be drawn to Christ, and come to Christ, that argues a change in disposition and will, a mind to be delivered and freed from that so cursed and dangerous condition that he is in. 4. To come to Christ, to take Christ, be good for the wicked man; for he hath no way else left for salvation; but first he may thank him, from whom that motion and persuasion came, who gave him that heart and ability to come. None can come to Christ unless the Father draw him. "No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him; and I will raise him up at the last day. It is written in the prophets, and they shall be all taught of God. Every man therefore that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me." {Jn.6:44,45} And so if this be all the good you so plead for to come to Christ, then he is wicked, and no better, nor otherwise till he come, or begin, and have a heart to come; and so much his words import; which might have prevented this wrangling, if you pleased. 5. Will you teach a man, that this act of coming to or taking Christ, is a good thing in him, to be looked at by him; or that it is in anyway satisfactory to the justice of the Law or available for the recovery of his lost soul and estate; that he may put this act in, and reckon it towards his discharge, or justification; or will you teach and tell him that Christ is all this, unto whom he therefore cometh for that purpose. If a notorious malefactor, condemned to die, have a pardon put into his hands, or have it for going to the King; can he plead his going; or doth any account him less wicked or guilty for that?

Also, on the same Page and Section, you are offended with the Authors Rhetorical expressions, as is also Mr. Gere.

Assertion: But what doth not offend a weak and crazy stomach? Where the mind is prejudiced and sinister, nothing can please; else, where or when may he better use it than in Christ's cause or work? And it is to as much {if not better} purpose, than a great deal of reading you show in this Book, making little or no use of your alleged Authors, but only for a flourish, like him that lighteth a candle, and presently puffs it out. If he had his weakness, so have we. The high-Priest of old, being compassed himself with infirmity, was thereby to be moved to have compassion on the ignorant, and them that were out of the way. {Heb.5:2}

And you impute it, in the same place, to his injudiciousness; that your adversary doth mind only the promissory part of the Scripture, and stand little upon the mandatory.

Assertion: Be it so; I hold it judiciousness and wisdom in him; for, 1, there be ten for one, yea a hundred for one, who are wholly for the Mandatory. 2 Besides, every man's conscience naturally preaches the Law of works within him, Rom.2:15, but is unprincipled in grace and the free promise. 3. If you did consider, what little pure Gospel-light is in the general Ministry, and how Jerusalem, the valley of vision, zealous in a religious way, yet did not know the things of her peace, Lk.19:42, but erred in her heart, not knowing God, or the way of peace and life in Christ, Is.59:8, in what a dangerous and deep temptation many a poor distressed soul lieth plunged sore, for want of this doctrine and consolation of free-grace. 4. And that the relieving, enlarging and saving of such a soul, is much to be preferred before conversation of life. And, 5, lastly, as Luther saith, that "there is no danger in preaching faith, free-grace without works; for good works will follow, where that is truly received; but in preaching works, and the Law so as it may be done and obeyed, is much

danger, lest free-grace be obscured, destroyed, unknown; men rest in the way of the Law, and the gate of eternal life never be opened, &c." If, I say you had considered these, and the like, you would never have condemned the innocent.

There be also divers things acceptable in your supposed disputable questions, and some that reflect on yourself, as being inconsistent with what you hold at other times, and confirming what you oppose; but we may not dwell on what is cursory.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "let us see what prejudicial inferences they gather from this doctrine of justification; denying them {good works} to be a way to heaven. Thus Doctor Crisp in page 6, &c."

Assertion: Methinks that expression of the Doctor is so clear, and fully satisfactory, that you should not quarrel with it; and to me, your language is so confused, that I cannot skill of it, but do fear it will lead the Reader out of the right way. Let Christ be the way and good works our employment or business in the way, as he saith, and then I see no error nor danger. If you do truly good works, you do them in Christ, abiding in Him, Jn.15:4, in whom you are alive, and walk continually by faith. Doth the soul go out of Christ, or leave Him, when or while it worketh? "As ye have received Christ Jesus, so walk in him." {Col.2:6} Now the soul cannot walk in Christ, nor have union with Him, except by faith. The believer also walketh in the way of obedience, but this is his way on earth amongst men, and Christ is his way to God and heaven. Let me add; Christ is set forth so to be our way, that He is our salvation also; so that in Him the soul is at her journeys end, and need not work to go further for attaining life, as if it were afar off, and good works were a way to carry and bring us unto it. Eternal life is in the Son. "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life." {Jn.3:36} "And this is the record, that

God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life. These things have I written unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God; that ye may know that ye have eternal life, and that ye may believe on the name of the Son of God." {I Jn.5:11-13} Also the words of Bernard are that, "it is only the good tree which brings forth good fruit; and that no tree is good until Christ has made it good;" of which difference, see more in the Assertion of Grace.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "thus, Matt.7:17, strait is the way that leadeth to life. What is this way, but the work of grace and godliness?"

Assertion: I might here put you in mind of a threefold work of grace, as you will have it. First, which God hath wrought in and by Christ for man; that which he worketh in man; and thirdly, that which man worketh by virtue of the grace of Christ. Now I need not ask you which of these you mean, for it is seen by your words that you take to the third and last; which, as I conceive, cannot be the meaning of the place; and I could give reasons for it. But I incline to Musculus, with others, {which Authors I have been forced to part with,} who expound it so; that the Doctrine of Christ and faith is the straight way, which few indeed do find; and the broad way is false Doctrine, and error of all sorts, which leaveth the simplicity that is in Christ. {II Cor.11:3} There is a broad way common to the religious Jews, Papists and deceived Protestants, which leadeth to destruction. As for the way of downright wickedness, all know that it is the way to hell; and as many be carried to damnation, as by profaneness, so by false and blind religious zeal. This is a strong inducement to me, thus to understand it, as that to believe, is the straightest way of all others, and few find and walk in that way with an upright foot; so because Christ is there, {Mt.7:13-20,}

speaking of teachers and their doctrine, and not of man's life and manners; so that it is doctrine Christ meaneth to be the straight way; for it is doctrine, true or false, that guideth and carrieth the soul one way or other, to heaven or hell; and that is either the righteousness of faith, or the righteousness of works. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned;" and no good work can help or save him.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "denying the presence of them {good works} in the person justified; for thus saith the Author expressly, speaking of that of Paul, therefore we conclude that a man is justified without the works of the Law; here, saith he, the Apostle doth not only exclude works from having any power operative, to concur in the laying iniquities upon Christ, but excludes all manner of works man can do, to be present and existent in persons, when God doth justify them. And he instances of a general pardon for thieves. Now one man may take the pardon, as well as another."

Assertion: Your charge is heavy, but I find no evidence or proof. What, doth he {Crisp} deny the presence of good works in the person justified, or after his justification? Did he not grant, and say, that they are our business and employment in the gospel way? Your words may be taken as if he denied that ever a justified person should do good works. If with Augustine he holds that good works do not go before a man to be justified, I hope it is no error. The air becometh warm, not before, but after the rising of the Sun. Perhaps your meaning would be, while justification is in the doing; not after it is done; yet your words are otherwise. And this is to you so dangerous, that to your charity it is inexcusable; yet your great reading might tell you of divers Orthodox, who speak and write as much, and the Scripture will warrant the same, when you come professedly to handle

the point hereafter. Besides, you cannot but know, that the Doctor speaks of the sinners justification in Christ, when God did lay on him the iniquities of all the Elect, and in raising him from death, did acquit and justify both him and all them, in and through him, of and from all those sins forever; and ever since, doth behold and accept them in that perfection and clear estate, wherein Christ was raised. And Master Pemble had that discretion and charity, that by distinguishing between justification in the sight of God, and justification in our conscience, he did admit of Polanus in the former acceptance. Now when sins were so transacted, and Christ rose again wholly discharged of them for our justification, Rom.4:25, how could any of good works be then present, or existent?

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "he {Doctor Crisp} concluded, that therefore though a man rebel actually from time to time, and do practice this rebellion, yet the hatefulness thereof is laid upon Christ. Is not this such a doctrine that must needs please an ungodly man?"

Assertion: The Doctor speaketh of the Elect, who before their effectual calling to the faith of Christ, did not cease to practice rebellion; and saith that God satisfied his justice, even for those sins which he is in committing, at that time in which Christ did suffer. And this will be the only refuge, plea, and staff of support and comfort, when that soul is in trouble and distress; which is the very end he propounded to himself, in these so free and absolute expressions of the grace of God; as neither you, nor any other, laying aside all prejudice, can otherwise conceive; for these be his words, {pg.141,} "I say, all the weight, and all the burden, and all the guilt of sin itself, is long ago laid upon Christ; and that laying it upon him, is a full discharge, and a general release and acquaintance to thee, that there is not any one sin now to be charged upon thee. Behold the Lamb

of God that taketh away the sin of the world. {Jn.1:29} The laying of thy iniquities upon Christ is an absolute and full discharge to thee, that there neither is, nor can be any iniquity, that for the present, or for hereafter, can be laid to thy charge. If the Lord give to any to believe this truth, that it is his iniquity the Lord hath laid on Christ, God himself cannot charge any one sin upon that person." You may remember your own rule that all things are to be taken in the Authors sense, and as he intended it; and so it is true, that this doctrine must be pleasant, and most acceptable to an ungodly heart, which travelleth and is weary, under the sense and burden of his sins. "Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God. Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry unto her, that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned; for she hath received of the LORD'S hand double for all her sins." {Is.40:1,2}

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "in denying of gaining anything by works, even any peace of heart, or losing it by them. Now this goeth contrary to Scripture."

Assertion: While you believe, that you are justified and accepted in Christ, you can want no peace of heart, for Christ himself is our Righteousness and our peace, Eph.2:14, Heb.7:2. If you cease to believe so, and fall from faith, to pursue Conscience by works, you gain nothing; but by catching at the shadow, lose all true and effectual consolation. But you say, it is contrary to Scripture; and when you show your Scripture, look for a more full and satisfying answer.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "thus, Doctor Crisp {pg.139} affirms that the business we are to do, is this, that though there be sins committed, yet there is no peace broken."

Assertion: I find no such words in that page; but I credit you so far, that those are his words; you tell us of error, but show none. The peace {saith the Doctor} is

not broken, to wit, between God and the believer, because the breach of peace is satisfied in Christ. What more Orthodox or plain? Christ is our Peace-maker. If any Conscience lose her peace, and be troubled, it is because he believeth not, and giveth way to sense and the Law; but then receive, abide in, and enjoy Christ as he ought. In your Answer you bring in nothing directly against him, only you pretend a confutation. You bid us especially to consider, Hebrews 12, two last verses, "our God is a consuming fire;" but this helps you not, because God is so terrible out of Christ in the Law revealing wrath; therefore receiving a Kingdom that cannot be removed, let us have grace, whereby we may serve God acceptably, &c. Here is an Argument to persuade the wavering Jews to turn to the LORD in the Covenant of free-grace in Christ Jesus, otherwise his presence and dealing would prove most terrible; and not that men should serve God themselves, and by that means to effect peace and procure the love of God unto themselves, and so to avoid the danger, which is to deny and overthrow faith in the reconciliation by Christ, and the whole grace of the Gospel. You infer that if the Scripture threaten thus to men living in sin, therefore if they do not sin, they may find comfort; but you should have said, to men that abide in the unbelief of the Gospel, dallying with it, or not having that grace unto which the Apostle there exhorteth; which in effect is this, that all those are so threatened, who believe not Christ to be the Messiah, and the Mediator who hath made and brought in a full and everlasting atonement; whereupon followeth the serving of God acceptably &c., the despising or neglecting of this grace, doth most displease God, and is the main condemnation under the Gospel. "And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil." {Jn.3:19} And so

long as the heart doubteth whether God be pacified and become propitious in Christ, it can never please God. {Heb.11:6} For no prayer, nor worship, with this unbelief or doubting in the inward parts, can be heard and accepted. "How then shall they call on Him in whom they have not believed?" {Rom.10:14} You say, if they sin not, they may find comfort. Comfort in what? Where is he that sinneth not, and can say that his heart is clean? All our comfort lieth in our discharge by Christ. "Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered." {Ps.32:1}

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "our holy duties have a promise of pardon and eternal life, though not because of their worth, yet to their presence, and therefore may the godly rejoice, when they find them."

Assertion: This is a strange teaching amongst Protestants. It is an assertion gross enough to have fallen from the pen of a Jesuit, who now deny any dignity in good works, as well as you, deserving eternal life, only by virtue of God's promise made to good works, they expect it. I will not write all my thoughts, while I consider how such doctrine is countenanced and commended by the President and Fellows of Sion-Colledge. But this I am bold to say, that this is not that Law or Doctrine which came first out of God's Zion. "For out of Zion shall go forth the Law, and the Word of the LORD from Jerusalem." {Is.2:3} If you teach thus, then no man can dare to believe or receive remission of sins through Christ's blood, till he be sure he find first the presence of good works before he believe. Or what are the good works he must so necessarily find, and unto which the pardon is promised? You might have done wisely, and it had been a special work of charity, to have given example in some, and then to have showed both how those good works may be done in the state of unbelief, and also how they may be certainly known to

be good before faith. Oh poor, sinful and trembling soul; into what an inextricable labyrinth will this bring thee; and when thou shalt be deeply plunged into temptation, how to prevent thy fearful desperation, by this doctrine, is utterly impossible. By this you will make people look more to good works than to Christ present and formed in the heart the only hope of glory. {Col.1:27} And he that hath Christ hath life, and he that hath not the Son hath not life, whatever works he may pretend to have. {I Jn.5:12} Yea; a legal ministry exhorting to duties, performances and conformity to the Law of works, will be held sufficient, and men need not be bid to examine themselves, whether they be in the faith, and Christ dwell in them, or not, II Cor.13:5, but whether they have a store of good works, and so they may be sure of pardon and salvation. But, Sir, if you will have your Doctrine to have a free passage, why do you not prove, clear and confirm it? Your word will not bear and warrant a tenet of this weighty importance and consequence. Where find you God speaking to the work, or not rather to the worker? And if the promise be made also to him of pardon or life, it is not for his faith, but rather for Christ's sake alone, in whom "all the promises of God" are "yea, and amen, unto the glory of God." {II Cor.1:20} "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, and to seeds, as of many; but as of one, and to thy seed, which is Christ - for ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." {Gal.3:16,26} Oh, that ever such a Doctrine should see the Sun, be heard out of any our Pulpits, and be suffered to pass the Press, and with such applause to be published. That good works must necessarily be present when we be justified, and that God should so respect and love them that he promiseth pardon and eternal life to them or to their presence! You mean sure to the man for their presence sake; for if they be so good and holy,

they need no pardon; or if they were not first pardoned, by what are they made good? If you say, yet you will have Christ present too, for he need but stand as a cypher; the promise is not to his presence, but to the presence of holy duties.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "lastly, their ground is still upon that false bottom, because our sins are laid upon Christ."

Assertion: You need wish to have your words well taken; if you dare not build upon it as an infallible verity, that your sins are laid on Christ; yet others dare, and the bottom is firm, even a sure Rock when you have done all. You add, "may they not be laid upon us in other respects, to heal us, and to know how bitter a thing it is to sin against God?" 1. If the laying of sin on us will heal us, what did make us sick or sore? The wound is by sin; and then our health is not by laying them on Christ, and discharging of us; or by faith in him, by the means of whose stripes we are healed. "But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed." {Is.53:5} 2. That phrase of God's laying of sin upon the one justified in Christ, in any respect is no Scripture-phrase, but it is full of danger, and most agreeable to the principles of reason, a natural conscience and the Law. 3. How bitter sin is, may best be seen, when we see and consider it upon Christ who under the heavy weight of it sweating water and blood, cried so out, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" I grant the afflicted conscience knoweth some little of it; and if ever God lay sin upon you, and let you not see it laid on Christ for your full and final discharge, it will then be intolerable.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "in denying works to be signs or testimonies of grace, or Christ dwelling in us;

and here one would wonder to see how laborious an Author is to prove that no inherent grace can be signs, &c."

Assertion: Our works can be made no further evidences, than it is evident and plain that they arise from true faith; and then I must first know that I have received faith, and be assured I am justified, else all such signs will leave me uncertain, and may prove to be counterfeits. For, as this Argument holds not forth, here is light, therefore the Sun is up; for all light is not from the Sun, as the Moon and the Candle have proper lights also; so all that we call graces and holy duties, ascend not from faith in Christ; nor are not only found to be in him, who is in a justified estate, and therefore cannot convincingly argue such an estate. What can you instance in being materially good, that was not in Paul while he was a Pharisee, who was blameless, as touching the Law? I fear, that it concerns us to know, teach and profess a Christ crucified, and come not to find Christ truly formed and dwelling in the heart; whose presence is the only light, peace, consolation, and rest to the Soul; and that is the reason of our eying and requiring of works and graces, for testimonies and assurances of a good estate.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "in answering the Author, we may show briefly how many weak props this discourse leans upon. In confounding the instrumental evidencing with the efficient; not holy works, say they, but the Spirit. How he doth oppose subordinates!"

Assertion: The Spirit and works are not subordinate; for, as is showed, works may be, where the Spirit of adoption and faith is not. Neither can they be subordinate, except the Spirit do infallibly reveal and confirm a good estate by them; which you cannot make good.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "you say that every man is in darkness, and like Hagar seeth not a fountain, till his eyes be opened."

Assertion: That is true; but where do you read that our duties, or works, do open the eyes, and clear this unto us? The opening of the eyes is a good work indeed; but it is God's work and not ours. "The God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him; the eyes of your understanding being enlightened; that ye may know." {Eph.1:17,18} "To open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me." {Acts 26:18}

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "we say, that a Christian in time of darkness and temptation is not to go by signs, &c."

Assertion: And out of darkness and temptation, what need is there to put them to that use? Will you light a candle at noon-day, when there is light enough? When there is no temptation occasioning the questioning of faith, or the estate, what need is there to prove either?

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "his arguments go upon false grounds. That a man cannot distinguish himself from hypocrites; and that there can be no assurance, but upon a full and complete work of godliness."

Assertion: No; a man cannot distinguish himself certainly without faith's evidence; how would you have discovered Paul, having a zealous respect to all God's Commandments? No one, nor all your works can bring assurance sufficient; and I dare say, that soul, which seeks establishment and to overcome doubting that way, is far from it in the secret bottom of it.

Imperfections in all, whereunto the conscience is privy, will more weaken than confirm.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "all those Arguments will hold as strongly against faith; for, are there not many believers for a season, or may not a man then know as soon the nature of his heart, as the truth of his faith?"

Assertion: Though true faith fail never, yet that is not simply from the nature of faith, for there is no gift of grace, but of itself it is perishable. Constancy and immutability natural be only proper to God, therefore Christ prayed that Peter's faith might not fail. {Lk.22:32} Faith doth not ascertain, in that it endureth, but in that by it the soul hath an effectual entrance into that grace wherein it standeth irremovably. "By whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God." {Rom.5:2} There is not that light of evidence in sincerity, which is in faith, Heb.11:1, for faith giveth light to those things which otherwise cannot lightly be discerned.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "it is said that God justifieth the ungodly. That which our divines do commonly give, that those works are not to be understood in the sense of any event which is foreknown by God will occur; therefore they compare these passages with those of making the blind to see, &c., not that they did see while they were blind, but those who were blind do now see, and this is true and good."

Assertion: If you grant, that a man is as merely ungodly till he be justified, as a man is blind till his eyes be opened, with those divines, the Doctor and you might agree; but this answer likes you not, though you say it is good and true, so well as another, viz.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "but I shall secondly answer it, &c. Ungodly there, is meant of such who are so, in their nature considered, having not an absolute

righteousness, yet at the same time believers, even as Abraham was. So then the subject of justification is a sinner, yet a believer. Now it is impossible that a man should be a believer, and his heart not purified."

Assertion: So that in few and plain words, your opinion is, as we see by this and other passages, where you call Abraham the ungodly man, that a man must be a believer and have his heart purified by faith, be qualified as Abraham was at least then, when it was said, his faith was imputed for righteousness, before he can be capable of justification; here is poor and cold comfort to a distressed conscience, who feels himself nothing but a mere compound of sin and misery. Do you put men to believe, and to know they believe, and to be sure faith hath purified the heart {but you mean not faith, but rather the Law} and sanctified them, before they come to God who justifieth the ungodly? A profound Rabbi; O strange Divinity! Much good do it you! You fear infection, and so get as far from Doctor Crisp, and from Paul's Doctrine as may be. You might have named some of those learned men, for I know them not. But to deal honestly, you know that Doctor Crisp speaks of Justification, as it is God's only free act, absolving and discharging all the elect of all their sins at once, even when he laid them on Christ. Now as God said to Job, "where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth," {Job 38:4,} so where was this faith, purity of heart and sanctification then? This is no evasion you know; but by this all you have said is annihilated; he makes faith not to be necessary to justification, but the evidence of it in due time for the relieving, staying and comforting of the conscience troubled and affected by sin and the Law.

To draw nearer to you, who have thus set yourself at this great distance, that your longest weapon cannot reach your Adversary to harm him; I will grant

you, that the Scripture setteth forth God as a justifier of them that are of the faith of Jesus, Rom.3:26, but let me then ask whether it be his faith, or God's act in justifying, that doth alter him and his condition? Israel looked upon the Brazen Serpent, but the blessing of health came from God which did effect the cure. You say faith purified the heart? What before justification or after justification? Calvin and Luther understand that purifying to be by justification. Luther's words are, "because of Christ received by faith, the heart becometh pure;" and when you tell us, Abraham is that ungodly man, if you mean he was ungodly when he was justified, there is no difference; but if you consider him otherwise, he was then a worker, and so the text is fully against you. "But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness." {Rom.4:5} But when Paul saith, "he believed in God who justifieth the ungodly," it is a description of the object of faith, or of God on whom faith believeth, even that God whose nature, property, office and promise is to justify an ungodly man; and not a declaration how the subject or man is to be qualified. So that the true God of the Gospel findeth men ungodly when he justifieth them; but leaveth them not so. Or, if you will understand the place of Abraham, {yet there is no circumstance requiring it,} however he was so qualified by faith, his heart purified, he reported and found to have excellent things in him, at that time when it was said, faith was imputed for righteousness, Gen.15:6, yet God in whom he believed, is said to justify them that are without such qualifications, even the ungodly.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "another place they much stand upon, Rom.5:8, Christ died for us while we were enemies, while we were sinners. But, why then do they say, that if a man be as great an enemy as enmity

itself can make him, if he be willing to take Christ, &c., he shall be pardoned? Which we say is a Contradiction, for how can an enemy with Christ, close with Christ? So that would seem more than in some places they seem to allow."

Assertion: You do not surely deny the truth of that Scripture, but argue the inconsistency of it with that assertion, viz., that such great enemies and sinners coming to Christ can be pardoned; for this is a Contradiction, say you. I answer, if Christ died not for such, how could such come unto him or believe on him? So that there is a sweet harmony; yea who else could be saved? For what difference is there originally, and inwardly? Though not in outward expressions and out-breakings to the eye of the world, the strictest Pharisee is as wicked and unclean as the loosest Libertine. God looketh upon the heart. But you ask "how can an enemy to Christ, close with Christ?" I answer, is it not possible for enemies to be reconciled? Or for a Rebel convinced of his danger to submit and receive a gracious pardon being offered? And when he is receiving it, he may rightly and worthily be called a Rebel, though afterward he become a true professed Subject. But further note that neither the Text alleged, nor the Doctor, say enemies to Christ, but when we were enemies, viz., to God, his justice and holiness, in reference to his Law. For as God absolutely considered cannot be the object of mans hatred, so God in Christ as Mediator cometh under another Notion, as being the only means to slay enmity and reconcile both in himself. You say "it is more than in some places they allow." When you show some place, we may speak to it. But how frequently read you in Doctor Crisp, these and like expressions? If God give thee an heart to come, if thou canst believe, if now thou have a mind to look to Christ, &c., which ought to have prevented all these exceptions, as annulling the grounds

and reasons of them. I marvel that any understanding and experienced man should except against his Ministry it tending specially to encourage the poor and troubled soul to come freely and with confidence unto Christ; assuring it, there is no such force and let as the conscience of sin and his own unworthiness will suggest. Oh how hard a thing is it in the feeling and horror of sin to look up to free-grace, and to receive Christ the gift of God, without all disputings and reasonings about works or qualification? It is an evil rooted deeply in nature, even that opinion, which your doctrine maintains, nourishes and reinforces; enough to overthrow the soul in the hour of temptation; witness all experience. And so the thought and consideration of some conceited goodness doth breed presumption, and an unwarrantable persuasion of being the rather accepted. If the Doctor had said that Christ is theirs, and become their salvation, when as yet they had no heart to receive, or desire him, you had some ground of excepting against him.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "Christ died not only to justify, but to save us."

Assertion: Christ hath saved all that are to be saved. "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." {Tit.3:5,6} But it followeth not therefore, that any can lay hold on salvation without justification or the righteousness of faith {although he may so do without the righteousness of works, Tit.3:5,} for justification is to life, the Antecedent of it. "By the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life." {Rom.5:18}

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "indeed the grand principle, that Christ hath purchased and obtained

antecedently to us in their sense, will as necessarily infer that a drunkard abiding a drunkard, shall be saved as well as justified."

Assertion: That Christ hath purchased and obtained all graces {as you call them} is so clear and fully convincing in the light of the Scripture, that you cannot deny the truth of it, only our sense of it is corrupt and erroneous, as you say; but why do you not tell what our sense is? It is out of no love, that you conceal it; but rather it argues a mind in you to make the world think worse of us than you can make us to appear. What you make, or how you pervert our sense, would be seen; but that grand principle will necessarily infer the contrary to the conclusion you make; for what Christ purchased for us, must necessarily be dispensed and given; therefore cannot that grace of Regeneration be withheld from them that are Christ's; but it cometh to them not in the preceptive way of the Law, but through the word of promise, which you cannot skill of. If any should teach that some graces, favor, and part of eternal life were left to be purchased and obtained by our obedience and service, that doctrine might find more free passage, and better entertainment. But I wonder you are so peremptory and unadvised in making such an inference, as if justification did leave a man as it found him, and there were no virtue, efficacy, nor health in it, nor that precious faith apprehending it; or as if we did teach so {as by you we are slandered} that the contrary still lying under your eyes. You need, and must be forced to acknowledge, that the whole process, the only and entire passage from sin to righteousness, from death to life, from bondage under wrath, and the curse unto liberty, and the receiving into favor, and felicity, is attributed by Scripture, and all sound divines to that article of free justification in Christ, so that in a true and strict sense, salvation is inseparable from it. Yet that the

world may see, how the simple intent and sense of Dr. Crisp is misrepresented by you, these are his words, pg. 66, "if a man, {saith he,} have a little holiness and righteousness, he thinks now that in regard of that he may without presumption close with Christ. Christ came not to call the righteous, but sinners; but it seems a man must be righteous before he have to do with the calling of Christ." See now whether this be with or against the Gospel of free-grace; therefore even to sinners is it no licentious doctrine, nor doth it a jot maintain the continuance in sin. I say therefore, that Christ doth belong to a person that embraces him in faith, though he be in his sinfulness; Christ indeed doth wash, cleanse and adorn a person, when he is looked to, but there is none clean till Christ himself do enter, who makes clean where he doth enter. Do not then so misconstrue the Doctor, as if his doctrine were inconsistent with the truth. All that you can gather and directly conclude from him, is, that sinners, under that very notion and name, are called upon in the Gospel, to come unto Christ, and that he is recommended unto them while they are such. If God give a heart to a wicked man at this instant willingly to look to Christ, he giveth him an absolute, complete and perfect interest in Christ; and these his expressions imply as much, as you in truth can require. For can there be a heart given to come, a real willingness to lay hold upon Christ, where there is no sight and sense of sin and danger? Why doth the soul desire Christ, believe in him? Is it not that it may be saved from sin, wrath and damnation, and obtain righteousness, life, favor and salvation? Doth not the hastening unto the City of refuge, sufficiently prove the man to be a manslayer? So here, it argues a true inward conviction of, and a real confession of a guilty estate; yea, a persuasion that in Christ a distressed and

pursued soul may be safe and in peace, but nowhere else.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "now these speak of Christ's death, as an universal meritorious cause, without any application of Christ's death unto this or that soul. Therefore you must still carry this along with you, that to that grand mercy of justification something is requisite as the efficient, viz., the grace of God; something meritorious, viz., Christ's sufferings; something instrumental, viz., faith; and one is as necessary as the other."

Assertion: The full bent, and chief drift of the Doctor's ministry is the application of Christ, and the benefits of his death unto the soul, who so see anything cannot but so judge. I marvel then at this your so palpable accusation. Doctor Crisp speaketh of justification, as it is God's alone gracious act in Christ, discharging and acquitting all the elect in Him at the time of His passion and resurrection, fully and forever. This was done forever before the judgment of God. As for the instruments, whether the word to reveal and publish it, or faith to apprehend and rest upon it, they were neither necessary to that act of God; but only afterward to give evidence and assurance to the several consciences of all those elect, of what was done for them freely by God in Christ upon the cross. For there God was in Christ, reconciling them to Himself. II Cor.5:18.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "I will but mention one place more, Psal.68:18, "thou hast received gifts, even for the rebellious also &c.," adding, is not all this strange? Though the Author press sanctification never much in other places, yet certainly such principles as these overgrow it."

Assertion: Why is it that you think this strange, viz., that the loathsomeness and hatefulness of this

rebellion is transacted from the person upon the back of Christ? He beareth the sin as well as the shame, &c., so that God acquitted his Elect and satisfied his justice in Christ their Surety; and by this means it cometh to pass that God can dwell with those persons. Is this any more than what Paul saith in short and plain words, viz., that "Christ was made sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." {II Cor.5:21} Christ by his Cross hath slain enmity and made peace. "But now in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ, for he is our peace." {Eph.2:13} Is not Christ the bond and means of union and atonement with God by his only sacrifice? "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." {Rom.5:10}

The ground and the reason of your opposing is, in that you are of the opinion that God comes unto us by, or with, or because of some inherent graces or qualifications in us, which be as a magnet to draw and unite His affection; and that Christ is but the meritorious cause of this, which is a Papistical conceit indeed! God is in Christ, and where Christ is, there is God present. "I am in the Father, and the Father in me." {Jn.14:10} He that hath the Son, hath the Father also; and he that hath not the Son, hath not the Father. "He that receiveth me receiveth Him that sent me." {Jn.13:20} God then loveth, uniteth Himself, and cometh to the soul only in and through Christ, in whom he makes us accepted, Eph.1:6, and that only by His grace. If the presence of good works you so contend for in justification, were granted you, yet God hath no respect to them, but beholdeth us as sinful wretches plunged into all confusion, and being moved to pity us, He considereth our persons and receiveth us alone in our

Lord Jesus Christ. He only beholdeth us, so all our good works reside in that perfection of His Son, else they could not be accepted, but altogether rejected. And these are the only true, most powerful and operative principles of all right sanctification; though your legally forced sanctity or reformation may grow and arise out of another natural principle and dead root.

Lastly, as for that conversion and change of the most rebellious, by the Ministry, it is the product or effect of this doctrine. I muse that a man of your parts and Religion, should so stumble in so clear a light.

LECTURE IV

"But we know that the law is good, &c." {I Tim.1:8}

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "having confuted some dangerous inferences that the Antinomian makes from that precious Doctrine of Justification."

Assertion: Splendid indeed is the praise and ample spoils as you tell us all you have won; but Review now your elaborate work, and you will not find one syllable of real confutation. I only intend to defend and vindicate the assertions and cause of your later Antinomians, {as you are pleased to call them,} for as for Johannes Agricola, he is none of my acquaintance; I never read him. If you wrong him, God is his Judge and avenger; yea and this also I would have the Reader know, that I am minded to pass by whatever I shall henceforth meet withal, whether positive or controversial, if it do not directly touch or reflect upon his three named Antinomians, lest all the rest in this book be taken for orthodox, or I be accounted an approver of it; for many things in it besides are to me unsavory and unsound.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "they tell us not only of a righteousness or justification by imputation, but also saintship and holiness by this obedience of Christ; and hence it is that God seeth no sin in believers."

Assertion: If they tell you of such perfection, that God seeth no sin, they also in the same place tell you, {if you had the same ears to hear it,} that this justification or saintship is by imputation and not by inherent sanctification. If Christ be held forth unto you by God Himself, as one that hath washed you and cleansed you from all sin, and withal it be given us so to apprehend and receive it; what think you now of yourself and condition, while you abide in this light? In the Creed you say, 'I believe a Holy Church,' yet the Church itself is no exterior or visible thing, that the world can discern, though the persons be visible; for her holiness is invisible. Only faith {which is of things not seen, Heb.11:3,} can behold this purity of the Church, not in the Law, nor any work or inherent thing; but as she is washed and made clean in the blood and righteousness of her Redeemer. The Church is all fair, for her filthiness is taken away by Christ, and He hath made her fair. If the Christian look upon his life, he will there find many things that are blame worthy. If he look within himself, the work of renovation there wrought, it is also imperfect, and not pure; but only as he is beheld in Christ who hath sanctified him, he is all together pure and holy, but faith only seeth this. Mark but this one saying of Calvin, "to the intent that God may no more be an enemy, and take part against us who are sinners, he must be fain to look upon us in our Lord Jesus Christ, and his righteousness, &c." And why do, if not yourself, yet many others in their prayers, say, 'Lord behold us not in ourselves, but in our Lord Jesus &c,' if there be no such sure and secure estate, why pray we to attain to it; and if we be persuaded of the truth of it, why wrangle

we against it? You might inform yourself, and others, as to what it is to continue of yourselves separated or remote from Christ; and of the meaning of the phrase, 'God seeth no sin?' Indeed you overthrow the Gospel, and do strangely shuffle and confound grace and works. For more full satisfaction, I refer the "Honeycombe of Free Justification," and "The Assertion of Grace."

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "you shall carefully distinguish between these two propositions; good works are necessary to believers to justified persons, or to those that shall be saved; and this, good works are necessary to justification and salvation."

Assertion: It is all too evident that you do not heedfully observe this distinction. Besides, your sense in the terms you use is doubtful when you say good works are necessary to justified persons. Is it your meaning, after justification, according to that of Augustine, "no works are good, except they follow faith, going after," or that they are necessarily required in order to go before, so that their presence must be had necessarily when God justifieth; as your pleading hath been hitherto? I know the terms or words themselves are plain and distinct, but you confound them in your after prosecution. 2. There be many kinds of necessary; and if you understand them to be necessary after justification in a right sense, you have no adversary. But if good works be necessary to those that shall be saved, I would ask you what you mean; for do you not hold salvation to be the proper, next, and immediate effect or consequence of justification? Can a man be said, or supposed to be justified, and not to be saved? If he be justified, he hath Christ; he that hath Christ hath eternal life, for the essence of eternal life or salvation is but one, and indivisible. You cannot make the full revelation or sensible fruition of it, to be any part of it. Your error is, that you will have good works, necessary to come in

between justification and salvation at least, as a cause or conditions of it; or so requisite, that the promise of eternal life is made to them, and only by virtue of that their promise, eternal life becomes his that doth the works. But eternal life is the free gift of God, Rom.6:23, and salvation is in Christ alone, Act.4:12, he that hath Christ, hath life; I Jn.5:12, and if he have not Christ, he can have no life, whatsoever works he have. So that as a man may have Christ without works by faith, so may he have salvation in order before good works; unless you will say, either that without Christ a man can do good works, or that Christ may be had as separate and apart from life and salvation; Christ and salvation standing at a distance, and so after he be come unto Christ, and have him, he must perform good works that by them he may come unto it, but both these are impossible. Works done in this sense, with such a mind, and for such an end as to help us to salvation, as if Christ did not sufficiently content us, "these works, saith Luther, cannot be good; but, whatever they be for the matter of them are and ought to be numbered among the worst of evil works; fornication, stealing, lying &c., are not so heinous saith he, neither is the danger and fearful effects and fruits of these evils comparable to the evil of such pretended good works." While I do good to help me to salvation, I in heart deny Christ to be my full and sufficient Savior. I make faith void, and the promise to be of no effect; I overthrow the whole Gospel of salvation, I appropriate the promise of life, not to Christ, but to my works. And if it be said, it is only the presence of good works that is accounted necessary to those that shall be saved; I answer: 1. How can they be present, when I must have Christ, and with him eternal life, before I can do any good work? 2. Is not the presence of Christ and his righteousness sufficient? Why then did Paul desire to be found in Christ, not having his own

righteousness of works, but only that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith? {Phil.3:9} 3. What comfort or pleasure can they afford or gain, when as Calvin saith, "if God do respect or look upon them, there cannot be so little a fault, or so small a blemish in our works, but the same is enough to make them foul and loathsome unto God. Thus all Abraham's virtues, saith he, if they had been examined, could have brought him nothing but damnation; Abraham had no other help, nor comfort therefore, but faith in Christ, in whom God did singly consider and accept him." 4. If, as you affirm, the promise of life be made to them and their presence, then cannot the soul receive or lay hold of any promise of life till they come into sight. And what promise then is made to the righteousness of faith, or of Christ? Paul was most diligent and faithful in his ministry, abounding in the works of the Lord, fought a good fight, kept the faith, finished his course; but the crown which was laid up for him and which he certainly expected, was the crown of the righteousness of faith. {II Tim.4:8} If the crown be not due to that righteousness, to what purpose is it; and if it belong and be annexed to it, will God make promise of it to our good works? It is true, it shall be said at that last day, "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world; for I was an hungred, and ye gave me meat &c., {Mat 25:35,} but the promise of inheriting is to them, in that they were elected to it from eternity, and prepared for it by the righteousness of faith, were found in Christ, and heirs annexed with him; and these works in ministering to the necessities of the Saints, did flow from their hearts fervent love unto Christ, and declare the truth of their faith, and of their Adoption and Election. It is for the weak and simple sort that I have been thus large.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "when we deal with adversaries, especially Papists, in disputation, then we ought to speak exactly."

Assertion: You now deal with a friend, however you slander and account of us, but with whomever you deal, or in what case soever, you nor I cannot be too exact and careful in our words and expressions; nor may we use more liberty at one time, than other. Yet it is true, learned men are found in their disputes more distinct and clear; for as the fan cleanseth the barn-floor, so opposition enforces them unto it; and so I think you clearer in these controversial Lectures, than ordinary; but if we be not distinct, clear, and fortified in every Sermon, that so our hearers may be rightly instructed, thoroughly established, and well able to answer the objections of the tempter, and of his own thoughts, {which are not so easily satisfied, as an adversary of flesh and blood without us,} a little failing herein may occasion much danger in the time of inward dispute, and conflict of conscience. One thought of the necessity of a work, or of the presence of anything but Christ, may prove the sinking, and the casting away of the soul forever. Let me add two more considerations, and I have done.

First, that many who have not the true faith, and be not of the stock of Christ, yet may and do flourish in good works, are full of pity and compassion, honest and sober in life, true and just in their dealings, careful in performing duties, and zealous in their religious way; now if you teach thus, as you do in this book: 1. That good works are necessary to salvation, in regard of their presence. 2. Good works are the way to heaven and salvation. 3. Our holy duties have a promise of pardon and eternal life. 4. There is some kind of Analogical relation between good works and heaven, comparatively with evil works. 5. Our goodness is a motive, moving

God to favor and bless us, as a King is moved to prefer one that daily salutes him. 6. To every good action thou doest, there is a promise of eternal life. 7. Good works be conditions, without which a man cannot be saved. 8. They are necessary by way of comfort to ourselves, and the like, &c. Will not such Doctrine inspire and encourage them in their way, make them to bless themselves and speak peace falsely unto themselves; and conclude, that their case and estate is safe and good? To say nothing of a hundred more fearful consequences, and dangerous effects of it.

Secondly, consider how this kind of teaching doth suite and agree well with the principles of nature, and answereth the dictates and requiring of every natural conscience, therefore ponder that of Luther; "it is, saith he, the property of all those who consult with reason in the matter of salvation, to be offended at the doctrine of the mercy and grace of God; for although God himself did preach this doctrine, concerning the free promise of his mercy unto our first Parents in Paradise, and in ages after, did illustrate and confirm it, &c.," yet this cleaveth and sticketh firmly within us, that we confess God indeed to be merciful, yet reason thus judgeth, that they alone do obtain mercy, who give themselves to righteousness, or in whom something may be found worthy of some kind of respect, more than is in others; and afterward, he saith, "the wisdom of man is offended, as if by the preaching of grace, the justice of God is abolished, and that they were afraid lest carnal security, and sinful licentiousness would be bred among men, &c." So ignorant are we by nature, of the true nature and efficacy of the doctrine of heavenly grace and salvation in Christ alone.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "good works are necessary upon these grounds. 1 They are the fruit and end of Christ's death, Tit.2:14. There are two things in

our sins. 1. The guilt, and that Christ doth redeem us from. 2. The filth, and that he doth purify us from."

Assertion: It is the filthiness and loathsomeness of sin that maketh us odious and guilty; if God abhor us, it is because of the vile and evil nature of sin, which Christ's blood doth cleanse and purify us from, that so a way may be made in Divine Justice for our reconciliation and acceptance. Guilt is an effect of justice in the Law, not holding the sinner innocent, but binding it over to the curse and death till it be purged and washed. "Jesus Christ, who is the faithful witness, and the first begotten of the dead, and the prince of the kings of the earth. Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood." {Rev.1:5}

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "there is some kind of analogical relation between the performance of good works and heaven, comparatively with evil works; so in those places where it is said, if we confess our sins, he is faithful, and also just to forgive us our iniquities, &c. So, II Tim.4:8, a crown of righteousness, which the righteous Judge will give, &c."

Assertion: You tell of an ordinability of works, and say that evil works cannot be ordained to eternal life, but good works may; a very dark expression; for who ever read of ordination of works to heaven or hell, but of the worker; and secondly, there can be no ordinability in good works, nor by them to life, unless you can make it to appear, that God hath any respect unto them, either in ordaining or accepting us unto eternal life; but in this case, good works and grace are made directly opposite, and contrary one to the other. "And if by grace, then is it no more of works; otherwise grace is no more grace." {Rom.11:6} The soul is become ordainable {ordained or appointed} by free grace, but not disposed by works.

2. In your first Scripture, I Jn.1:9, there is mention made of no work, but only of confession of sin; and is that such a good work? Judas confessed that he had sinned. If there be any ordinability in it, it is not because of any goodness in the act of confession simply, but because God hath purposed and promised, in that way, or after that order to dispense and give his pardon; and so this place maketh directly against you, for it is by the knowledge and confession of sin, and not by any good thing the soul findeth or acknowledgeth in itself, that its ordinability is affected. And whereas you observe, that God is not only faithful, but just also to forgive; they are arguments to persuade a man to take that course without fear, or doubt; for man naturally hath that opinion of God, that where he sheweth favor unto any, it is for some goodness; and therefore he dare not come as a naked and mere sinner into God's sight and presence, as is plain in Adam. {Genesis 3} But if he can bring nothing else, he will make promise of amendment, in some hope of mercy to be the rather showed him; hence to correct, and satisfy our thoughts, and to encourage us to take this course, to come as we are in our sins, making our selves, nor our case or matter better than it is, he requireth a free and simple confession of sins; adding, that God is faithful in his promise, in which he hath declared a gracious mind to pardon such in his Son; and also, that his justice, the thought whereof in that case, chiefly terrifieth, is so fully satisfied, that now God may in order of his justice forgive and save.

To that other place, II Tim.4:8, I have before showed how you misinterpret it; for that righteousness unto which the crown belongeth, is the righteousness of God, and not ours, Rom.1:17, Rom.10:3, of faith, and not of works that we have done, Tit.3:5, Rom.3:22.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "hence some divines say, that, though godliness be not meritorious, nor causal of salvation, yet it may be a motive; as they instance, if a King should give great preferment to one that should salute him every morning, this salutation were neither meritorious nor causal of that preferment, but a mere motion arising from the good pleasure of the King; and so much they think that particle, for I was an hungry, doth imply."

Assertion: O how welcome and pleasing is this teaching to man's nature! It tendeth to withdraw our eyes and considerations from off Christ unto ourselves, and from free-grace unto our works; whereunto all are most prone by nature. If our goodness be a motive moving God, then God seeth something, out of himself exciting and moving him to do good; and if you hold this foresight of goodness which thus moved him, was from eternity, you are not far from Arminianism or Popery; and if he was moved at the time of doing good {which many of them also hold} as the King you instance in, then this new and present motion in God to do good, is a child of time, begot in his mind or occasioned of late; and God shows more kindness than from the beginning he intended. Lastly, a motive must needs have some influence, if not into the act of salvation, yet into the mind of God; for the salutation worketh upon the kind nature and heart of the King, stirring him up to be so bountiful; and the man may thank his salutation in great part for his preferment. O happy man I am, and happy was that time that I met and so saluted the King! But the Gospel calleth from all such fleshly rejoicing in ourselves, that he that rejoyceth may only so do in the Lord Christ, in whom, and for whose sake only, God shows all favor, exalteth and blesseth with all spiritual blessings. And why do you bring in and propound this to your hearers, and the whole world as now, but both

because you like and approve of it, and would put all upon the like course and practice in hope so to speed? But before they had done good or evil, it was said, Jacob have I loved, &c. The true God loveth, accepts and saves freely in Christ, without any thing considered in the party.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "so that God having appointed holiness the way, and salvation the end; hence there arises a relation between one and the other."

Assertion: Keep the Law and Works, as you told us Luther said, here below on the earth; and by faith mount up, live, and converse above in heaven; then the way in which the soul walketh to salvation, is Christ and his righteousness; a way sanctified by his blood. {Heb.10:19,20} Believe and be saved; and so the relation will be between salvation and Christ's righteousness, and not our righteousness of works; distinguish between believing Abraham, and working Abraham, as Luther wisely did, &c.

Secondly, for that place, "I was hungry, &c.," it makes nothing for your purpose. For the kingdom was prepared from the foundation of the world, therefore God was not moved by works. "Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." {Mt.25:34} It is an argument from the effect of true faith working by love, by which faith the elect do declare and witness the truth of it, by such seasonable, proper, and kindly fruits as is there mentioned, all relating to Christ, and being expressions of ardent love to him; and this is, that God may appear to be just, therefore he proceedeth to give sentence according to what is manifest to all; for faith is hid in the heart, and not seen nor known.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "there is a promise made to good works, I Tim.4:8, godliness hath the promises."

Assertion: Some by Godliness in that place, understand the righteousness of faith, by which we become Saints towards God, and indeed all true piety is virtually included in it. Actual holiness is produced by it; and if the promises were to this active righteousness, yet not primarily, nor yet causally, but by reason of justification, the sole root and foundation of it. "There is a secret faith in all that we do," saith Luther; and unto this, God, in his promises of any good, hath respect; and for it, or more truly to Christ apprehended by faith, is the promise made; so that in having Christ, we have all the promises, else we have none. Yet it's more plain and direct to take Godliness in that sense it is in. "And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness; God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory." {I Tim.3:16} Great is the mystery of godliness; that is, of Christian religion in general; but all tendeth to one, though this seemeth to me to be the meaning of it.

Secondly, you say, that the promises lie scattered up and down in the Word of God, so that to every godly action thou doest, there is a promise of eternal life.

Assertion: If every Godly action have a promise of eternal life, then either so many actions, so many eternal lives be due; as where promise is of twelve pence a day to a laborer, and so many days work, so many twelve pence become due; or at least, there be so many rights and interests in it as be holy actions. But eternal life can but be due to all holy actions jointly, and to no one singly, if it should be due to works. It is true, that promises be so made in the Law, wherein there is a concatenation, or linking of all in one; yet they are upon

such hard conditions, that it is poor comfort, and small or no hope of having any performed, it being impossible. The Law is weak through the flesh, Rom.8:3, but the New Testament is upon better promises, which are sure to faith, because they are made to Christ. He saith not, the promises be made to seeds, as of, many, but to his seed, as of one; that is, Christ, Gal.3:16, therefore the collection of the scattered promises is in Christ only, and by union with him, we come to have interest and right to them all; and not by our works.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "though God be not a debtor to thee, yet he is to himself, to his own faithfulness."

Assertion: God is a debtor to whom he made the promise, which is not to himself, but to Christ, whom he hath ordained and given for a covenant to his people. "Thus saith the LORD, in an acceptable time have I heard thee, and in a day of salvation have I helped thee; and I will preserve thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people." {Isa.49:8}

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "you add, O Lord, it was free for thee before thou hadst promised, whether thou wouldst give me heaven or no; but now the word is out of thy mouth."

Assertion: 1. If God were free and at liberty, not to give you heaven, until he saw some of your good works to promise it unto, then there is no firm decree in the mind of God, or purpose to save you from eternity. Or, it is not founded upon grace, but works foreseen; but now he hath written your name in the book of life, and it is now become his will to give you the Kingdom; for you have so pleased him with your holy duties, that you have moved him to make you a promise of it. This is your way; but I would be reluctant to wrong you; neither is it a pleasure to me to let any see your nakedness; but only you have forced me to let you see

how you publish your own errors or failings, while you seek the shame of others. Further, was it not as free for God whether he would have made a promise to Adam for the recovery of life and felicity, and whether it should be of mere grace or of works? The Papists now do disclaim proper merit, and claim all as belonging to works by virtue of the promise. If you look for a promise of life to your works, then is not Christ, the Gospel, Faith and free-grace denied or excluded, and the way is not with you. Believe, and thou shalt live, or be saved, as Acts 16:31, nor yet, believe, and then work {I believed, therefore I spake} but be holy and do good first; and upon that ground well laid, make claim to the promise, and build thy faith and hope of Salvation; but Christ is become our righteousness, our only foundation and hope of glory. "For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." {I Cor.3:11} "To whom God would make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles; which is Christ in you, the hope of glory." {Col.1:27} Your divinity and way be to yourself. Alas Sir! What other fruits can this teaching bring forth in your hearers, but to confirm and maintain that legal and natural opinion men have of God, and to make them despise true Faith, Grace, Christ and his Gospel?

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "God is faithful; therefore saith David, I will make mention of thy righteousness, that is, faithfulness only; and then mark what the Apostle saith of this speech; this is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptance, &c."

Assertion: It is true, God is faithful, and so all that walk in the steps of Abraham's faith, do judge him to be. Abraham "staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief; but was strong in faith, giving glory to God; and being fully persuaded that, what he had promised, he was able also to perform." {Rom.4:20,21}

But that covenant of sure mercies and peace is founded on the Rock Christ, and not on the sandy ground of works. 2. To that of David, Bernard understands it of imputed and passive righteousness, which he saith also is ours by the gracious act of free donation, when we were yet sinners, as it is said, "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." {Rom.5:15} It is the gift of righteousness through Christ. 3. That faithful saying of Paul, "and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners," {I Tim.1:15,} is directly against you, who teach that our good works merit the promise; for then must we be good ourselves first, before we can do good, and so not sinners, and that salvation is not for sinners, but the godly. Lastly, the faithful labor and suffer shame because they know and are assured aforehand by their faith in Christ, the Lord entitling them unto it, that they have in heaven an enduring substance; a glory and kingdom laid up and reserved in Christ, which will more than countervail all their labor and loss for his names and truths sake. "But thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ. Therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye stedfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labour is not in vain in the Lord." {I Cor.15:57,58} With a bleeding heart pitying you, and the people under your Minister. I write this.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "is then the Gospel a covenant of works? I shall answer that afterward."

Assertion: Indeed you overthrow the entire Gospel, and do strangely shuffle and confound grace and works; how weak your answer is, and ineffectual to free and clear you from these thoughts you are so sensible of, will be seen in its place.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "our good works are testimonies whereby our election is made sure. II Pet.1:10."

Assertion: Calvin saith upon that place, {II Pet.1:10,} "if it should be so, that our vocation and election, for the stability of them should be founded and rely on good works, it would follow, it did depend upon us, against all Scripture, which teacheth first that our Election is grounded upon the eternal purpose of God; then, that of God's free pleasure and goodness our vocation is both begun and perfected." If it be understood of certainty to others, there is no absurdity in it; but if we should refer that assurance unto conscience, it so ought not, saith he, in my judgment, as if the faithful thereby should before God acknowledge themselves to be elected and called; but simply I take the meaning to be, that by their holy life their calling may firmly appear, and so they be discerned from Reprobates. Now this is but to taste and know the inward and hidden goodness of the tree by the fruits, and so to judge and determine of it; but he that hath no surer and clearer testimony within himself, will still be uncertain and wavering; for how can works certify me of my estate in Christ, further then I know and see assuredly that they arise and come from true Faith? Then we must first know that we have Faith, which hath clear evidence in itself, Heb.11:1, and yet is Faith more out of question, when we feel it work by love. "For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; but faith which worketh by love." {Gal.5:6} The love of Christ constraining us feelingly and effectually to all good, for Christ's name sake alone. {II Cor.5:14}

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "works are a condition without which we cannot be saved."

Assertion: It was taught and received among the learned and Orthodox, before you were ever born, that being first justified, reconciled, saved, we then work, and that freely, which before we cannot. Christ is no sooner our righteousness, than he is our salvation also. I muse what your Faith is, or what treasure or pleasure at all it bringeth into your soul; for you may as well and truly say, our works are conditions of our righteousness or justification, as of our salvation; if salvation be by Grace, works are excluded, Eph.2:8, Rom.11:6, and if God's grace be free, it is without condition, the "free gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." {Rom.6:23} All the Orthodox deny the promise of the Gospel to be conditional; for if good works be conditions of life in the Covenant of Grace, what then are the conditions of the Covenant of works? Or wherein do they differ? As this is to confound Law and Gospel, thus to distinguish between Justification and Salvation; so it is remarkable that this distinction and question did first come out of the school of the false Prophets, who thereby occasioned great disturbance in the Church. {Acts 15:1-5}

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "now by the Antinomian Argument, as a man may be justified while he is wicked, and doth abide so; so also he may be glorified and saved; for this is their principle, that Christ hath purchased justification, glory, and salvation, for us, even, though sinners and enemies."

Assertion: Methinks your face should blush for shame at the framing of this so apparently unjust charge and accusation; doth any say that Justification leaves a man wicked? Nay, do not all and every write otherwise? Let others judge; I need say no more, but that their principle is undeniably true; yet your Logic can find no ground in it, for this corrupt and absurd inference. If Christ ever purchased glory, justification

and salvation for us, it was when and while we were sinners and enemies, or not at all, for he purchased nothing since ye became holy, and a friend to God or him; neither needed to purchase righteousness and life for any, but sinners. How are you permitted to err and mislead!

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "they are in their own nature a defense against sin and corruption, if we consider the nature of these graces, Eph.6:14-16, for there you have some graces a shield, others a breast-plate, &c."

Assertion: Graces, as you call them, or gifts of Grace, are improperly put in and reckoned among good works. The defense and power they have against sin is especially in regard of their object Christ, his righteousness and all those promises of God "that in him are yea, and in him Amen," {I Cor.1:20,} for thence it is that all they are so good and useful armor. If you have faith and hope, and ever was in any great conflict, you have found that all your defense, help, stay and victory was only from and by Christ the object; as he is the only refuge, plea, and sure Rock, when all works will fail.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "they are necessary by debt and obligation."

Assertion: The works of the Law are debts required to be paid first, that we may have life and favor; but the love and works of the Gospel are for life, peace, and favor first had and obtained in Christ alone.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "and the Law of God still remaineth as a rule and directory"

Assertion: As the Law rules, so it reigns, reproveth and condemns; and when you have walked most precisely according to it, it will subdue you and your obedience under the Curse. "For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse; for it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things

which are written in the book of the law to do them." {Gal.3:10} For all that you can do is too light, when it is put into this balance. You say, the Antinomian teacheth the abolition of all the Commandments. He is an Antinomian indeed that doth so; but I muse that you still thus wrong and slander us.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "works are necessary by way of comfort to ourselves. And this opposeth many Antinomian passages, who forbid us to take any peace by our holiness.

Assertion: There be divers kinds of comfort, arising from different grounds and considerations. The Doctor {Crisp} speaks of that peace and comfort which ariseth from the true and certain knowledge of remission of sins, and reconciliation with God; the true, proper, and pure fountain whereof, is Christ crucified; as for your works, they are like puddle-water, a blundered and polluted stream, or a deceitful brook, yea as a broken Cistern that holds little or nothing. You say in temptation they fail, and are not to be regarded or looked at. See this answered also, in the third prejudicial inference. Lecture 3.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "these good works, though imperfect, may be a great comfort to us, as the testimony of God's eternal love towards us. Thus did Hezekiah, II Kings 20:3, as he is there a thankful acknowledger of what was in him, &c."

Assertion: The best and most satisfactory testimony and assurance of God's love is His giving of that dear Son of His love to die, that we might live through Him. "In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him." {I Jn.4:9} In this he commands, sets forth, and confirms His love, Rom.5:8, to put it beyond all doubt. The next testimony is the giving of his Spirit, for to reveal the

things of Christ, the unsearchable riches that are treasured up in Him; {Eph.3:8;} to shed abroad that love in our hearts, that so the soul may know it, and feel the consolation thereof, &c. A third is the delivering and freeing of our hearts and natures from that bondage and pollution of sin, by sanctifying us in body, soul, and spirit; yet these are no causes, but certain effects and expressions of God's free and eternal love, because He loved his own, He doth all for them. "Having loved his own which were in the world, he loved them unto the end." {Jn.13:1} Our works are no causes or motives to Him, nor yet sure testimonies of God's eternal love, for many a Papist, heathen, and reprobate, for the matter and show of works, exceed divers of them who believe and confess Christ.

Therefore, if you will have them such testimonies, and so have comfort from them, you must look on them in all their causes, especially in the efficient, the impulsive and moving cause, which be neither the light judgment or assertion of reason and natures principles, nor the command, coaction and commination of the Law, by its rule and authority, extorting them from us as being unwilling; but they come from a free and voluntary spirit, so proceeding from and made thus by the Spirit of Regeneration and Adoption, moving to do good in love and delight. "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." {Rom.8:14} Therefore are they called the fruit of the Spirit. {Gal.5:22} Secondly, in the subject, that the person be reconciled, accepted and in favor through Faith in Christ Jesus. {Heb.11:6} Lastly {to say nothing of the form or object} the end they are to be referred unto, is not self-praise, or profit, to procure nor preserve by them our own peace, favor, or salvation with God {which be the effects of the grace of Christ} but simply, God's honor, his Churches, and our neighbors good;

even as our love is due also. {Mt.22:37-39} And if these circumstances required necessarily to every good work be considered, the soul will find little need of works, as testimonies and arguments of God's love. For that must be out of doubt first; for a doubtful Conscience cannot please God by any work or obedience.

As for your example of Hezekiah, it cometh nothing near to make good your assertion. For as God's works for us are testimonies of his love to us, so our works at the most are but witnesses of our love unto him, and therefore cannot be testimonies, as you affirm, of God's eternal love to us; and why should you, or any other, think that Hezekiah, so approved and commended a long time for a truly devout King, should now call his spiritual estate into question or doubt, as no circumstance in the Text arguing any such thing? And if it had been so, he had gone far about to fetch his comfort and assurance from his works and life; and it would have been very uncertain and weak, when he had done. And so this makes nothing at all against Doctor Crisp, who would have all to derive their comfort and peace from the pure fountain, even Faith in the Satisfaction, Discharge and Atonement made by Christ, as the most direct, near, and infallible way; and not from works, which must be first carried to our faith or assurance that our state is good, there to be proved to be good; and so at best can but secondarily and weakly seal that comfort formerly had by believing. I think Hezekiah might be reprov'd and condemn'd, so others nearer unto him, for his zeal in demolishing Idolatry; whereupon, he going to God, maketh him the witness of the righteousness of the things done, and of the integrity of his heart in doing them. As David many times did, being wrongfully charged by Saul and others; and as it is our case, who are falsely slandered as Antinomians, and yet can and dare boldly go and appeal

to God, before whom all things are naked, saying, "thou knowest, O Lord," that we are no Antinomians, no Libertines, no Teachers of licentious Doctrine, &c., and so the testimony of Hezekiah's, David's, and our Consciences being clear of such things in the presence of God, is a great support, a sure defense, and an effectual comfort against all those calumnies, censures and false aspersions. "Lord, thou knowest all things; thou knowest that I love thee." {Jn.21:17} This is my rejoicing, saith Paul {being misreported to be what he was not} 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. {II Cor.1:12} But now all this is touching things controverted between man and man, where our innocence, such as it is, is and ever will be the best buckler, plea, and comfort; and it is not pertinent to what Doctor Crisp entreateth of; or, if this satisfy not, I could add, that as the Churches estate was then servile, Gal.4:1,2, and as servants, not having the promised Spirit of Adoption, they did all things rather from a principle of fear, more than love; and so Hezekiah having discharged the office of a godly chief Magistrate, and now being called upon by death to lay it aside, presenting himself before the Lord, hath his own thoughts to witness his integrity touching the generality of the course of his life; and so they excusing and comforting him, in that case, do give him some boldness, even as it is with a servant who hath finished his course and walked in the commands of his dear Master, in the day of his accounts. "I have fought a good fight, {saith Christ's servant, Paul,} I have finished my course, I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day; and not to

me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing.”
{II Tim.4:7,8}

Thus, it is one thing to be comforted from the inward testimony of my Conscience, reflecting with an impartial eye upon my conversation in this world, and finding it to be beyond reproach and in all integrity, sincerity and simplicity of heart, especially when adversaries do accuse and speak evil of me; and another thing to fetch my peace and comfort thence concerning my spiritual estate and reconciliation with God; for he that is exercised with inward constricts and temptations will easily perceive how dangerous a thing it is to have the eye and consideration of the soul, taken off Christ and his Righteousness, and to be set upon any work or qualification of our own. Then nothing but Christ, for all is accounted as dung and loss else; our own righteousness as unclean and filthy rags. {Phil.3:8,9, Isa.64:6} But without these spiritual buffetings, the Doctrine of the grace of Christ, our righteousness, our reconciliation and peace cannot be prized, learned, nor purely taught.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, “they are necessary in respect of God, &c., a Leah, though tender-eyed, yet when she was fruitful in children, said, “now my husband will love me;” and so may Faith say, “now God will love me, when it abounds in the fruits of righteousness.”

Assertion: God is not as man; his love to man is not begotten or caused by anything he seeth in us; he loveth before and without works, even while we were enemies, our minds being in wicked works, Rom.5:8, Col.1:21, thus the Word testifieth, and Faith receiveth it; for whatever good the Lord works in us, or frames unto, and enables us to work, are the effects and fruits of his eternal love, not causes of it.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "in regard of others, &c., I Pet.3:1, it is an exhortation to wives, so to walk, that their husbands may be won to the Lord, so that thy life may convert him. By 'the word,' the Apostle means the public preaching of the Word."

Assertion: You rather make more obscure, than clear the sense and drift of the Apostle; while you are minded to plead for good works, you attribute too much to them. Faith in Christ, and conversion to God, is by hearing of the Word. {Rom.10:17} If the husband were an idolatrous radical or profane person; yet by the sweet, humble, and dutiful carriage, and virtuous life of the wife, he might happily be gained to approve and like well of her profession of Christ, which had wrought such a sensible alteration, and brought forth so plentiful and pleasant fruits in her; and so be moved to give ear and attention to the Doctrine of the Christian Faith; thus his mind becomes prepared, and more ready to embrace that which did not so well please, or perhaps was an offence before. This is all that can be meant or intended in those words.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "if good works be still a necessarily requisite, why then is not the Covenant of Grace still a Covenant of Works? Answer - Although good works be requisite in the man justified or saved, yet it's not a Covenant of Works, but of Faith, because Faith only is the instrument to receive Justification and eternal life."

Assertion: I see no difference in effect between the Arminian Doctrine and yours in this; for you hold good works to be imperfect, so do they; and you make all the promises of eternal life to belong and to be made unto them; and what do they more? You answer, although they be requisite in the justified or saved {before, you said, in a man to be justified and saved,} yet it is a Covenant of Faith. Where do you find it to be

called a Covenant of Faith? It is a Covenant of Grace, and so it is entire without our Faith.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "good Works are to qualify the subject believing. Faith only is the condition or instrument that doth receive the Covenant; but yet, that a man believe, is required the change of the whole man."

Assertion: They qualify the subject believing, in some sense may be true; but do they qualify before he believe, in believing, or after faith? This you should have told us; for it may be concluded from your words, that they must qualify the subject before he believe, and this is your reason, because, that a man believe, is required the change of the whole man, as if good works did change the man, and so were pre-required to believe. To this I answer that the heart must be first changed, I grant; for the natural heart is evil and unbelieving. And secondly, it is a good work to renew and change it; yet that is no work of ours, but God's alone. Thirdly, do our good works qualify towards God or towards others? Or to our own sight and sense? Is not Christ revealed to us, Christ put upon us, Christ formed and dwelling in us, qualification sufficient for acceptance to salvation?

You are still ministering your vain remedies. Take you heed of that spiritual Anti-Christ within man, which strongly maketh head against the true Christ. What you preach and profess may be a deceitful flourish; for you bid, reconcile Law and Gospel, Justification and Holiness, &c., and I know none making such jars between one and the other, as doth yourself. Is the Law than against the Promise? {Gal.3:21} That is a blind conceit. Christ was ordained to be the Righteousness of the sinful and lost soul of man, and to be received by it in the feeling of the failing and want of all goodness in itself. He dwelleth in the poor, meek, low, and broken heart, to receive, heal, and satisfy it. We may think and talk of him out of us, as

held forth in the letter and outward Ministry; and all this too small and no effectual consolation or purpose.

LECTURE V

"Knowing this, that the law is not made for a righteous man." {I Tim.1:9}

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "concerning the righteous man here, we must not interpret it of one absolutely righteous, but one that is so in his endeavors and desires."

Assertion: Why may we not understand it as well of one who hath attained to the righteousness by Faith, which is absolute and perfect in Christ, as that of and inherent sanctification, which is incomplete and imperfect? Or why is it that you do altogether exclude this passive and imputed righteousness of Christ? You do not with the Papists hold it only to be a putative and not real righteousness? And you err if you take that which is sensible, imperfect, and so defective, to be yet more worthy to give the denomination.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "the Antinomian and Papist do both concur in this error, though upon different grounds, that our righteousness and works be perfect, &c., and that not only in Justification, but in Sanctification also."

Assertion: Though the righteousness of Faith in Christ, and sanctification by his Spirit, {which are inseparable in regard of the subject,} be two distinct things, yet they argue not the party to be in a twofold estate towards God for acceptance to favor and life; but his estate is peaceable and safe, only by the free grace

of Justification. You grant your sanctification is imperfect and defective; now seeth the sinfulness remaining in us, doth disspread itself throughout all the powers of the soul, all parts, actions, and passages of the whole man, when you then have gathered and summed up all in one, do you not bring all your works in the end to your Justification, by your confession of weaknesses, wants, pollutions, &c., and so seek forgiveness of the sins of your prayers, your failings in your sermons, errors of heart and life? And this is in effect to have all healed and justified by free justification, or the blood of Christ; knowing that otherwise all is damnable, and in law and justice to be rejected; know it, and cause also your hearers to learn it, that though Justification be one individual act, yet the virtue and efficacy of it is necessarily to be extended throughout all the life and ways of man. This purifies the man, and makes all pure also and "acceptable to God by Jesus Christ." {I Pet.2:5} "Unto the pure all things are pure; but unto them that are defiled and unbelieving is nothing pure; but even their mind and conscience is defiled." {Tit.1:15}

Thus may you see that it is a gospel truth, that all are become perfect in virtue of that perfection they have in Christ, and the manner also how; and lastly, that all is in Justification, and not in Sanctification; and so know your mistake. If you receive not this, how shall what is imperfect be accepted, except either by some mitigation of God's Justice, contrary to that place, so much, and that without cause urged against us, Matt.5:17-18, or that you will so far be beholding to the new Covenant, with the Arminian, as to seek for the grace of it, in some form of inward sanctity; which may pardon or pass by our defects, or in effect to deny the extent and continuance of the force and virtue of Justification and Christ's blood unto the last end?

What you charge upon your old Antinomian Johannes Agricola I pass by, as an Author I never read his writings.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "as for the latter Antinomian, {meaning myself,} he speaks very uncertainly and inconsistently. Sometimes he grants the Law is a rule, but very hardly and seldom; then presently kicketh all down again; for, saith he, it cannot be conceived that it should rule, but that it also should reign; and therefore thinks it impossible that one act of the Law should be without the other; the damnatory power of the Law is inseparable from it. Can you put your Conscience under the Mandatory power, and keep it from the damnatory?"

Assertion: None can speak more uncertainly and inconsistently than you in these Lectures; you make neither to appear in your adversary, but he proves you guilty of both. For when you use these expressions, as good works are necessary in the justified, and then presently, they are necessary in him that is to be justified. Again, only Faith in Christ is necessary to salvation, the promises of life are made to the believer, and good works have the promises of life; and that every good work thou canst do, hath a promise made to it of eternal life, &c., you both leave your reader uncertain as what your opinion is; and these will in no wise consist together, besides many other like passages. Also, here you say he grants it a rule; and yet do charge him with the total abolition of it? Is not this inconsistency? You say he granteth it hardly; nay doth it freely without constraint.

This is not to kick all down again, to say that the Law, if it rule, it doth also reign; the latter doth not overthrow the former, but only it crosses and overthrows your vain and airy conceit of a Law ruling and not reigning. You say, he thinks it impossible that

one act of the Law should be without the other. Answer: Here you wrong your adversary; he speaks of a power, and you of an act. The Law may actually condemn, where and when it cannot actually justify {as it condemns every transgressor, but can justify only the innocent} and yet the power for to do both is equally in it as a Law. Why do you not answer the ensuing Question, viz., can you put your Conscience under the Mandatory power of the Law, and yet keep it from under the damnatory? The Law bids you love your neighbor, though your enemy, and presuppose you are obedient thereunto, yet do you do it so perfectly, that the Law hath no power to reprove and condemn you in that particular? If the Law condemn you not, away with humiliation, confession, repentance, justification, and all living by faith in Christ. For now you can so walk according to the rule of the Law, that it cannot subject you to its curse and death; you are not reprov'd and judged in yourself for anything; your peace and safety is by your just life, the Law being curbed and restrained, or rather, ex-authorized or dis-invested of all power to condemn; and your life and comfort is not by your Faith in the Son of God, who loved you and gave himself for you, as Gal.2:22. There is no condemnation unto you, {not because you are in Christ, as Rom.8:1, but,} the reason is, in that the Law though a rule, yet lacks the power to reign to death. We often meet with this groundless and false assertion; and now see what is the chief stone that you stumble at. Let this now suffice.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "the same Author again; he dare not trust a believer to walk without his keeper, &c., as they are only kept within compass by the Law, but are no keepers of it."

Assertion: The word "they" relates not to believers, if you look the place, as here you do intimate. You only repeat what we write, and refute nothing.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "the same Author at another time, calls it a slander to say they deny the Law; and who can reconcile such contradictions?"

Assertion: I see no contradiction, nor show of any; so you might tell your Reader wherein it lieth; for all are not as quick-sighted as yourself. But is not this a contradiction in you, who say, that we grant the Law to be a rule, and that a believer is a free keeper of it; and yet that we hold and teach the abolition of it? Here the task to reconcile is now yours. Also, that we deny the Law, abideth still another slander, for which the Law is against you. See the ninth Commandment, for "thou shalt not bear false witness." {Ex.20:16} The Lord lay it not unto your charge.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "the second interpretation is of the damnatory and cursing power of the Law; the Law is not made to a believer so as he should abide under the cursing and condemning power of it."

Assertion: You might remember, that right now you said that the Law a believer is under, hath no power to condemn and curse; what need he, or how can he then be freed from the cursing power? See your own instance. If the fire had no power to burn, what need was there that God should hinder the act? You would feign such a fire, as is without all power to burn, and tell us of such a Law as has no power to condemn? Who will now fear either? Or rather, who can credit such empty words? Your sword cuts the throat of the owner; for from the removal or restraint of the act or operation, the Argument doth not hold for the removal of the thing, or the power to condemn, but rather on the contrary, it strongly and necessarily infers and concludes that there is such a condemning power in the Law, in that it is restrained and hindered from the actual doing of it. But secondly, here is no such miracle wrought upon the Law,

as was there upon the fire, which kept it from burning the three worthies, Dan.3:23-25, though more abundant mercy be showed; for Christ was made under the Law, to redeem us from under it, Gal.4:4,5, not to take the curse from the Law, but to redeem us. In what sense, and to what end Christ was under as our Surety, in the same sense are we freed; but he was under both the rule and reign of it. Yet it will not follow that believers are in no state of subjection and obedience; or being enlarged, and set at liberty, do not run the way of God's Commandments. For they do it, though by another efficient, from a new principle, and for a different end than that of the Law, do and live. They are under Christ, and moved and led by his Spirit, who is the head and husband of his Church. But of this more afterwards.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "consider some parallel places of Scripture, Gal.5:22, speaking of the fruits of the Spirit; against such there is no Law; the Law was not made to these, to condemn them."

Assertion: And if you refer it to the fruit of the Spirit, the Spirit produces his fruits of himself, and of his own accord; no outward Law commanding and directing.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "and if because the godly have an ingenuous free spirit to do what is good, he need not the Law directing or regulating; it would follow as well, he need not the whole Scripture."

Assertion: You would still bear men in hand that we are against the use of the Law, which yet we do stand for, if lawfully used, as your Text requires; and that in all the Authority and Offices of it; and this we can and are ready to make good upon any occasion; yet since this is so often inculcated by you, I wish you would give satisfaction in these few things. First, if the Spirit make the will and affections free to what is good, doth it alter and enlighten the understanding also, to know what is truth and good, and effectually incline, move,

guide, and lead aright, without the direction and regulating of the Law? Doth the Spirit, which is light, and giveth all light and directive power to the Law, need the Law in his work? 2. You are to prove and clear better than yet you have done, that the Law is instrumental to the Spirit in the works and ways of sanctification. 3. Where do you find that the moral Law doth give help or power unto any? The Law commands, and offers no help. 4. Whereas, you say we are flesh, and not all spirit, &c., it may be replied, that by Scripture and all experience, sin, the wickedness of our nature, is rather irritated and strengthened by the Law than weakened and mortified. It is such a desperate disease, that it makes head more strongly against any legal plaster and application, Rom. 7.5, &c.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "you say it will follow as well, that he needed not the Gospel to call upon him to believe."

Assertion: Your reason is much unlike; for first, the Doctrine of the Gospel is not only the object of Faith, but the outward instrument and ordinary means the Spirit uses both to implant faith and to increase it, to regenerate to Faith, and to confirm and build up in that way; which you nor any can truly affirm of the Law. Now this your Rock is passed by without danger.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "the Libertines upon like ground, deny the whole Scripture to be needful to a man that hath the Spirit; and that which the Antinomian doth limit to the Law, that it is a killing letter, they apply to the whole Scripture; and I cannot see how they can escape this Argument."

Assertion: I see that with a little help, the light may so shine forth, that there is hope you will prove ours; however, we are not here nonplussed. See the error of the Libertines, and your own weakness; first if we were perfectly holy and happy, as in Heaven and

Glory, we should not need the Scripture, no more than the Angels do; but we are so only imperfectly and undeveloped, so that the Scriptures are most requisite and needful, that we may increase with the increase of God, Eph.4:12, for the perfecting of the Saints, "till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ" Again, your friend the Antinomian doth not call the Law a killing letter, as it is without the Spirit, but as it is that instrument, or the ministration the Spirit useth to kill and condemn, as touching the Conscience. {II Cor.3:9} "For I was alive without the law once; but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died." {Rom.7:9} But this may serve now, viz., the Law can but direct in the things of the Law; where you can find no Christian estate, nature, name, way, life, faith, nor hope of his Calling nor, to speak properly, anything of Christianity. How now shall your Law direct in these things?

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "the Law must needs have a directive, regulating, and informing power over a godly man, as will appear by the fact that we cannot discern the true worship of God from superstition and idolatry, but by the First and Second Commandment."

Assertion: Here is a large field, this requireth a full treatise in itself, as for the expounding it in such a manner as may satisfy men's minds, being concerning this full of darkness and doubts; so for the general necessity of some clear and special light to be held forth for the informing and directing aright; a world of people going far wide, through want of this true knowledge. In brief, thus for the present, first; God was not only a God unto his people, but had made known also Himself unto them, before the solemn giving of the Law; and he gave not the Law, that by the observation and works of it he

might be their God, and they His people; nor yet that thereby they might know and conceive of Him in their hearts according to that Law of works. And therefore is it observable, that he begins with these words, "Hear, O Israel, I am thy God, &c." Now as he became their God only by Christ the promised seed, in the face of whom the knowledge of His glory is made manifest, II Cor.4:6, so his redeemed and peculiar were only to take notice of Him as God in Christ reconciling them to Himself, blessing all in the alone Messiah, giving out all peace and life through Him, and vouchsafing all favor and respect only in reference unto Him. To this dispensation, manner, and kind of revealing Himself to mankind {according to that first promise found in Genesis 3:15 – "the Seed of the woman shall bruise the serpents head;" and "in Him shall all the nations be blessed"} are all to attend; for God will not be known, nor worshiped out of his Christ. Now man's heart naturally is a shop of idolatry; infinite are the forms, conceptions, and images which we frame and have of God within us. And, as our inward notions are, under which God cometh to our understanding, so we think of Him, worship Him, seek to please Him, and lay a foundation for expecting and receiving some good from Him. And what inscription the Athenians had on their altar, {Acts 17:23,} the same may be found on a world of our devotions, all being to an unknown God. For as Christ said to the woman of Samaria, for the most part we worship we know not what, Jn.4:22, for he is only a God in our opinion and conceit, and not in truth, and his own nature, who accepteth, respecteth, loveth, or blesseth any, for any work, worth, or goodness of theirs; but the true reason and ground of all favor is Christ alone. {Eph.1:6} Thus he that in his thoughts falleth from that true knowledge of Christ, and that in Him alone the LORD is well pleased, in Christ the Father is pacified towards him,

receiveth, loveth him, without and before any actual holiness and work, or performance of his, he necessarily falleth forthwith into idolatry; because he cannot now but imagine such a God, and frame Him in his own mind, which is nowhere to be found. A God out of Christ, without a mediator, not satisfied, reconciled, at peace with us, propitious to us, &c., but requiring and respecting some duty or holiness in us, to move Him to grant us access, audience, and all blessings needful; an absolute God, clothed with glorious attributes, terrible to sinners {and not justifying the ungodly through faith in Christ, nor loving us when we were enemies, and so by His own hand and work reconciling us to Himself, without any of ours, Rom.4:5, 5:8,9,} such a God do many set up in their hearts, and they frame their devotions, works, and ways suitable with this their image; seeking in their own righteousness and holiness to draw nigh, and that some goodness or qualification of theirs should commend and ingratiate them unto Him. A friars coat, a monks hood, holy orders, pilgrimages, a strict and religious life, must speak for one sort; others fast, pray, vow, reform, &c., thinking, studying, seeking by those to pacify God, and procure His favor. Now, as we may plainly see, that the preface of the Decalogue, relates to the Covenant of Grace, of promise of peace and life in the Messiah, in which God did commend and make known Himself, what a God He would be unto them, in what way He would deal with them, and give them peace. So God, to keep this light in them, to suppress or prevent all idolatry, or spiritual and false conceivings and imaginations of Him {contrary to that His promise, whereunto man's nature is exceedingly prone} therefore saith, I am thy God {as I have made myself formally known unto thee} and thou shalt have no other; as not worship stocks and stones, so not form and conceive otherwise of me in thy heart and mind.

And verily, as the heavenly light of this true knowledge of God which did appear in the word and work of atonement by Jesus Christ, began to be eclipsed and darkened in the Church, so idolatry and superstition crept in and prevailed, so at last it became palpably gross, by images, pictures, using of saints for advocates, and the like. And the bright and glorious arising and shining forth of the Sun of righteousness, who hath healing under His wings, {Mal.4:2,} will prove the alone effectual means to disburse, dispel, demolish and abolish all that trash and superstitious vanity, and to instruct and guide to men's souls aright into the knowledge of the true God.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "the practical use is to pray and labor for such a free and heavenly heart, that the Law of God may not be a terror to you."

Assertion: You have taken a course for that aforehand; for how can the Law be a terror, while you teach that it cannot curse nor condemn? But thus a man's heart may flatter him with a false peace in the way of legal conformity, having not attained to the righteousness of Faith or of Christ. Again, that Spirit which maketh the heart so free and heavenly, that the precepts of the Law are sweetness and delight, cometh not by the Ministry of the Law, but of the Gospel; this is not the Spirit of bondage to fear, but of Adoption, Grace, and love. Therefore let us pray and labor that the Gospel may have a free passage, and be glorified.

LECTURE VI

"For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves; which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another." {Rom.2:14,15}

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "observation; there is law of nature written in men's hearts. How can the Antinomian think, that the moral law, in respect of the mandatory power of it, ceaseth?"

Assertion: Your Antinomian thinketh {as you also know} that the moral law is perpetual and inviolable, in respect of the mandatory and damnatory power also, within its own territories and dominion; there is nothing taken from it; thus you mistake him, forget yourself, and abuse your reader and hearers.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "this is good to take notice of, against a fundamental error of the Antinomians, about the Law in general, for they conceive it impossible but that the damning act of the Law must be where the commanding act of a Law is."

Assertion: If this error be fundamental, I muse you bring no stronger artillery to batter and quite raze it. Your adversary speaks of the power, and you dispute of the Act; there may be power where it is not always acting. I say still that the law hath power from the Author of it, indifferently to command and to condemn. If the Law of our Land should never condemn or punish actually for murder, because no man-slayer is to be found, yet it hath power to do it nevertheless when occasion shall serve.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "there are only two things go to the essence of a law, &c. 1. Direction. 2. Obligation."

Assertion: These are but your words, without warrant or weight, which can never carry it; your part is to fall again the contrary. 2. If there be such a law which can only direct and oblige to it, the Apostles Argument may seem to be invalid, Gal.3:10, saying, "they that are of the works of the Law are cursed, &c.," for a man may be of the works of the Law, as it is of power to oblige to direct and oblige only, say you, and yet be exempt and free from the curse. I much marvel that you or any can suppose a law obliging to it for obedience, and yet not obliging or binding to answer for disobedience. Whatever the Law saith, it saith to them that are under the law; "that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God." {Rom.3:19} Herein say you, lieth the essence of sin that it breaketh the Law; which supposeth the obligatory force of it. Answer. Sin is a swerving from the rule of direction, for "whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law; for sin is the transgression of the law, I Jn.3:4, but can there be sin, and not guilt? Or can you suppose a man to be formally a sinner, and yet out of condemnation by the law, by preventing that consequence, as you call it? Lastly, a man is properly odious and hateful to God, in that he is a sinner; and not as he is guilty and subject to the curse, which be the effects of justice, occasioned only by sin.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "God, by reason of the dominion he had over man, might have commanded obedience, and yet never a promise of eternal life."

Assertion: To what purpose do you here tell us what God might have done, where the question is of what God hath done, what a law he hath made and put man under, which, as it commandeth obedience, so it

condemneth disobedience. "Who will render to every man according to his deeds; to them who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory and honour and immortality, eternal life; but unto them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath." {Rom.2:6-8} Is not here the express and full mind of God in his law? And will you curtail or conceal any part of it? Besides, how can it stand with divine justice, to constitute a Law, without power to punish transgressors? When he giveth his law in charge, he saith, that he setteth before them life and death, blessing and cursing. {Deut.30:19} You may long tell any sober understanding man, that he may safely put his hand into the fire, it cannot burn him, for there may be a fire without power to burn, before you can persuade him unto it. And yet God hath sufficient power to do this also.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "as for the other consequent act of the law, to curse and punish; that is but an accidental act, and not necessary to a law, for it cometh in upon supposition of a transgression; and therefore as we may say of a Magistrate. He was a just and complete Magistrate for his time, though he put forth no punitive justice, if there be no malefactors offending; so is it about a law."

Assertion: The Apostle in Gal.3:19, doth strongly and convincingly conclude against you, viz., that the moral law came in with power, not only to direct, but to reveal wrath, curse, and condemn; for, saith he, "it was added because of transgression;" that is, to accuse and convince of it, and to condemn for it, that so it might be subservient to the promise, in preparing the heart for Christ the blessed Seed. This is plain to be God's intent, in giving and bringing in his law at the first by Moses. Except you can, since then, let us see how it is altered, or where and when the law was only given to direct and

oblige, the other authority and power being denied it, or rather taken away from it. 2. As for your instance in the Magistrate, I answer, if the Magistrate have no power to punish, he is no complete Magistrate. See Romans 13:4. He is a minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doth evil; this is one main part of his office, and as essential to it, as it is to countenance and defend the innocent and good. Also, I Pet.2:14, governors be sent {of purpose} for the punishment of evil doers, and for the praise of them that do well. Your other instance of confirmed Angels, is as ineffectual. They were under a law, say you. Answer, well, it is true; and those that fell are condemned by that law they were under; and now suppose any of them that do stand, should yet sin as did the other, would they not fall into the same condemnation? It may be disputable; yet it is currant with most, that the Elect Angels are confirmed by Christ; now I would learn, whether the benefit they have by Christ, is, in that the condemning power is taken from the Law they live under, so that though they fall, it cannot hurt them; or is it in that they are upheld, and established in their integrity that they cannot fall as did the evil angels, and yet the condemnation remaineth in the law still? Who then do now need most rectifying? I fear you wittingly do oppose the truth; and your manner of replying doth confirm this my opinion. If what is said be true and evident, let it leave you satisfied, and not go on against the clear light.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "every believer, though justified by Christ, is under the moral Law of Moses, as also the Law of Nature."

Assertion: You are too bold and peremptory in your assertion; for 1, if believers be under those laws, then he is under their curse; for both of them do curse and condemn all that any way disobey them; but everyone under them do many ways disobey them.

Where is there any one, if any stirring be in him, but he may observe within his own thoughts, and feel a sentence given out against him daily for one thing or other, that he is found to be guilty of! But is it not written, that Christ was made under the law to redeem us from under it. "But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons." {Gal.4:4-5} "For sin shall not have dominion over you; for ye are not under the law, but under grace." {Rom.6:14} Whether now shall we believe Paul thus saying by the infallible Spirit of God; or shall we credit you speaking contrary, of your own head, by a private spirit? 2. You say, though justified by Christ. Now I here would ask, whether by justification his condition or estate be not changed? He was under the Law before, and is he so still? What availeth then his justification? Or where is his liberty wherewith Christ hath made him free? "Therefore being justified, by faith we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ; by whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God." {Rom.5:1,2} This grace of justification is like the City of Refuge, for the peace and safety of the soul, unto which it betaketh itself by faith, that so it may find rest and security in Christ, by escaping the condemnation and danger of the Law, when it is pursued by sin and the tempter. "Who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us." {Heb.6:18} So that a Christian by his faith seeketh to be delivered from the law in the purest obedience and best works, whereof the conscience cannot be secure, nor dare not rest. Indeed faith worketh also by love, in another sphere and consideration; and here in love he is under the law, serving his neighbor in the freedom and willingness of his mind, Gal.5:13, according to that

exhortation, Eph.5:2, "walk in love, as Christ hath loved us, and given himself for us &c.," but this appertains only to our conversation and the things of this life; and is so perfect in none, but that law he serveth under, will find matter and cause of condemnation; so that still the soul, elevated and kept above in faith, by which it liveth, {"by the faith of the Son of God, who loved him, and gave himself for him," Gal.2:20,} would be found in Christ, having his righteousness, which is perfect and everlasting; and not having its own righteousness, which is of the law. "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." {Phil.3:9} If there be no curse nor danger in the works of our own righteousness, or of the law, {it having lost its condemning power, as you affirm,} why should Paul be afraid to be found there? But in temptation, and the time of inward conflict, the truth, benefit, and necessity of this will better appear, and so be discerned and readily received; and without temptation then there is no Christian. It seems that your spirit lives and abides under the Law, as under a quiet and peaceable government, without sense or fear of condemnation, and without inward molestation or checks of conscience, in that you tell us of being under both the natural and moral Law, and yet free from the condemnation of either. I find you in doctrine agreeing with Doctor Laud, who in a sermon before the King, his text being Jeremiah 6:16, said that the old paths wherein we might rest, were the Creed, the Lord's Prayer and the Ten Commandments; and added, that the Law was like unto a serpent at the hedge bottom, which had lost its sting. I believed him not, though you do; and so he told the King and the rest, what a pestilential sect the Antinomians were; and thus he did labor, as you do, to make the world believe that there

are some abolishers of the Law, and that these against whom you write, and all others who go in the same way, are such, and so not to be tolerated in the kingdom. And about the same time D. Gifford, after many invectives against that sect and sort {for it is spoken against everywhere, Acts 28:22,} in his closure gave this wise admonition to his hearers; namely, 'to repent, to believe, and to do as they should do,' and so he would warrant them to be saved. Here was repentance, faith, and inchoate obedience, as in your friend; but in which will you place salvation? In all, you and these your accomplices do say and teach; and then in none at all, doth the truth of God say; for, "if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing." Gal.5:2. You cannot but see, as D. Tailor in that his book, so others of great note amongst you, to preach and print many erroneous things; and why do you not blaze, or reprove those their assertions, as being far more palpable, and of more dangerous consequences, then is the worst or weakest expression you can find in your Antinomian authors. Is it out of a pure zeal for God? I doubt it, or you come forth thus Goliath-like to show your valor, and to defy the family of faith. And so to gratify others, you are resolved to venture against the pikes of old tried and pure truth, innocency and a good conscience. Well, henceforth be better advised; like one misted, you have mistaken your way, misrepresented your adversaries, and run your credit, cause, and conscience into a great hazard; and you may expect worse in all these, without wise and timely retreat. The council is good, if it can be seasonably taken; and it cometh from a friend, and well-wisher.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "this law of nature can never be abrogated. And herein we may demand of the Antinomian, whether the law of nature do bind a

believer or no? Whether he be bound to obey the dictates of his natural conscience?"

Assertion: If a man were not first bound, he could not be said properly to be loosed or set free. It is granted, yet with much limitation, and in some things only, that everyone is bound to obey the dictates of his natural conscience; and it is as true, to be granted by you also, that in case he hearken not at some times, or in some things, or in case of defect and failing, or imperfection, this natural law will give out sentence of condemnation for the same, as Rom.2:15, from which it is the peculiar and continual office of faith to set free, and secure the conscience. So that you do very improperly demand whether the law of nature do bind a believer, to what extent so; whereas a man believeth, that he may be set at liberty in Christ, in whom he is, in his spiritual estate towards God; in the things of his peace and life, is free, as Christ is free; with whom, by a true and real union, he is become one spirit. "But he that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit;" {I Cor.6:17;} and so is passed from the judgment of condemnation, and from death to life. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life." {Jn.5:24} And here faith doth not stand bound to give ear to the voice of either implanted, or moral law, for the procuring or preservation of peace and comfort; but turning from both, and not regarding them, doth direct and confine ear, eye the thoughts and meditations of the soul to that alone simple object Christ, and to what he speaketh in the word of grace and salvation, whose blood sprinkled and shed for remission of sins, cries for better things than the blood of Abel. This is the proper office, obedience, and exercise of faith; so "in God will I praise his word; in the LORD will I praise his word;"

{Psa.56:10;} here will I settle my thoughts, and fortify them against the dictates and accusations of a natural conscience, sense of sin, reason, law, Satan, or whatever assaileth. If faith give not an acquiescence and rest to the soul in that free and full atonement by Christ, and the goodness and favor of God in him, it is in danger to be lost forever.

And as you have given me this fair occasion, so for the more simple and weak believer's sake, who is little versed herein, and principled otherwise, let me further add, that although nature do acknowledge a God, and that he is to be worshipped, and served; yet this opinion, which is also seconded and much strengthened by the moral law, is not without danger, and is repugnant to the doctrine and knowledge of faith; for nothing is more cross to faith, than the law and natural reason; the main battle and dispute in a believer, is between the dictates of his natural conscience confirmed by the moral law, and the principles of his faith; and as the law of faith doth enter and prevail, so it captivates, demolishes and expels the natural and legal knowledge and thoughts of God, and imprints a divers from them, only suiting to the Gospel or Covenant of Grace in Christ; for now, since the death of the Testator, the covenant is so ratified and confirmed with God, that he remembers the sins of his people no more, but abides fully, and forever pleased with them in his Son; and through faith herein, the conscience also is made to yield to it, to receive and embrace it, and so is led and brought into this confidence of the quietness and peace of God towards us, and hereby effects our assured rest in God reconciled forever, which is the true Christian Sabbath. Thus every high thing exalting itself against the knowledge of God according to the Gospel, is to be cast down, and every thought to be brought into captivity to the obedience of Christ. {II Cor.10:4-5} And

by this is glory given unto God, while one thing is felt or suggested within, and another is believed. Let this be well marked of great and continual use in every Christian, that the law implanted by nature, is ever contradicting and reclaiming against the testimony of God in the free proclamation of his grace in Christ; whence arises the difficulty and impossibility of believing save by the direct power and effectual operation of God, Col.2:12, therefore in the weighty things of faith to hearken to the natural conscience, or moral law, will quite overthrow whole Christianity, and turn aside the soul to destruction. The seeds of morality and remnants of the covenant of works may be found in nature; but there is no spark nor intimation of any pure Gospel. Not even in innocence was Adam not principled to find and receive his righteousness, peace, and life in another out of himself.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "think not, that because Christ died to free you from the curse of the law, that therefore you are freed from the obedience."

Assertion: And do not you think nor teach that Christ came to take away the curse and condemning power from the law, contrary to his own express words, Mt.5:17-18, where he saith, that every jot of the Law is imperishable? And in his opening, and applying it afterwards, he doth as command, so reprove, threaten and condemn. 2. You will not deny but what Christ hath performed for me as my Surety; that I am so freed from, that it may not be required of me to that end as before. 3. Christ doth free us that we by his Spirit may serve freely and cheerfully, and without all fear, in holiness and righteousness before God all the days of our life. {Lk.1:74} Therefore are we taken into a New Covenant that giveth power and fitness so to serve, wherein he promiseth the law in our hearts, to put his Spirit into us, to give a new heart, and a new way, &c.,

which the covenant of works could not do. {Jer.31; Ezek.36:27, &c.}

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "use of instruction against the Antinomians, who must needs overthrow the directive and obligated force of the law of nature, as well as of Moses."

Assertion: This is but the old slander, the same false charge so often repeated; it is by this evident enough that those things whereof we are accused, are not so; we overthrow no force at all in your sense; thus we have it in confession, that you do deny the condemning power; for the stones then that you cast may fall upon your own head.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "some Antinomians of old held that a man was never truly mortified till he had put out all sense of conscience for sin."

Assertion: Let the understanding reader judge, whether this your doctrine of taking away the damnatory power of the law, doth not directly tend to that end, and can produce no other effect or fruits, but senselessness, and wretched security; for if I apprehend no danger in the law, it revealing no wrath, nor threatening, nor condemning, nor terrifying; I can then rest quiet and secure under the law and in sin, and so never seek nor desire to come and dwell under the protection of Christ in his Gospel.

LECTURE VII & VIII

In these two Lectures, I find many things not currant with me, and more which are dubious and questionable; but as he medleth not with his Antinomian; so I willingly let all pass, as having no mind to raise or occasion new disputes; the Church being too much disquieted already.

LECTURE IX

"For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves; which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another." {Rom.2:14,15}

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "Antinomians seem to deny all the preparatory works upon the heart of man."

Assertion: Can there be a heart desiring Christ, and willing to receive him for righteousness, reconciliation and life, and yet be no preparatory work? These a man with but half an eye may see and read in Doctor Crisp, against whom this exception is made. And what other preparation is needful, or you do know of one that may be known hereafter.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "holding that Christ immediately confers himself to gross sinners, abiding still in their sin."

Assertion: Your terms are ambiguous; by that word immediately, may be thought as if your adversary denied all use of means, as an Enthusiast; or else, that Christ communicates himself before the sinner can or do prepare to meet him or receive him, according, to that of the prophet, "I am found of them that ask not after me," Isa.65:1, as he called Matthew sitting at the receipt of custom, Mat.9:9, and Peter, Andrew, James and John, Mat.4:18-21, and so he apprehended Paul, Acts 9:3-5, for will ever the stray sheep seek first to the shepherd? Or is it not the shepherd's office to seek the scattered and lost? "For the Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost." {Lk.19:10} You are no patron of free-will, why then do you wrangle in a matter so clear? "Surely after that I was turned, I repented;

and after that I was instructed, I smote upon my thigh; I was ashamed, yea, even confounded." {Jer.31:19}

2. You say "to gross sinners?" Do you make a difference before Christ and Faith come? Paul saith, there is no difference between the profane Gentile and the legal Jew, Rom.3:9, the Jew is in no wise better than the other; although the blind Pharisee thought and judged otherwise, Lk.18:11, or is not Christ as free for one sinner as another; for a gross and great offender, an idolater, a Necromancer, as Manassas; a blasphemer, and persecutor, as Paul; for Publicans and harlots, as for a refined and reformed legalist? Alas, Sir, what then shall become of all gross sinners, if Christ may not communicate himself unto them? You would have them amended first; that may suit you but it pleaseth not Christ, who is most glorified in the chief of sinners, like that skilful physician whose art and faithfulness doth best appear in the healing and recovery of a patient desperately sick. But by what power or means shall a gross sinner reform and amend, before Christ come to him, who said truly, without me you can do nothing? You seem by this book to be just of the elder brothers, that is, the Pharisees mind, Lk.15:12, who was offended, and murmured because the loose and sinful prodigal was so freely received, and kindly welcomed and entertained. What your fears or other reasons may be, I cannot well tell; but Christ took more pleasure in conversing with gross sinners; the mercy and grace of God is become most free, and rich to the praise of the glory of it, when such are freely justified and received into favor; and never did nor shall any love so much, and be so serviceable and full of expressions of love, as such unto whom most are forgiven. "Wherefore I say unto thee, her sins, which are many, are forgiven; for she loved much; but to whom little is forgiven, the same loveth little." {Lk.7:47}

3. But you add "abiding so." What? After Christ hath communicated himself? Impossible! 2. You know your adversary can intend no such thing, nor hath any such words; but his expressions are otherwise, as it clearly appears in his book to any reader. 3. And if you mean, abiding so till Christ come to him; I say, then you must work some strange cure on such an one, in making him a Proselyte; but I forbear.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "and though they hold us passive at the first receiving of Christ, which all Orthodox do, yet they express it in an unsound sense, comparing God unto a physician that doth violently open a sick man's throat, and pour down his physick whether he will or no."

Assertion: 1. If you think that a man must or may prepare himself, you are not so Orthodox, as to hold us passive at the first receiving of Christ. 2. You stumble at the similitude used; but have not other approved divines compared God's dealing with man at first, to a rider's rough handling of a wild colt, who is forced to cast him ere he can saddle him, and by a strong hand, and sharp usage, to subdue, break and tame him? Neither of these do imply any more than is warranted, Jer.31:18, and other places. Are you of opinion that God in the conversion of a sinner doth nothing against the will of man? Look then on Manassas, Paul, the Jailor; was there not violence done, whilst God useth afflictions without, and the terrors of the Law within, driving sin into the conscience, and so compelleth the man to come in? {Lk.14:23} No bitter potion, or aloes, is so unpleasant and loathsome unto the body, as the due working of the Law is hostile to the wounded conscience; besides, the patient knowing that his physick is given not to kill, but of purpose and with a mind to prevent death, and to cure the diseased body, will more willingly receive and digest what is so

distasteful; but the soul, when the law revealeth sin and wrath, and the spirit of bondage beginneth to work, knoweth nothing of God's purpose herein, unless it be that his mind is to destroy; and therefore it doth struggle, and resist, as much as in it lieth. It may be truly said in a good sense, that God, who worketh the will and the deed, Phil.2:13, doth save a man against his will; for man of himself is both unwilling to suffer and abide the work of God in him and upon him, and also to have salvation in God's way; therefore said Christ, "you will not come unto me, that ye may have life," Jn.5:40, and that none will come, unless the Father draw them. "No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him; and I will raise him up at the last day." {Jn.6:44} And how often would God humble us, and yet we will not be humbled! Man stands out until he be made to yield, by an irresistible force outside himself. A frantic man will not be bound or cured; besides, he is held captive, and bound by Satan, though voluntarily; the strong man must first therefore be cast out by one stronger. {II Tim.2:26, Eph.2:2} Yet being overcome, converted, and made willing by the Spirit of God, his will believeth, converteth and inclineth according to the way and voice of the Gospel; so not at first, but afterward, man being changed, is become willing and active. "Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power." {Ps.110:3}

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "we may hold truly some antecedaneous works upon the heart before these graces be bestowed on us; this take to antidote against the Antinomians, who speak constantly of the souls taking Christ, while it is a grievous polluted soul."

Assertion: There is no such fear of hurt by your Antinomian doctrine, as you still pretend; but is far more danger in your so many antidotes; and the poison, as is now apparent, lieth and lurketh elsewhere. But that the

world may yet more fully and clearly see how in this also you wrong your adversaries, 1. It is evident, that both the Honey-combe and the Assertion do grant and teach as much concerning the antecedaneous work upon the soul {as it is God's, and not man's} as you can rightly call for. And whereas Doctor Crisp doth compare God to a physician so violently working upon, and enforcing his patient, &c. Is not that a sufficient preparative? Yet further, God giveth, saith Crisp, an heart to desire and receive Christ, &c. Now who can be supposed to have an heart desirous of Christ, but he that is a sensible sinner, apprehensive of his fearful estate without Christ, and convinced withal, that Christ, and Christ alone, can reconcile and save? The alone tender of our Savior to any, doth imply a lost condition without him; and may not God even then let the soul see it hath no Christ, and so is in sin and death? And thus awakening it, at that present stir up the desire and longing after him for salvation; and so that free and gracious tender of a Savior to such, becometh very seasonable and acceptable. I'm astonished that you will so vainly quarrel with your antagonists, and the plain truth of Scripture too. Oh, but this will not be received, that the soul should take Christ while it is a grievous polluted soul; we have this often set before us and I think it is sufficiently answered; at least, I grow almost weary in replying unto it. Will you have this so polluted soul to be half, or in part washed and cleansed before Christ do it? 2. Do you think that the tears of repentance, humiliation, confession, &c., have power to wash the soul from sin, as you know those of your company do teach? Or will such acts or exercises diminish the evil of sin? When a man is made to know and feel into what woe and misery his sin hath plunged him, he cannot by that think better of himself, but only grieveth, complaineth and feareth the more. Thus I write, because {which is the best I can

make of it} I take your meaning to be, that Christ should be declared to none, but to such as feelingly do acknowledge their sin. Now the sense of sickness and pain doth no whit extenuate the same; or the confession of a great debt, is no abatement of it. Further, when the woman with the bloody issue desired, and sought to many for cure and health in vain, was she by that diseased the less in body? Yea, or when through the report of Christ, she was strongly persuaded, that if she could but touch the hem of his garment, she should recover; did even this persuasion remedy her disease, till that virtue went from Christ to effect the cure? Two blind men cried, Lord, that we might see; and were they less blind therefore, before Christ opened their eyes than other blind folk who did not so complain, nor seek to Christ? Indeed, these two were not contented with that comfortless condition; but that did aggravate misery, and afflict more, rather than mitigate and ease it; only the uncertain hope of some help, did somewhat sustain and relieve their spirits. And so to conclude, the soul is not less polluted, when it knoweth and confesseth with tears its great pollutions; and whatever work or exercise else you will put the soul unto, it will not thereby cease to be polluted as much as before, for its no act or work of mans, but God's only, that cleanseth and healeth sin.

LECTURE X

"For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves; which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another." {Rom.2:14,15}

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "the Law, if it was not in itself a covenant of grace, yet it was given Evangelically, and to Evangelical purposes; and therefore the Antinomian doth wholly mistake in setting up the Law as some horrid Gorgon."

Assertion: Your "if" implies that you question the matter, and do rather incline to hold the Law in itself a covenant of grace; and if it be a covenant of grace, then it is not a covenant of works, for grace and works be as two things most contrary, which cannot agree. {Rom.11:6} 2. If the law in itself was a covenant of grace, then there were two covenants of grace. 3. You would confound Law and Gospel, which you told us out of Luther, are to be kept at a like distance as heaven and earth. 4. Yet it was given evangelically, say you. Evangelically? Who can credit you in this? For the law came in a terrible manner, as in thunders and lightnings; and the Lord descended upon mount Sinai in fire, and the whole mount quaked greatly, so that all the people trembled. {Exod.19:16-18} But the Gospel came in a joyful manner. The Angels said unto the shepherds, "fear not; for, behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people." {Lk.2:10} Neither was the law in a proper and strict sense given for Evangelical purposes, for God purposed by his Gospel to give pardon, freedom, peace, joy, refreshing, health, and rest to the souls and consciences

of his people; but by the law he intended to reveal sin and wrath, to terrify, wound, and condemn, &c. These two ministrations are to produce two contrary effects; for humbling, bruising, and beating down of the soul, being convinced of sin, guilty of death, and worthy of God's everlasting wrath, is the true and proper effect of the law, and that for which it was especially given. "Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made." {Gal.3:19} "Added because of transgressions;" that is, to discover them, to cause fear and horror in the conscience, and so to conclude or shut up the soul under a fearful and inevitable bondage and malediction; "the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe." {vs.22} Thus did Paul set up the law in a most horrid and terrible manner, as if there were no Christ, neither grace nor redemption to be expected from God, as Luther saith; so that the mistake is wholly yours. And if no such indignation, and terror be by the law, what need a Mediator for reconciliation and peace? Or Christ to be a Sanctuary or hiding place? Or any to fly to him for refuge and salvation? It seemeth that you would have the law to be preached more mildly than some Antinomians do, and with much mitigation of justice; and yet you blame others for too little law. You are not good to please; and few men's Ministry like you, so as doth your own. But this I dare say, he that was never killed, was never made alive; where the law worketh not to condemnation, there the Gospel never brought justification to life. And by this means the law is subordinate and subservient, in making sensible of sin, guilt, and damnation, in suppressing and destroying that pestilent opinion, and conceit, which everyone hath of himself, his own strength and righteousness. And lastly, when a man lieth in that deplorable and desperate case,

sighing and lamenting under that burden of sin and wrath, in making to desire and seek after help and remedy. And in a remote and general sense, or inadvertently, it may be said to have Evangelical purposes, in that all hope of righteousness, acceptance, and life, being quite lost, and gone by the Law, the mind and intent of God hereby, is, to drive man to believe in JESUS CHRIST. But of this you will tell us your mind more fully afterwards, as you say.

LECTURE XI

"But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." {Gen.2:17}

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "the Antinomian cannot by his principles avoid that Christ intentionally died, and so offered his grace to all."

Assertion: That is, Christ intended by his death, fullness, perfection and sufficiency of salvation, and that so it should be proclaimed to all, though the elect only can conceive it through faith; and that it will prove the judgment and condemnation of others who were invited to be guests, but refused to come in, as Matt.22:1-14, and had it propounded to them, Rom.10:13; this is a truth, as received by the Orthodox, Ancient and Modern, so consonant also to the Scripture; and hence Christ is called the Savior of the world. And there is neither error nor danger in it.

You say in another place, that God justly requires faith to the Gospel of all to whom it is preached, as if we all had power to believe given in Adam; and is not {according to your notion} then the object of faith, or

the grace of the Gospel to be propounded to all, with command that they believe, even for the obedience of Faith? {Rom.1:5} This is the commandment of God that men believe on the Name of his Son Jesus Christ, &c., how should they receive and apply Christ, unto whom he is not preached? {Rom.10:14-15} Or how can any be reproved for rejecting of him, whom they might not receive; or blamed for not coming unto him to have life, when as yet they had no way nor leave given? "And ye will not come to me, that ye might have life." {Jn.5:40}

LECTURE XII

"But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." {Gen.2:17}

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "for did not God deal thus with Adam? If he would obey, he should live; but if not, then he must die; will you say with the Antinomian, that this was an unlawful thing, and this was to make Adam legal, and one that was not affected with the goodness of God to him?"

Assertion: If you deal candidly, you should name your Antinomian, and not charge any crime upon the guiltless; you think he cannot be wronged too much. But if the continuance of Adam's felicity was upon condition of his obedience, it follows not that it is so with the Elect in the second ADAM Christ, for here they have a far more free and safe estate than was that in time of innocency.

LECTURE XIII

"But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." {Gen.2:17}

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "another main question is, whether the estate of reparation be more excellent than that in innocency. Now here we cannot say, one is absolutely better than another as the first estate of Adam did far exceed this in the rectitude it had &c."

Assertion: Our state of reparation in Christ, without all controversy, doth far excel that of Adam's innocency, even as an infinite Good exceedeth a finite; yea and in respect of rectitude, immortality, and felicity, your three instances; but then we must believe more than we see or feel, yea, and things contrary to what these our senses are set upon. In Christ Jesus there is a new creation; old things are past, and all things are become new; {II Cor.5:17,} he that by faith putteth on Christ, beareth the image of the heavenly, whereas the image of Adam was the image of an earthly man. As is the earthy, such are they that are earthy; and as is the heavenly, such are they that are heavenly. But our life is hid with Christ in God; and when Christ who is our life shall appear, then shall we also appear with him in glory. Again, the state of reparation is more excellent than that of innocency, in regard of immortality; for the life that Christ hath purchased and brought to light, can never be extinguished; it is an everlasting life, without fear, danger, or possibility of perishing; here is no subjection nor propensity to death or mortality; but Adam's state was not so absolute and happy; and though the body die, and the outward man perish, yet the state is imperishable and unchangeable in Christ. And, saith Christ, "if a man keep my saying, he shall

never see death." {Jn.8:51} Lastly, unto faith there is no infelicity; for all the creatures stand reconciled in Christ unto the believer; a firm and inviolable covenant is made for him with the beasts of the field, the fowls of heaven and the creeping things of the ground. {Hos.2:18, Job 5:23} Also crosses, afflictions, tribulations and even death itself, not only cannot separate from the love of God in Christ, Rom.8:33-39, but all are yours, saith Paul, for your furtherance and hope; the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come. "For all things are yours;" "and ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's." {I Cor.3:21-23} And all work together for good to them that love God, Rom.8:28, but this state is not discerned, save by the eye of saith; yet this is the truth of the Christian condition by the means of the blood of sprinkling, which hath slain and abolished all enmity, and sanctified all things unto us; and as it stands and is confirmed in the mind of God, and by him is revealed, and held forth in the word of atonement; he that is truly and effectually called by God, is stated in that grace and blessed condition, where he is without fear or danger of evil. The defects or imperfections which you speak of, are not in the state, but in our sight and apprehension; not in the thing or object, but in our little faith. The word and ordinances are left us to use, for the increasing of our knowledge, faith, assurance, consolation and full contentment of our happy condition; but the state itself simply considered, is always one and the same, neither subject to diminution, or to be augmented; as the Sun is as glorious in itself when it rises, as at mid-day, though not so to our sight and senses.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "the next question is, whether we may be now by Christ said to be more righteous than Adam, for so an Antinomian in his

Treatise of Justification, quotes places out of some Authors &c."

Assertion: The Author of that Treatise both in that book, and in his life, appeared to be as much, if not more, for the law, than any of his accusers. You cannot deny, but that the quoted places do speak fully home to what he affirmed and held; their expressions have so puzzled you, that your Answer is silly and frivolous. For, you grant the truth of all, but you must find and appoint the ground they are to stand upon, when as they had a clearer and firm ground before; but we will deal with you upon your own ground also. The Orthodox express so much, say you, upon this ground, because the righteousness of Christ as it was his, was of infinite value and consequence, and so as we are in a Mediator, we are in a better and surer condition than the Angels or Adam. If it be of infinite price and consequence as it was his, then it is so as it is imputed; for it is not impaired or diminished a whit by imputation; neither read you anywhere that God impute but only some piece or part of it; and also Christ ceases not still to be the Author and Subject of it, though imputed to us, even as we are the authors of sin, and the subjects in whom sin is seated, however it be imputed by him. Christ is the Lord our righteousness. {Jer.23:6} "Surely, shall one say, in the LORD have I righteousness." {Isa.45:24} "But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption." {I Cor.1:30} In Christ are all the treasures of his Church, and in him she is complete. "In whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." "And ye are complete in him, which is the head of all principality and power." {Col.2:3,10} By her union with him she hath communion in all his unsearchable riches, as hath the wife all by marriage with her husband; she is beautiful by his beauty. Whole Christ is the believers,

and not some portion of him or of his treasures. "Of him {saith Paul} are ye in Christ Jesus," who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption. In that Christ is ours, all his be ours, even his purity, holiness, and perfections. Again, this doth necessarily infer that imputed righteousness is more excellent than that of Adams or Angels, in that theirs was finite, they being creatures, but Christ's as imputed is infinite.

Christ, as Mediator is God-man, and therefore his person, obedience, and all things of him and from him are infinite, by reason of his Godhead. What did fully satisfy the justice of God which is infinite, must in itself needs be infinite, but that obedience and righteousness which God imputeth. Was it that gave satisfaction to his infinite justice, for the almost infinite sins of a world of men; therefore that imputed righteousness must needs be infinite. As for your reasons you bring after, they are so poor and weak, that they may well shame the owner. "For, {say you} it is only imputed to us for that righteousness which we ought to have; it is not made ours in that latitude as it was in Christ, but as we needed it. Now God never required of us greater righteousness than Adam had; and therefore it is a senseless thing to imagine, that this should be made ours, which we never needed, nor were bound to have." Answer. 1. I hope I have made it plain, that it is ours in the same largeness it was in Christ. 2. Whereas you see no necessity of it, I affirm, that a greater righteousness than Adam had, is needful and requisite for the repairing and advancing of our condition, and that upon these grounds. 1. Suppose Adam, after he had eaten of the fruit forbidden, had yet either the righteousness implanted by creation preserved in him without violation, or that God had restored it again unto him presently upon his fall; could this his righteousness have

done any more than answer and satisfy the righteousness of the moral law for the time to come? And then it could not make amends for the disobedience against the positive law, and so redeem him and his posterity from death, hell, and the devil; therefore a greater was needful. 2. There seemeth to me to be more poison in sin, than that the goodness of any or all created righteousness should be able to equipoise or countervail the evil of it; for in the transgressing of the law, there is also the act of high treason, sin reflects upon the lawgiver also contemning his authority, rebelling against him; &c., and so in regard of God vilified in the breaking of his law, the sin by this object becometh infinitely heinous and hateful, though the act and person be finite. 3. Thus for to preserve and to have kept Adam in that life and felicity wherein he was first placed he had sufficient strength and righteousness; but that could not recover and raise him up again, nor nothing that was less than infinite. 4. What God required of us to keep us in favor and happiness, was one thing, and Adam had sufficiency to have given; but now the question is, what God requireth of Christ for the making up of the breach, the appeasing of his wrath, and the full satisfying of his mind and justice according to that Law of Mediatorship laid upon him, the righteousness whereof he hath fulfilled in its totality. The first Adam, in all his perfections and abilities, could never have done the will of God as it is contained and required herein. {Ps.40:7-8} 4. Lastly, a better righteousness was needful now, in that God intended to restore, and raise his Elect unto a far more blessed state than an earthly Paradise, even unto an heavenly crown and kingdom, where they shall shine like the Sun in the firmament, and their bodies shall be, not natural, as was the body of Adam, but spiritual, made like unto Christ's glorious body. {I Cor.15:44} "Who shall change our vile body

that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself." {Phil.3:21} Therefore hath the Lord laid the infinite satisfaction and righteousness of his Son for a foundation of so superexcellent and glorious a structure or edifice. "For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." {I Cor.3:11} "And are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone." {Eph.2:20} "The glory which thou gavest me I have given them;" "Father, I will that they also, whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory, which thou hast given me." {Jn.17:22-24} You, to find out what righteousness is needful, only consult with the moral Law, and imagine a condition attainable by Christ, which, you say, is only in respect of certainty of perseverance made happier than that of Adam. You are peremptory, and Dictator-like in your assertions; and when you have put your self-liking sense upon the words of any Author, never intended by him, then you canonize him for Orthodox.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "but they never used such expressions in the Antinomian sense, as if hereby, we were made not only perfectly righteous, but also holy, and without sin."

Assertion: When the Authors have the same expressions, and use the same words; yet, if you may be the Glossary, your sinister mind can make their sense to vary and differ. They who say we are perfectly righteous, do affirm us to be holy also and without sin in the same sense and manner, but not inherently; for if the law require holiness and righteousness, how can we be justified in Christ, from what the Law hath against us, and yet not be as well holy as righteous in him, and so without sin? What can be spoken by the Spirit of God

more plainly than this, that Christ hath loved us, and "washed us from our sins in his blood?" {Rev.1:5} "And you, that were sometime alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled, in the body of his flesh through death, to present you holy and unblameable and unreprouable in his sight." {Col.1:21,22} Read Luther on Psalm 130, verse.3, who there saith, "they that put not their trust herein alone, that by the death of Christ their sins are taken away, and God's eyes closed, that he cannot see their sins, must needs perish; for this only do the Scriptures set forth, that our life resteth wholly and alonely in the remission of sins, and in that the Lord will not see our sins, but in mercy cover them, &c." In the reading of which words, the said Author of the Honey-combe was much convinced, and sore terrified and troubled, as he confessed. But your carnal reason can put a lower and strange sense upon all such places, and so present them in your own shape, that nothing may offend any; beyond a carnal sense, no truth can be admitted; what God speaks plainly, will be received no further, than wit conceiveth and letteth us see how it may be true, and then we will say, we believe it; but that is not to give credit unto God, in what in his word he these propounds, but to assent unto reason, as it comprehendeth.

LECTURE XIV

"And God spake all these words, saying." {Ex.20:1}

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "happily the Law will be more extolled in its dignity than ever, by those opinions which would overthrow it."

Assertion: It is impossible for any to extoll the Law above the dignity due and proper to it; but what you attempt for that purpose, doth neither gain glory to the Law, nor commendation to yourself. You tell us of opinions overthrowing it, yet can let your reader see none more subverting and injurious than your own. Indeed you bear the world in hand, that the adversaries which you have made, or feigned to yourself, do speak against the use of the Law and preaching of it, cry down the Law and utterly abolish it, &c., all which, with more such-like interwoven stuff, is falsely suggested by you, to render them erroneous and odious; but you can make no such things appear.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "for we may either take the word Law for the whole dispensation of the commandments, moral, judicial, and ceremonial, or else more strictly for that part we call the moral law, yet with the preface and promises added to it. And in both these respects the law was given as a covenant of grace {which is to be proved in due time} or else most strictly for that which is mere mandative and preceptive, without any promise at all."

Assertion: It is granted the word Law is capable of the two former significations; but that in both those respects it was given as a covenant of grace, especially in the later more strict sense for the moral law, is a new-coined and bold assertion, lately come out of the mint, having as yet no image or superscription upon it save only that of an unsupported assertion, to make it

currant. If your spirits be grown so wanton and confident, by reason of some supposed parts or abilities more eminent in yourself, that you will not keep tract of the Orthodox, but slight and reject all human authority, as falling too short of that height you aim at in your aspiring thoughts, yet reason requireth it of you to show your reader some clear text of Scripture, upon which you ground your distinction and positions. If the moral law strictly and properly so called, was given as a covenant of grace, why is it called a law of works, requiring man's righteousness? And then Paul argued nothing solidly, when he said, if it be of works, it is no more of grace; and if of grace, it is no more of works; else grace is no more grace. To admit the one, is to exclude and deny the other; so inconsistent they be in this point. {Rom.11:6} But you take time to prove it, and you have your asking; and we wait your leisure. In the interim, you present us with as uncouth and unwarrantable an assertion, viz., that the word Law is taken for that which is mere mandative, without any promise at all, &c. It will prove as difficult, as bold an enterprise, to undertake the proof and defense of this. The Scriptures define the law in these words, Do, and Live; and so implies the contrary, viz., he that doth not shall die; so that the mandative is not without the promise, nor threatening. When Paul saith, they that are of the works of the law, are cursed, Gal.3:10, doth he not argue convincingly, that the works of the law, which we do in obedience to its command, cannot be secured and set free from the curse? And that the law is ever invested with divine authority to promise and threaten, to curse and bless, to kill and give life? I should be afraid so to limit the Lord's Sovereignty, and to divest him of so much power in his just and holy law, as to make him some petite and under-ruler or commander, allowing him in his law only a jurisdiction to make and

impose a law, without a full and due reigning power; having no more light to clear it, than as yet you hold forth unto us. And now with this wittily-devised key, you can pick out, and give us the right sense of all those assertions which the learned have concerning the difference between the Law and the Gospel; and putting your sense into their words, can make them speak as you please. But though you can show us no text to ascertain the verity of anything, yet you give us a reason, as weak and unsound as is your affirmation.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "for if you take {as for the most part they do} all the precepts and threatening's scattered up and down in the Scripture, to be properly the law; and then all the gracious promises, where-ever they are, to be the Gospel; then it is no marvel if the law have many hard expressions cast upon it."

Assertion: This reason seemeth to occasion your forged distinction; and you would father this upon the learned, but tell us of no author, book, nor testimony. It would have been to your credit, and the justification of your weak and questioned cause, to have produced one sentence or syllable sounding that way. You may seem to disparage the learned too much, as if, confining or ascribing all the promises to the Gospel, or accounting them to be Gospel, they should deny any promise to appertain to the Law. Whereas, I think, you cannot allege one learned Author, who doth not grant the law to have its promises also, yea, and to make this difference also between Legal and Evangelical promises, that the Evangelical are free and absolute; the legal, conditional; yet never read I of any hard or undue expressions cast upon the law, as you insinuate. If the curse be not sometime expressly set down, yet it is implicit and necessarily included, where-ever the law is mentioned,

taking it for law moral; but you reserve this to a future time; and so it is referred.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "in the moral law is required justifying faith and repentance, &c., the second commandment requireth the particular worship of God; insomuch that all the ceremonial law, yea even our Sacraments, {Ordinances,} are commanded in the Second Commandment."

Assertion: You may as well say also, that the judicial law is included in the first commandment, and the second table, and so jumble and confound all in one law, which in their delivery, nature, use, and end, are so distinct. 2. Justifying faith is so called only from the object of it, unto which it hath respect; but this object is not propounded in the moral law, for the soul to have respect unto; therefore it is an error to teach that justifying faith, properly so called, is required in the moral law, and a confounding of Law and Gospel. The righteousness of God is the object of justifying faith {therefore it is called the righteousness of faith also, Rom.10:6, and that in opposition to the righteousness of the law, vs.5,} and it is only revealed in the Gospel; whence Paul infers it to be the power of God to salvation, Rom.1:16,17, and the Gospel is preached for the obedience of this faith, Rom.1:5, that is, to call and bring men unto this justifying faith; but if the law do it, it is not the proper office and end of the Gospel. 3. That which requireth repentance must necessarily propound a promise of pardon and acceptance unto the penitent; but the moral law knoweth, nor offereth no such mercy to any sinner. 4. God cannot be rightly worshipped, nor known, but in Christ the Mediator, by whom alone we have access with boldness, and confidence, Eph. 3:12, but the law teacheth not Christ. 5. And if our Ordinances be commanded in the second commandment, then they were commanded the Jews; for whatever the law

requireth, it is of them that live under it, as did the Jews, Rom.3:19, but I hope our Ordinances were not commanded them to use; yea, and we by that are to be circumcised, who now have the second commandment? If all the ceremonial law be commanded there, then the ceremonial doth not differ in nature and kind from the moral, but as a part from the whole; so that you have vainly distinguished the law into moral, ceremonial, and judicial; and many other arguments might be used to let you see your great mistake; but I forbear in a case so clear.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "the moral law hath more particulars, than can be in the law of nature; hence the Apostle saith, he had not known lust to be sin, had not the law said so, &c."

Assertion: As the Law is not so comprehensive as to contain faith and repentance, so neither do you evince it to be more extensive or large than the law of nature, having more particulars than be in that; these be your private crotchets. How will it stand with the justice of God to require more than was given to our nature at first? And the invalidity of your reason is evident; for though the Apostle had not known lust by it, yet you know that much of that law lieth dead and obscure in us; there be many seeds and remnants of it, which to us be unperceivable, till the Ministry of the Law do fetch those sparks from under the ashes; revive, and bring them to light. And lust lurketh in our corrupt nature, as fire is in the slint, not known, nor taken notice of, till the law, as the steel, beat it out, and cause it to sparkle abroad; but it followeth not that the Law containeth more, because it revealeth more. 2. You take the natural law as it is obliterated and imperfect in our corrupt nature, and the moral law in its perfection; an unequal comparison. 3. The sin of lust was there before the law came; now if there were not a law of nature, or

in nature, against which it was, how came it to be sin? By what law had it a being? For the knowledge of it, you say, was only by the moral law.

As you pass along, you are ever and anon, like a rash and passionate Schoolmaster, lashing your adversaries without cause, accusing them as guilty of crying down the law, preaching against it, reviling it, &c., and the like aspersions you cast upon them; which argue and betray too much gall and distemper in you; but such passages I pass over, being minded not to reply to every extravagant expression, but only to give satisfaction in what is material.

LECTURE XV

"And God spake all these words, saying." {Ex.20:1}

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "lastly, observe in general, that God did not give them his law, till he had humbled them."

Assertion: The principal end of giving the law, is, that by it, as an instrument, God may humble us, beating down that pride and presumption in our spirits, conceiting and boasting of what we neither have, nor are.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "to signify that the law could not be a way of justification."

Assertion: And yet you said but lately, that the law requireth justifying faith; to what end is it, if it show no way to justification; nor cannot justify, as you say afterward? Or how can it then be a Covenant of Grace?

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "God doth use the law as he doth his whole word, to beget and increase the life of grace in us, and in this effect of the law, to increase life, David doth often commend it."

Assertion: There be two principal and essential parts of the Covenant of Grace. To hold out the way of justification, peace, and life; and to promise and give the Spirit of Regeneration and Renovation. {Jer.31:33,34 & Ezek.36:25,26} And the law doth neither of these; therefore it is no Covenant of Grace.

There is nothing more against Scripture, and the main current of all true divinity, than to teach that the life of grace is begot by the Law. Here are two great mistakes. First concerning the nature of the life of grace, which is not in works, nor the expressions of inherent holiness or sanctification; for to move and walk in the law of works or in our own active righteousness, is a legal life; but that is the life of grace which reviveth, quickeneth and comforteth the mortified, dejected and distressed conscience, which lay in extreme woe, and in the shadow of death, being apprehensive of the sentence of condemnation passed upon him by the law and the spirit of bondage.

If you know not yet what this life is, and wherein it consists, ask the condemned prisoner, whose life is gone by the law, and he will say, his pardon would be his life, which must come from the mere grace and mercy of his Prince. Your great reading may tell you that when divinity was more pure and distinct than it is now, repentance was said to have two parts. Mortification & Quickening; and the object of both these is the man, who is spiritually slain by the Law, as Romans 7, and again quickened through the faith of the operation of God, and so made partaker of the first resurrection, Rev.20:6, hence it is said, "and you, being dead in your sins and the un-circumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses;" Col.2:13, and the efficient or worker of both these is God alone, who killeth and maketh alive; and man is the patient; the soul receiving the pardon of

sins, hath entrance into the presence and favor also of God; and in his favor is life; and his loving kindness is better than life. In his presence is fullness of joy, saith the Psalmist, and "at thy right hand there are pleasures for evermore." {Ps.16:11} Hence we read, that justification is to life, Rom.5:18, and Christ is the bread of life, whoever eateth of him, shall live forever, {Jn.6:51,58} and whosoever heareth his voice, shall live. {Jn.5:25} Thus life cometh by believing; but the law is not of faith. If there had been a law that giveth life, surely righteousness {which is our justification} should have been by the law, Gal.3:21, for righteousness and life come both one way; but you confess our righteousness cometh not in that way of the law; and so I hope, hereafter, you will say life cometh another way.

He that hath any Christian experience, knoweth, that when the soul lieth in death and darkness, the apprehension and presence of Christ {who is received and cometh into the heart by faith} is the only true light, life, peace, and consolation of it. What that law is, David so commended to get life by, is to be known hereafter, together with your second mistake here, viz., that the law is the instrument to beget life, and to sanctify; for it is too irksome and vain a thing to speak to these every time you cast them in our way.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "this is remarkable, that though the former tables were broken, yet now God enters into a covenant of grace with them, as appeareth by proclaiming himself long-suffering, gracious; but yet God causeth the commandments to be written again for them; implying, that these may very well stand with the covenant of grace which opposeth the Antinomian."

Assertion: God entered into a covenant of grace with them, not now, but long before. "As for me, behold, my covenant is with thee, and thou shalt be a father of

many nations." "And I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee." {Gen.17:4,7} Though God in great wisdom gave the Ten Commandments to Abraham's posterity for special ends and purposes {as now also it is continued in the Church} yet it is not joined to the covenant of grace, as if it should perfect, or alter it, or add anything to it. It being entire of itself, and distinct from the law; their natures, offices, ends, and effects so much differing one from the other. Read, Gal.3:15-17, a place full of light and satisfaction, "brethren, I speak after the manner of men; though it be but a man's covenant, yet if it be confirmed, no man disannulleth, or addeth thereto. Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, and to seeds, as of many; but as of one, and to thy seed, which is Christ. And this I say, that the covenant, that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect." And note by the way, how the Covenant or Testament and Promise are both one with the Apostle, which you stumbled at elsewhere. 2. That there is not one word of truth, in what you say to oppose your adversary; but the text is directly against yourself. 3. Where you say the Law may stand with a covenant of grace, your own words imply, that it is not then a covenant of grace, as you formerly asserted.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "how necessary it is to have this law promulgated, if it were possible, as terribly in our congregations, as it was on Mount Sinai! This would make the very Antinomians find the power of the law, and to be afraid to reject it."

Assertion: If it were so necessary that the outward promulgation or preaching of the law should be

so terrible as your wisdom requireth, surely God would have it so; for he hath power to do it, but the special power and terror is inward and spiritual; God by his convincing spirit making the heart shake and tremble in the conscience of sin, and a cursed perishing condition; of this terror and consternation, your Antinomian may soon have much experience as you, yea more, for he findeth death in that ministration, by the reviving of sin, Rom.7:9, 10, and therefore is dead to it, as Gal.2:19, but you say life cometh by the law, and so live by doing and working; an assured argument that you were never truly slain by the law. 2. Would you now have the law become so terrible in your congregations? Why then did you reprove them that made it like a horrid Gorgon, &c., you mean surely this terror only for the Antinomians, not for others; you thunder against your adversaries, but deal gently with friends. Also you dash sin out of countenance, which is well; but do not throw down man's righteousness, but establish it rather.

A little after you say, "the Antinomian counteth sin nothing, because of justification." But in what sense doth he so vilify it? I dare affirm that none hateth sin more, is so weary of it, complaineth so of its remaining and dwelling in the flesh, and the sorrow it sometime breeds him, &c., and yet if he make light of it, how can he prize justification from it? He that accounteth nothing of sin, cannot rightly esteem of a Savior to save from it; therefore contrarily our counting all things loss and dung, even our best works, legal zeal, reformation, and worship, because mingled and defiled with the leprosy of sin, for the excellent knowledge sake of Christ Jesus, our desire ever to be found in him, not having our own righteousness, to know nothing but Christ crucified, &c., all do argue sin to be our greatest and most fearful evil to our apprehensions; but it is not so with you, and your disciples, who seldom or never preach or desire to hear

of a Savior, of free justification; and do so wrangle with the doctrine of grace and faith. And lastly, it is confessed that by faith in the blood of Jesus, and the grace of justification reigning in the conscience, sin, Satan, and hell, be conquered, defied, and triumphed over. Who can lay anything to their charge? Thanks be to God through our Lord Jesus Christ, &c., he that envies this in others, is to be pitied, because of his poor condition. What account do you make of a debt you know is discharged? It troubleth you little in reference to danger by suite or law.

Lastly, that phrase of God's not seeing sin in a believer is still an eye-sore to you and many other. And to add this to the former; it argues that you make nothing of sin. For, 1, if you hated it, you would seek to get your soul cleansed from it. 2. If you loved God, you would not come and appear in his sight until you were washed from it, seeing it is unto him so hateful and abominable, that he cannot endure the sight of it; and therefore calleth upon his people to wash and make them clean, and then to come. Or yet, 3, if you feared God, and stood in true awe of him, knowing how terrible he and his presence is, where he sees and marks iniquity; {for, "if thou, LORD, shouldest mark iniquities, O Lord, who shall stand?" Psal.130:3;} for you durst not abide in his sight without that faith and assurance that the blood of his Son Jesus hath washed and cleansed you from all your sins. If, as that martyr said, the veil were taken off from the face of Moses, such a glory and dreadful Majesty would break forth, as would confound your spirits, and be intolerable, your sins being set in the light of his countenance; then you would not deal with God without faith in the blood of Christ; nor durst entertain a thought of him out of Christ, in whom iniquity is done away, never to be remembered any more. Then you cry out, Oh blessed man, whose

iniquities are forgiven, and whose sin is covered, and so use your own words; say all that ever you preached or writ against this is false, you knew not what you said. Thus a day of temptation and trouble may come, in which you all who have disparaged and despised this, may be brought to acknowledge and embrace it, as an useful and most acceptable truth of God, full of soul-consolation; which in your wretched security is now loathed and rejected; the law is so mitigated and modified in your opinion and ministry, that Sinai is your Zion, and you are not afraid to stand there.

LECTURE XVI

"And God spake all these words, saying." {Ex.20:1}

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "the Antinomian pleads for the universal abrogation of the law."

Assertion: He is indeed an Antinomian that doth so; but you cannot find the adversaries you deal with guilty of such a crime; yet you are no fit advocate to patronize or defend the law, for it is abrogated by yourself, if that be true, as it is most certain, that a law without power to condemn is no law; for the law you would establish hath no condemning power, as you say; therefore the law is by you abrogated. Sophisters do understand and take the law to be abrogated; but the truth is, the believer is abrogated and dead to it; and yet the law remaineth entire. Henceforth correct yourself, and cease to slander, or mistake your poor brethren, and without cause so to embitter your words with gall and fervor of spirit; and the Lord forgive you.

What further is spoken in this Sermon against the Antinomians, is either chargeable upon Islebius, or some

other not known to me; or, 2, is grounded upon a mere mistake of our tenets, or is answered elsewhere; so that, to avoid prolixity, I meddle with no more.

LECTURE XVII

"Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment; but I say unto you, that whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment; and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council; but whosoever shall say, thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire." {Mt.5:21,22}

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "I wonder at an Antinomian, who is so apt to oppose the doing of things in love, and doing them by the law together; for doth not the law command every duty to be in love?"

Assertion: Did not Christ tax and reprove the Pharisees for their alms, prayers, sacrifices, &c., which were things commanded in the law, because they wanted pureness of love, and did them in hypocrisy, for praise and self-ends? 2. It is the chief point of wisdom in the teacher, to discover want of truth, of affection and love to things done according to the outward precept of the law. 3. Whoso doth a thing simply, being moved thereunto by the authority of the law, doth it not in love. 4. Though the law require love in every duty, yet it both finds us in enmity, and yet it cannot breed nor work love in the heart, though it be often pressed to be done, where no such affection is found, nor once spoken of; thus most are suffered to bless themselves in that kind of doing.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "Yea, we are to love God by the law, because he hath given Christ for us; for the law commandeth to love God for whatever benefit he bestoweth upon us."

Assertion: If God command love by the law, because he hath given Christ, then you must presuppose that Christ was given before the promise to give him in the future, it had been more probable; for the promise of the Messiah was before the giving of the Law. 2. But neither you, nor I {if we understand what love in truth is} can love God because the law requireth it, though that be a reason alleged and used for it; for it is his love shed abroad into the heart that causeth love in us; as we love him, because he loved us first. Natural enmity {whatever we profess otherwise} cannot be destroyed and abolished, but by faith, which purifieth the heart, and worketh by love.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "God doth work grace in us by this {the law} as well as by the Gospel, for God doth use the law instrumentally, for to quicken up grace, and increase it in us."

Assertion: Paul rendered that as the only reason why righteousness cannot come by the law, because it cannot vivify, quicken, or give life, Gal.3:21, the quickening spirit is not adjoined to it. The proper office and end of the law is to convince us of sin and death, that we may seek righteousness and life in Christ by faith; the branch liveth and groweth in the vine, and so bears fruit.

But this controversy you do professedly, and with all your forces of Scripture and Arguments, enter upon and largely handle in your next lecture; therefore let us pass on unto it, for this entire lecture is nothing concerning us.

LECTURE XVIII

"Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment; but I say unto you, that whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment; and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council; but whosoever shall say, thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire." {Mt.5:21,22}

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "the Antinomian doth directly derogate from the profitable effect and benefit of the law."

Assertion: Your accusation and charge will prove too directly peremptory, bold, and unjust; he that acknowledgeth all the effects and benefits of the Law, that the Orthodox or God himself in his word do mention, cannot derogate any jot from it.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "this therefore is the assertion which an Antinomian Author maintains, viz., that the law is not an instrument of true sanctification; and that the promise of the Gospel is the seed or doctrine of the new birth; and it may not be denied, but that many speeches might fall from some men, which might seem to comply with that opinion.

Assertion: Here is strange insolvency and loftiness of spirit. All men's eyes must be put out, but yours, or theirs who see as you see; for you pretend learning and reading; but how is the judgment of the learned slighted and contemned by you? You stand up as a zealous advocate pleading for the Law; but what illegality and injustice is this? With what scorn and lordliness do you insult over your Adversary? And would bear, and beat down him, the truth, and his innocence, under the foot of pride and disdain. Your single opinion

must be preferred before all, and received by all; in your conceit it carries in it the light of the Sun; here is the spirit of the Pope, all err but he; all is Gospel that comes from him; his word is a law; only his chair is wanting. But what mean the President and Fellows of Sion-College to do in the end, who so approve and applaud this man, and his Book? Intend they hereby to bring in and establish a piece of new and strange divinity, and to reject and overthrow what is old and true?

1. "It may not be denied," say you. Answer. But if it might, then perhaps it would be denied; but there is that convincing power in the light of simple truth, that will force even the most impudent somewhat to yield.

2. Yet see what mincing he uses, and how unwilling he is to grant the whole truth, and that the world should know that his Adversary hath any of the learned Orthodox truly and really for him, or that he himself opposes any in this but a vilified and despised Antinomian. Many speeches might fall, saith he, from some men; as if they were half a sleep, or not so considerate as he is, when they let such speeches fall; or at least intended no such thing, or not in our sense, as he often saith; for it is in him to put what sense or gloss he pleaseth upon their words, that so they may not be for us, when as the same truth is asserted by both.

3. "From some men;" and are they not men of least worth and account too in the Church? I dare say you do think no better of them for it. They are but some then; perhaps you mean few; and yet I think you can hardly name one learned and sound Author, from whose pen the same assertion hath not fallen.

4. "Might seem to comply with that opinion." Many see things when they are not. What do they seemingly accord with us, but in truth and reality are all for you, or as you will have them? Who have learned to

make something out of anything; yet why do you not produce one for you? Because you scarce can do it. Reader, if thou hast my "Assertion of Grace," and wouldst turn to page 166 – 170, thou wilt find there Augustine, Luther, Calvin, Bullinger, Perkins, Cudworth, Brentius, Piscator, Fox, Tindall, and Rollock; unto which it is easy to add as many more Orthodox all punctual and full to the point affirming what I say; and their words are direct, full, and exclusive, denying this power and work to the law; wherefore I am not the first deviser or broacher thereof, nor alone in this opinion, as walking in an unbeaten path. But unto me it is most strange, that you should be so self-confident, and bold of spirit, as to presume to carry it with violence against all others. Let me commend unto thee the words of Perkins, because he is worthily approved of, and best known unto the simple sort, upon Gal.3:2, here, saith he, "we see the difference between the Law and the Gospel; the law doth not minister the Spirit unto us, for it only sheweth our disease and giveth us no remedy; the Gospel ministereth the Spirit." And upon Gal.2:19, "evangelical sorrow is sorrow for sin, because it is sin, this indeed is the grace of God; but it is not wrought by the law, but by the preaching of mercy and reconciliation, &c., the Law then being the cause of no good thing in us. And Cudworth on Gal.6:2, in the last difference between Law and Gospel, hath these words, "the law is no instrumental cause of faith, repentance or any saving grace." Is this now but seemingly to comply with our opinion, when they say the law is no instrumental cause of faith, repentance, nor of any saving grace, nor yet of any good thing in us? And still these Authors were no Antinomians, but we must be so, because our Adversaries, like those of Stephen, do rule, and will have it so. I tremble to consider the woeful consequences, if the Ecclesiastical power should be once

in their hands; but I trust God will not suffer the wise and honorable Parliament so to entrust them. But let us listen what his conceit is.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "I shall now labor to maintain the positive part, that the law preached may be blessed by God instrumentally to work the conversion of men."

Assertion: The question is not of God's power whether he may or can do it, but whether he hath done it; let it appear in all the New Testament, that any one was converted, but by the Gospel. Nay Paul, and Priests, with others, who had been zealous in the way of the law, were then only converted when they received the Gospel, and become obedient to the faith, Acts 6:7, or did God ever reveal it, that his will is to convert by the law? God can or may make heavy mountains to ascend as high as the Sun, and there abide; and the waters in the Sea to burn like straw or other combustible matter; but he never did so as yet. If you show it to be his will, we shall question it no further.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "and it is necessary to make this good."

Assertion: Because you have undertaken it, and are resolved to oppose the apparent and generally received truth; to be contrary to all the Orthodox; to gratify Sion College, to get a name to yourself, of being a knowing man, seeing more than all other learned divines; or at least, to maintain your own credit, now it is necessary for you.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "for were the contrary true, it would be a Ministers duty in great part to lay aside the preaching of the Moral Law, as not instrumental and subservient to that main end of the ministry, which is the conversion of souls."

Assertion: If I take your words in their true sense, they argue that {I am sorry to speak it} that Mr.

Burgess knoweth not what conversion of the soul is; but this may be tried by and by. Furthermore that he intends, when he preaches to convert people by the Law, and looketh that the Spirit should make it effectual for that purpose; and however he putteth in, or subservient to that main end, yet he means not only preparatorily, for that he saith he cannot yield unto {which yet is the clear judgment and constant and sound doctrine of all true divines} but he will be singular. But see his ground, and how sandy, uncertain, and weak it is, to lay and erect an edifice of so great consequence upon it.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "I suppose that Jesus Christ hath obtained of God by his death, that such efficacy and virtue should go forth in the Ministry, that whether it be by Law or Gospel he preacheth, the souls of men may be healed and converted thereupon."

Assertion: And must your mere supposition satisfy us in a controversy {so newly, needlessly, and yet dangerously started up, to the great offence and disturbance of the Church} of this nature, and high concernment? You may suppose, Christ hath redeemed all, men and devils. A Papist supposes that Christ by his death hath obtained that his alms-deeds, penance, and good works should have a meritorious virtue and efficacy in them for pardon and salvation; and upon that deceitful foundation or supposition, the silly deluded wretch buildeth and hazardeth his everlasting salvation. Oh that any should be so simple and unwise, to content himself with such empty and vain notions.

You say, whether it be by Law or Gospel; so, as if God and Christ are indifferent, and it is left to man's choice to use either, as he thinks or likes for conversion. That is more liberty than is allowed you!

That the souls may be healed and converted. The right order is, first to be converted, then healed,

Matt.13:15, but let this pass; yet it is requisite that we agree about the terms {for some doubts or differences may arise from the ambiguity of the words} yet not as if I would yield that regeneration, conversion or healing {of which I see you make no difference} in whatever Scripture-acceptation, are wrought instrumentally by the law; but to help the weak reader, and to clear the truth every way.

And first, regeneration is the begetting again of the soul to God, which God doth freely of his own accord by the word of truth, Jam.1:18, but because this will not be current, that this is meant of the Gospel only {as is objected, and as is to be discussed more fully in the next Lecture} in that the law is also called the word of truth. Let me therefore add two pregnant Texts, to put this out of all doubt, that it is to be understood of the Gospel exclusively. The first is Eph.1:13, "in whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation;" by which Paul tells us, how the Ephesians came to their faith and hope in Christ, namely by the preaching of the Gospel. So saith Calvin, "he adorns the Gospel with two epithets, in that he calls it the word of truth, and in that it is the instrument of salvation; which two adjuncts, saith he, are diligently to be observed." And the Gospel is not only a certain truth, which cannot deceive {for so is the Law} but he calls it the word of truth, as if properly no truth were without it; and the virtue and efficacy of it is such, that it bringeth salvation unto us, as it is also the power of God unto salvation, &c., {Rom.1:16,} and therefore Paul was not ashamed, nor afraid to preach it at Rome also. If the Law would have served, and Paul had known also this your liberty, and chose to use either Law or Gospel, he needed not to shun, nor shrink in the preaching of it, for every man's heart is principled to approve and receive that doctrine having the seeds and effect of the law

naturally in his bosom; but the Gospel is supernatural, and the soul is indisposed to receive it of itself, yea and strongly biased and inclined against that way of peace and life revealed by it; for it maketh void, rejects, and casts down all the excellency of man, his freewill, strength, righteousness, wisdom, goodness, as being vanity, folly, weakness, sin, and vile with God; so to prepare and make way in the soul to bring in and commend God's grace to be all-sufficient and that Christ alone may be exalted and rejoiced in. Hence the mystery of the Gospel was to the Gentiles foolishness, and to the Jew a stumbling-block. {I Cor.1:23}

Also it is more than evident, that this word of the Gospel was the instrument of converting all those Churches to whom Paul wrote, as his Epistles do testify; as besides these mentioned places to the Romans, Corinthians, and Ephesians, you may also see in Gal.1:6-9, Col.1:5, Phil.1:5, &c., who were called into the fellowship of the Gospel. But what need the lighting of a Candle at noon-day, unless it be still dark Saturday with us. The second remarkable place is found in, I Pet.1:23, "being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever;" and in verse.25, he expounds himself, saying, "and this is the word which by the Gospel is preached unto you." If need were, a cloud of expositors might be here produced to evince and confirm it, that this instrumental word of regeneration is not the Law, but the Gospel.

It is true, some tell us of a twofold regeneration, or rather a twofold sense of the word; by the one, the soul cometh to a second new being; and by the other, it hath the image of God imprinted upon it; and of a regeneration of Faith, and another of holiness of nature and life; but I would trouble none with these distinctions; yet this I add, that Melanchthon upon John,

observes, that "Christ calleth our justification, regeneration; and indeed it is a new creation, and the putting of the soul into a new and happy condition, for thereby it hath {a sense of} reconciliation and peace with God.

There is a twofold healing of our spiritual estates; and thus we are said to be healed by the stripes of Christ, Isa.53:5, who is the repairer of this breach; and as for that wound of conscience {in that day when sin doth bite and sting, and the law accuse and terrify} none other plaster can cure it, but the blood of Christ, who by his Eternal Spirit offered himself to purge and purify the conscience, Heb.9:14, and this is done by the application of faith; for health or salvation is only in Christ, and in nothing else you can name; and as Moses lifted up the Serpent, so must the Son of man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth in him might not perish, but have everlasting life. {Jn.3:14-15} Also, there is an inchoate and partial healing of our natures, hearts and lives, which is effected by the Spirit of Christ, renewing and changing all and every member of his mystical body, whereof he is the head; but as the Moral Law is not the instrument to reveal and hold forth Christ crucified; so Faith, by which the soul comes to be sensibly healed, and having communion with Christ to receive virtue from him, this Faith is only instrumentally by the Gospel, which is preached to all for the obedience of Faith. {Rom.16:25-26} And if our inheritance come by the law {in part or in whole} then Faith is made void, and the promise made of no effect. {Rom.4:14}

And lastly, conversion may be taken for the change of the condition, as when one who was in bondage is enlarged, set free, delivered out of the hands of his enemies; and of far off, is made near, as Jn.8:36, Eph.2:13, Col.1:21, or for the turning of the heart to God. "To open their eyes, and to turn them from

darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me." {Acts 26:18}

But note that a man may change his religion, as did the Jewish-Proselytes; and his outward way and manner of life, being refined and reformed according to the letter of the Law, as the Pharisee in Luke, chapter 18.

Now to apply all. Hence I infer, and say, that it is never read in the Scripture, that the soul was made spiritually free, and stated in grace and favor, by the preaching of the Law; but the office of it is to arrest, convince, shut up the soul under sin, the curse, and condemnation, Gal.3:22, as the Law and the Gospel are the two keys that Christ gave, that by the one, sinners might be shut and bound; and by the other, set free, and brought forth. {Matt.18:18} "For the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." {Jn.1:17}

Neither did the Law instrumentally convert and turn the heart to God; for Christ is the way to the Father; his blood and cross slays the enmity that is between divine justice and the sinner, and removes all lets whatever did hinder or separate, and so opens a free way for access. "Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way, which he hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh." {Heb.10:19,20} The righteousness of Christ is the bond or mean of union between God and the soul, bringing them into a sure and everlasting covenant of peace; Christ is first King of righteousness, and after that King of Salem, that is, of peace, Heb.7:2, now Christ, his death and resurrection, with the fruits and benefits thereof, are the subject and peculiar treasures of the

Gospel, whereof Paul was made a Minister, that he might preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ. {Eph.3:8} God cannot be compared unto, known, nor enjoyed, but in Christ. And he effectually gains and irresistibly draws the soul with cords of love; he appears gracious and merciful to poor sinners beaten down, humbled, and brought to deaths door in the conscience of sin; else the soul being afraid of him, would with Adam flee away, and hide itself from him. Hence men are exhorted to turn to the Lord, because he is gracious and merciful. {Joel 2:13, Psal.86:5, Hos.6:1,2} We are to hold forth God in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, and not imputing their sins unto them; and as Ambassadors for Christ, we pray men in Christ's stead to be reconciled unto God. {II Cor.5:18, 20} Now this cannot be by the ministry of the Law, by which cometh the knowledge of sin, for it worketh wrath, Rom.4:15, threatneth with the curse and death, Gal.3:10, and thus the Law doth by the will and appointment of God, to force man out of himself, to destroy all self-confidence, and trust in any goodness of his own, and to make him to seek out, and to hearken after Christ, the true and only right door set open in the Gospel; that by him the soul may have entrance, being found in him, not having its own righteousness which is of the Law, but that which is through faith in Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith. {Phil.3:9} It is a vain, and a strange conceit, that the soul should convert to God by the preaching of the Law, it can only turn and come unto him by faith, which nothing doth so much cross and hinder as the Law; and it putteth the soul upon a contrary way.

But if by conversion you mean {as happily you do} the change of the disposition and frame of the soul; it is as certain also, and clear, that God doth not this by the law, but by Gospel; thus, Acts 15:9, God purifieth

the heart by faith; and sanctifies by faith which resides in Christ. {Acts 26:18} This is the special commendation that Paul giveth of the Gospel, that therein we all with open face behold the glory of the Lord, as in a glass, and are changed into the same image from glory to glory even by the Spirit of the Lord. {II Cor.3:18}

Again, can man's nature be changed till he be united and engrafted into Christ the true vine? And doth not virtue come by that union? And was it ever taught, or read, that the law should be that ministry by which this is wrought? If the Law do not set this object Christ before the soul, nor is no mean to bring and join it to him, how can it be an instrument to give and communicate the Spirit of Christ? Indeed, a legal spirit or power it hath, which hath been effectual to work a great deal of reformation and legal strictness, having a specious and deceitful show and lustre, as we see in the Pharisees, who therefore were admired in their age. O Sir, if you would set before your own, and the eyes of your people, duly and daily, that exceeding kindness of God, and sweetness of his so surpassing love in Christ in so infinite expressions of it, and seek to affect both your own and their hearts with it; you would find what an incredible force and virtue is in it, far beyond any power in a legal Ministry, to melt, gain, and leaven the soul, transforming it into its own nature and image, which is love and mercy; and so disposing you to do all things of the law freely and willingly, which are but the offices and duties of love. And the law was given not to beget this love, but that by requiring it of us, either love or enmity, as it is in us, might be made manifest. In a word, no sounder, further, nor better conversion can be wrought by the law, than was in Paul, before he received the Faith; who in that his zeal of God was a blood-sucker and butcher of Christians, Christ's silly and harmless sheep; for he was inwardly in the gall of bitterness, &c.,

and so are too many this day, as we see, find, and feel, who might be metamorphosed by the Gospel, and of wolves become lambs; like Priest, like People, according to their pasture they feed in, viz. as the nature of the doctrine is they receive, so they are; where much law is, there hardness of heart, cruelty, self-love, &c., but want of meekness, humbleness, and mercy. And it will ever be true, that a legal zeal is persecuting.

If lastly, you hold this last sort of conversion to be by the law, viz. to make a loose and profane man strict and religious in his course of life, {which is properly no souls conversion; for both he may be in the same state as before, and his nature was principled for this way,} this may be granted you; but alas who seeth not that this is hypocritical, feigned & unsound. Luther saith, "the law can but make hypocrites, if there be no further work but what is by it."

This I ingenuously profess {whatever you may think of it} that my desire is not to know or think of God out of Christ, but to confine all the powers and workings of my soul unto that so pleasant and amiable object, God reconciled in his Son. And so to set him before me gracious, propitious, loving, &c., in all the events, occurrences and conditions of this life. And this is the true and only office and exercise of faith. And thus I deal with God, even as he also dealeth with me, {according to Luther's expression,} without the Law, in his Covenant of mere grace; the more I can do so, the greater confidence I have towards him, the better everything he doeth pleaseth me; the more welcome is the Cross, and the more apt and able I am to bear and digest it, the more is my heart and affections lively and sweetly stirred up and enlarged to love God, and to delight myself in him; by this mean the soul is made merry and kept joyful in the Lord, and like an Instrument in good tune, it is ready for use upon any

occasion. And the inward appearing and manifestation of God unto the soul in love and tender mercy, doth melt it, and effectually change and overcome the enmity and maliciousness of my naughty heart and nature. And this light I endeavor to hold out to all, and to walk in this way of loving kindness, long-suffering and compassion towards every one, in doctrine and life, holding it the wisest, most direct, effectual, and Gospel-like course and way, thus to overcome the forwardness and evil that is in man, with lenity and goodness, even as God in this way prevented and overcame me. The more I can look into that gentleness, amiableness, and those fatherly affections in God through Christ Jesus towards me, and that secret bosom of Divine love is so laid open; the more are all fears banished, discontentment swallowed up, and I am heartened to go on cheerfully in a Christian course, as best becometh that holy and heavenly calling. And the more abundantly God's thoughts of peace are discovered unto me, the more peace and rest I thereby find bred and preserved in my thoughts. You may account it a licentious doctrine, or otherwise asperse it with indignities, because you have little skill of it; and may bridle yourself and disciples by another mean and kind of woeful doctrine; but when you have done, I wish you might feel how your own pulses do beat. But I proceed.

You deny the Law to work only preparatory in conversion; and I think he never had experience of conversion, that is of your mind; you would make men believe you sit down with a legal reformation {as is the case of too many} instead of a Gospel-conversion; or that the law had never as yet its due and perfect work upon you, for then you would sing another song. "For I was alive without the law once; but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died." {Rom.7:9} Did ever any come to life, but by death? And

when a man hath seen and felt nothing but sin and death in himself, the law cannot tell him, nor let him know of a righteousness and life ordained for him in another out of himself; and therefore here it ceases to help. He that expects conversion by the Law, may as well seek light in darkness, life in death, conversion where confusion, terror, and desperation is. Who can credit your bare word in this, that the law, which is found both by Scripture and Experience to be the word that revealeth and worketh wrath and death, should yet be the ministry also of conversion to the soul? I cannot do it.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "only two things must be premised."

Assertion: Nay not only two, but a third also, viz. that what you say is infallibly true without exception; your new divinity must pass for current.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "first, that the law could never work to regeneration, were it not for the promise of the Gospel."

Assertion: You mean not, that the Gospel-promise should be any ingredient to the ministry of the law, and so by the virtue and efficacy of this {as some special pearl used amongst other things, in themselves of little or no force} this cure or work should be effected; but you say that virtue should go forth equally and indifferently by Law or Gospel; and this because God hath promised to give a new heart through Christ as the Medium, by and in whom he creates and changes it anew; for so you would contradict yourself; but thus you intend, that God's promise to give this heart is grounded on Christ, as the reason of making it; but the performance may be by the law. But is it your part to make this to appear for truth? By regeneration we are become {manifestly so} children to God; but if this be by the law, then are we but like Ishmael, children of the

bond-woman. Well, your words want weight and credit too. I wonder you should think such private fancies would ever be received, having no warrant but your pen. What have you no text nor author to produce, not one sentence or word from either, for confirmation?

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "so that while a Minister preaching of any commandment, doth thereby mold and new frame the heart."

Assertion: You lack any evidence for this.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "all this cometh by Christ, who therefore died, and ascended into heaven, &c."

Assertion: "Every word of God is pure; he is a shield unto them that put their trust in him. Add thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar." {Prov.30:5,6} Where is it said that Christ died and ascended to give such power and virtue unto the law?

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "so that there never was in the Church mere pure Law, nor mere pure Gospel."

Assertion: It is a heavy accusation and charge; never? What not in the Prophets, Apostles nor yet Christ's time? But always a miscellaneous or mixed doctrine? This seemeth too bold and rash. If you shuffle all together; it was not always so; the promise in Paradise, that the seed of the woman shall bruise the head of the Serpent; and that to Abraham, that in Christ all the families of the earth shall be blessed, was surely pure Gospel, without any Law. {Gen.12:3}

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "but they {law & gospel} have been subservient to each other in the great work of conversion."

Assertion: Subserviency was always granted and taught; but that may be without mixture. Christ, or the Gospel and the Law, cannot be and dwell together; and as the dead fly mars the ointment in the box, so the

least thing of the law mingled with the Gospel corrupts it, and wholly destroys it, saith Luther; they are so repugnant and opposite; you know the nature and operations of contraries, and the doctrine of grace and of works are contrary. If of grace, it is no more of works.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "you say that you approve of Luther, 'if anyone sees between the Law and the Gospel, to correctly judge, &c., know that he is a theologian;' but you will not meddle with that now."

Assertion: No, nor no time else, for it is needless; if they were always intermingled, how can they be otherwise now? And if either severally or both jointly may effect true conversion, what need we make a difference? Or why it is of so great consequence to give an exact difference between them, I understand not; but in the closure, you seem as if you would have eaten your own words.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "the second thing which I premise, is this, that howsoever the law preached may be blest to conversion, yet the matter of it cannot be blest to Justification, Adoption, or Consolation."

Assertion: Stranger still! What conversion is that which is not included in Justification? By it the soul is reunited and reconciled to God. The learned have taught and told us, that the whole passage and way from sin, wrath, and death, unto righteousness, favor, and life, is by mean of free justification. What is blest to justify, is blest to convert us to God; but the Gospel, and not the Law you grant, is blest to Justification, Adoption, Consolation. When Paul did beseech the Corinthians to be reconciled to God, II Cor.5:19,20, or to receive the Atonement, was not that to turn to God? No, God had the heart, to eschew evil and do good, is not to turn unto God. My son, give me thy heart, and then let thy eyes observe my ways. Christ is the way to God. Again, is it possible to partake of Adoption, whereby we

become children, by one doctrine, and to receive the qualification, or divine image or likeness enstamped upon us, by another doctrine? Is not our Reconciliation or Conversion, the ground of our hope and consolation? The promise of the Gospel giveth no ground of hope or consolation to the unconverted. We are begotten again to a lively hope. {I Pet.1:3} Who can have hope in God, or consolation from him, but he that is regenerated, or converted? Or is there any ground, or reason of either, but only in this, that we are called and converted to the faith of the Gospel? Blessed be God, who hath given us everlasting consolation, and good hope through grace. {II Thes.2:16} You put in after, not in any thing he doth, as if you made no difference between conversion, and man's doing, or work; which is gross. And yet elsewhere you erect much hope and consolation of future good and glory upon man's doing and duty, which here you deny, where you say there is a promise made to our works, &c.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "therefore let us not confound Law and Gospel, nor yet make them so contrary in their natures and effects, that where one is, the other cannot be."

Assertion: If this your doctrine doth not confound them, while you say they were never pure, nor distinct in the Church, and not telling what is Law, or what is Gospel, what then doeth it? But who will regard how promiscuously he preach, seeing, if he desire and intend either regeneration, healing, or conversion of the soul; or yet the increase of grace and holiness, the Law, as Gospel, may indifferently be preached by him, and blessed by God? And though in respect of the use and end intended, the law be subservient; yet in their way propounded, God's and man's righteousness; and of the effects produced by either, viz. life, and death, they are and must be contrary.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "and this must needs be the opinion of all sound divines, whatsoever may fall from them at other times; as appeareth by their common answer to the Papists question; if the Law and the commands thereof be impossible, to what purpose then doth he command them? Then we answer, that those commands are not only informing of a duty but they are practical and operative means appointed by God to work at least in some degree, that which is commanded."

Assertion: You know, they do not plainly and professedly say, this is their opinion; and therefore without alleging one sentence out of any directly to second this of yours, you labor to derive and infer it as busily as you may; such poor shifts are you put unto. Neither is it the opinion of all, for those are as sound whose answer is, that the law doth therefore command things now impossible, that we may see our great loss by the fall, with our present disability, that so we may be humbled awhile and confounded in our selves. To incline and dispose the soul to look into the Gospel-way, in which all cometh, as to beggars, by faith and prayer; therefore Augustine saith, "God commandeth things impossible," not as you say, that in commanding he may give power, but that we thereby feeling our own utter insufficiency, may be occasioned to turn precepts into prayers, saying, Give what you command, and command what you will. God bids us turn, not thereby to enable us, but that finding thereby both the necessity of it, and also our inability, we may cry, turn thou us and we shall be turned. Thus we see whose hand worketh the will and deed.

You also still mince the matter, saying, at least in some degree; you love to play at small games, rather than sit out; you are uncertain, not resolved as yet what to affirm and stick unto, this being a fiction of your own,

and no Scripture or Author can be produced to confirm or countenance it. It was never questioned, but what is wrought by the ministry of the word, is to be attributed to the Spirit, as the principal efficient; and other passages {of which he still giveth some verbal touch} being already cleared, I now proceed to his Arguments.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "I bring these Arguments to prove the Law, and preaching of it, the means of Conversion. That which is attributed to the whole word of God, as it is God's word, ought not to be denied to any part of it. Now this is made the property of the whole word of God, to be the instrument of conversion. II Tim.3:16."

Assertion: Your proposition is unsound, and will not be granted; many things are often attributed to the word in general, which cannot be affirmed of every part of it. "For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope." {Rom.15:4} That is, saith Piscator, through patience arising from the comfort of the Scripture, viz. that be written aforetime. Now in the second premise, you tell us, that however the law may be blest to conversion, yet it cannot be the ground of our justification, adoption, and consolation; nor a man cannot have hope, nor comfort in whatever he doth, but it must be the promise only of the Gospel. See how your self will not have righteousness, comfort, and hope from every part of the word, no from no part of the law, but do restrain it to the Gospel only, and yet the greatest part of what was then written was law. Your Assumption is denied also, viz. that it is the property of the whole word to be the instrument of conversion. And your place, II Tim.3:16, will not conclude it. For first, the Apostle speaks not there of conversion, but of conversation, manners and life, to the converted.

Secondly, if all Scripture were to reprove, correct; then none is to comfort; but one part is to reprove, and another for consolation, a third for doctrine, &c., law is to kill, and Gospel to make alive; what part is for one effect and purpose, hath not formally any partial ability or fitness for another; let the eye see, the tongue speak, and the feet walk, as being purposely made and fitted for their proper offices. The whole Scripture is as a full treasury, out of which may be drawn and taken what is needful for faith and manners; but what is for manners, will be unaptly used to build up in the faith. Also, Matt.13:3-9, where the word is compared to the seed, and in verse 19, is called by Christ himself, the word of the kingdom, or note of distinction; and by it is meant the Gospel, as all know. Lastly, for that place, Heb.4:12, let Piscator satisfy you if the context will not serve you; for he saith it is the word of the Gospel, which is effectual to pierce the heart, and convince the mind of the truth of the heavenly doctrine in it; so that none can with a quiet conscience derogate from the credit or verity of it. And he addeth, that it is a very usual thing with Paul, by the word of God in general, to mean the word of the Gospel.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "argument is taken from those places where the law is expressly named to be instrumental in this great work; not to name that place, Rom.7:14, where the law is called spiritual in that respect, as well as in others, because it is that which worketh spiritually in us; as Paul was carnal, because he wrought carnally."

Assertion: Indeed that place might well have been spared in this controversy; for you find nothing in it for your turn. It is called spiritual, because of the spiritual nature of it, in opposition to Paul's, which was carnal; and because Paul was carnal, therefore he wrought carnally; but his working carnally, did not make

him carnal. Also the law is called spiritual, because of its spiritual discovering and convincing power or efficacy; but not because of any spiritual change it wrought upon Paul, as the whole context and every circumstance there maketh it plain; the law let him see the viciousness of his nature, what repugnancy and contrariety was in him to that purity, holiness, and perfection held forth in the law; and so occasionally, by the commandment, sin became exceeding sinful, verse.13.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "the places are clear out of Psalm 119, and Psal.19:7, the law of the LORD is perfect, converting the soul; the testimony of the LORD is sure, making wise the simple. That which the Antinomian objects to is, that the Hebrew word doth signify largely any doctrine, and so may comprehend the whole word of God."

Assertion: You say, that others, as well as those Antinomians, take the law so largely; so that you see your adversary is not single in his opinion, as you are, who can produce no Author; but only say, it seemeth good to expound that phrase in such a manner. And otherwise it seemeth it would cross your design, else I see, nor you do show no reason. But Luther, and some others upon that place, Psal.19:7, do take the law for the moral law; but I dare say, you will not stand to their exposition of it. Luther saith, "this is no absolute commendation of the law, for the law worketh not these itself, but they are effected by the influence of the Son of righteousness, inwardly quickening, reviving, and comforting the soul through the faith of the Gospel. The law giveth, nor hath no such heat or virtue of itself, but produces contrary effects." It may indeed, saith he, "convert the eye, mouth, hand, ears, &c., all the powers; yea, the heart itself by fear of punishment, and the lusts of restrained indignation, but his heart is not right herein, and there is no true spirit of faithfulness."

In brief, his judgment is, that after the soul is justified and converted by the Gospel, then it loveth the law, which it hated before; and now it doeth not avert, or, as being afraid, flee from God in his law, but with confidence and delight draw nigh unto him, and observe the things of the law, because the Spirit of Christ in the Gospel maketh them sweeter to the soul than all the riches and pleasures of this life. Thus is the doctrine of reconciliation by Christ believed on, that marvelously altered the believer's heart, causing it to convert and turn to God, as being thereby able to abide his sight and presence, and to love his Law; which before in heart was despised.

You say nothing that hath any strength in it against the truth held out and maintained by us. And by this you may see, whence it was, that David so commended the law strictly taken, because his heart was so altered by the faith of the operation of God. It is remarkable, saith Luther, that the way to love and keep the law, is to believe and receive the Gospel; from this belief issues love and all true obedience, and it is not bred and effected by the law commanding and requiring it. "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid; yea, we establish the law." {Rom.3:31}

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "that opinion which would make Christ not take an instrumental way for conversion of men in his first Sermon; wherein he was very large, that must not be asserted; but to hold that the preaching of the law is not a medium to conversion, must needs be to say, Christ did not take the nearest way, &c."

Assertion: You answer yourself, where your words are, that our Savior's intent was only to explicate the law better than did the Scribes and Pharisees, that so they might be sensible of sin, and discover themselves to be fouler, and more abominable than ever

they judged themselves; unto which let me add, and that by requiring and so letting the hearers see a necessity of a more absolute righteousness than was held forth even in the doctrine of the Scribes and Pharisees, he might so destroy all confidence in their own works, prevent the establishing of man's righteousness, and prepare and dispose them to hearken after his righteousness; for he is the end of the law for righteousness to all that believe. {Rom.10:4} And by this it may appear that he used the law preparatory to justification and conversion; as you in part are forced to grant it to be the opinion and doctrine of all Orthodox divines, and yet it is thwarted by you, who love to have a way by yourself.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "if the law of God have that objectively in it, that may work exceedingly upon the heart when set home by God's Spirit, then it may be used instrumentally, as well as the Gospel; but it hath &c."

Assertion: Here is nothing but the vain reason of man. If God be otherwise pleased, what is it, how glorious, fit, and worthy soever it may seem for this in our eyes! The sun in the firmament is a glorious object to look upon, when we have eyes; but God useth it not therefore to give and restore the use of sight to those that be blind, the seeing man findeth variety of delightful objects to look at among the creatures, but they find him not eyes therefore.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "if the law of God may be blessed after a man is converted, to the increase of his grace and holiness, why not then to the first beginning of it? That it is for the increase of Godliness, appeareth by experience."

Assertion: The experience of every believer teacheth him, that the more he inwardly seeth and feeleth that Divine love that pardoneth, reconcileth and

preserveth the soul in that everlasting covenant of sure mercies and peace in Christ, the more it loveth again; and in love, hateth evil, escheweth it, doth good, and is every way cheerfully obedient. I love the Lord {saith David} because he heard me, when I called upon him in the time of trouble, he delivered my soul from death, my eyes from tears, and my feet from falling. What bred and caused love, and gained the heart to God at the first, that same is of continual force still to enliven and enlarge the affections towards him. But because sins are forgiven, it is said, she loved much, Lk.7:47, and if this Candle be put under a bushel, if this Sun, the light of God's countenance, do not shine forth upon the soul of a believer, it will be dark, dull, and indisposed to whatever good you can propound to it; therefore is it requisite that faith be nourished, and ever operative and lively in apprehending and feeding upon that exceeding kindness of God in Christ, that so it may be more quick and free in all holy expressions. Faith works by love; if faith die, or wax cold, by which the soul liveth, the law can but little work upon, or affect the heart. Besides, as the Christians beginning, so his building up and increasing is in another way, and by other means than are merely legal; he lives and grows in the Vine Christ, and thereby beareth fruit.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "it is hard to think that a Minister having opened any moral duty of the law, may not pray to God to clothe that word with power to change the heart of the hearers."

Assertion: Why should man think it hard, or be offended at anything, where he findeth it God's will that it be so and no otherwise? If God reveal not his mind and willingness to put forth any renewing power in the law, how can you then pray in faith to be heard? True prayer is for the fulfilling of his promise in his own way, and not in ours.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "if the Ceremonial Law, the Sacraments and Sacrifices were blessed by God's Spirit, while they were commanded to be used for the strengthening and increase of grace, notwithstanding the deadly nature of them, now then the law may be blessed, &c., seeing it stands still in force."

Assertion: While those ordinances were in use, they were effectual to increase faith, and so to quicken, confirm, and cheer the heart, against inward temptations from sin, Satan, the fear of death, of judgment, &c. for they were instituted for that purpose, and fitted also, in that they held forth and shadowed Christ Crucified, the body and substance, life, and thing signified. If you can prove that the moral law was either ordained, or so fitted for that end, you say something; else water is not so weak, as is this Argument.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "let the use of them be, &c."

Assertion: The Lord let you see your error and failing, and give you a right use of what is said. Indeed the law is holy, yet it is manifest, that maketh neither heart nor life full of holiness, though you abound in legal performances.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "what is regeneration, but the working of the moral law in the heart? That is the Image of God."

Assertion: Regeneration giveth a new being, birth and estate, as well as a new Image. It maketh us {manifestly so} sons, and also like our heavenly Father; but the law is the instrument for neither, but the word of truth, which is the Gospel of salvation, Jam.1:18, as is cleared before. You seem to have a zeal, but not according to knowledge, and so would lead and hasten on your hearers in a wrong way.

LECTURE XIX

"Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid; yea, we establish the law." {Rom.3:31}

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "let us consider a great mistake of the Antinomian Author, in the Assertion, where he makes the very ground why they are charged with Antinomianism to be, because they do not hold the law to be used by God instrumentally, for the conversion of men; certainly this is a great mistake, for there are many learned men, who hold the work of the law to be no more but preparatory."

Assertion: Sir, it is no mistake at all, for both Dr. Taylor, and many others upon that ground have so concluded, and condemned us. And if your words will sufficiently satisfy the world, that this our opinion and tenet is so Orthodox, and free from Antinomianism; as you are forced to do, lest otherwise you should unavoidably, as you see, and say, bring many, yea all the learned into the same condemnation with us, except yourself; who yet in so doing might put your own neck into the collar; I doubt not then, but the truth will also clear and free us in all other of our assertions. And so in despite of all ill-will, our innocency, which hath so unjustly suffered, and been so unworthily aspersed a long time by you and others, will at last come to light, and we shall strangely enough, stand our ground. Plead thou our cause, O God of our righteousness.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "yet for all that, they do peremptorily maintain the use and obligation of the law in respect of believers; therefore they are not in that respect condemned for that error."

Assertion: Surely, if I understand anything, neither they, nor yet yourselves will be so peremptory as to maintain the use and obligation of it to believers. To faith, or in the state or things of faith, there is no obligation, nor use of the law. If the law be useful to the working Abraham {as Luther's phrase and distinction is} yet here they all {and you also must do so at the last} unanimously confess, that the law hath power actually to condemn him in all his works, and ways; so that by his faith he ever retires in spirit, and returns to Christ his righteousness, that so he may enjoy and preserve his peace, freedom, life, and comfort; your best performances need remission of sins, much more you, for these your Lectures. Again, if the learned be not condemned for this error in this respect, yet you account it an error in them, {and cannot prove it so,} or else how is it so intolerable in us? Are you become partial and unequal judges?

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "the question is not, whether by the power of the law we come to obey the law; but whether Grace may not use the precepts, or law preached, for the inflaming of our affections so in love with the things commanded, that we are thereby made more holy; and thus I interpret those Authors that deny the law to be instrumental to holiness; that is, not animated by God's Spirit, or separated from it."

Assertion: Now you should address yourself to encounter, and you begin to shrink, in diffidence doubtless of your cause, which you perceive so unjustifiable, that no advocate will be found to patronize it; for did not you say, that you suppose Christ Jesus hath obtained by his death, that such efficacy and virtue should go forth of the ministry, that whether it be Law or Gospel, the souls might be healed and converted? And now you seem to be no longer of that mind, that by the power of the law we come to obey the law, which as

you mean it is all one with conversion. If we come not by the power of the law to obey, then it is by the power of the Gospel only; and so we agree. If you reply, you mean, by no power inherent in the law; I say, there is no inherent or physical virtue neither in the Gospel, to affect our conversion. 2. Now the question must be only, whether Grace may not use the law, &c. This is the liberty you can allow yourself, to alter and to state the question as best suites you. If you disliked the form and terms wherein you found it, why became you an opponent? And now your expressions in this be so uncouth and improper, as, that grace may use the precepts, &c., and your meaning in the residue so obscure and doubtful, and I so unwilling to wrong you the least jot, that I had rather forbear, than meddle any further.

I shall deliver my mind, {how pertinent to your question, or satisfactory to yourself it shall prove, I know not,} thus; this word of God which revealeth the riches of grace, and exceeding kindness, in giving righteousness and salvation to the soul, is the true and proper instrument for the inflaming of the affections in love both to God, his law, and all the things of God; and the law neither maketh to love God, nor its own commands. And here you so mince it, that your expression only is, to make us more holy, as if already you granted now, that the law doth not instrumentally initiate or work sanctification at first, but increase it afterward; consider this well. Lastly, those Authors you mean, are not beholden unto you for your so gross and inconsistent interpretation. They say that the law is not the instrument of sanctification. God's Spirit sanctifieth not by the law, the law is the instrument of no good, &c. It is true, you say, and thus they mean, that is, the law, not animated by God's Spirit, or as separated from it.

So neither do either they, or any, think Law or Gospel to be. 2. If that be their meaning, they might deny the Gospel to be instrumental also. 3. But you read their words in the Assertion of Grace, to be, that the Spirit doth not animate, nor use the law in sanctification or conversion, save only preparatory. Now you must either grant us, that these Authors {unto which might be added all others of any special account, are guilty of as much Antinomianism, as your adversaries are in this respect, or that your quarrel is as weakly managed, as it was causelessly undertaken; yea and that you with your society have erred in opinion and practice.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "I come to consider of those places, &c. I shall not take all, because one answer may serve for many, they being built upon the same ground."

Assertion: You are far indeed from taking all, but only such, by your perverse usage and wresting whereof, you may more subtly and easily elude, and seem to evade.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "first, the state of the question is obscurely propounded by him; for thus he saith, the promise or the Gospel, and not the Law, is the seed or doctrine of our new-birth; now here are ambiguities; as first, the promise or Gospel; for by this he seemeth to decide a great question, that whatsoever is a promise in the Scripture, this belongeth to the Gospel, but a command or threatening that belongeth to a law, whereas this needs a great discussion."

Assertion: You see a mote in your brother's eye, and consider not the beam in your own. How changeable have you been in the assertion and question last discussed and handled? You are so inconstant and mutable in your terms, sense and scope, that it is very uncertain and doubtful, as yet, what you are resolved to stand to. But, where it's said the Promise, or Gospel,

and not the Law, &c., do you accuse this of ambiguity? Surely without cause, except for your humor, or to take occasion to trouble the simple with a dotage, which none of mean understanding would ever question. As for your so great question, as you call it; all the promises in the Scripture cannot belong to the Gospel; for the law hath its promises, {do and thou shalt live in them,} where life is promised conditionally; of this is spoken before. If the word promise, were only used; yet being placed antithetically in opposition to the law, who can doubt what should be meant by it? Paul in Gal.3:18, thus uses it, "for if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise; but God gave it to Abraham by promise." How often doth he in that chapter, as in Romans, chapter 4, oppose law and the promise! Also, to avoid all ambiguity, as much as was possible, it follows. Or the Gospel; by which it is easy to conceive what is meant, by him who hath not a mind to cavil, and seek a knot in a rush. The learned tell us, that in the Scriptures use and sense, the Testament, the Covenant, the Promise, and the Gospel, generally are synonymous. Well, by promise then is meant the Gospel, so that controversy is decided, and there is no place for ambiguity. And if you turn to your named page, the word promise is not at all in the proposition; but a wanton spirit may find himself sport at his pleasure.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "the State of the question is not about the Gospel, or the Law, as they are both a doctrine, but as the Spirit of God working by one or the other; the not attending to this, maketh the Argument so confounded."

Assertion: The proposition is formally this; that the Gospel, and not the Law, is the instrument of true sanctification. What need these cautions, and vain words? As if none can speak plain English but you. And as by your Predecessor Dr. Taylor, so here we must be

styled and taken for confused men; but you only are distinct and seraphical.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "he saith, it is not the seed of the New-birth, whereas conversion or regeneration is made the writing of the law in the heart; and in Matt.13, where the word of God in general is compared to seed sown."

Assertion: And he saith nothing but he may truly affirm it still. You put no difference between regeneration, conversion, and writing the law upon the heart, which yet in propriety of phrase, sense, and use, are distinct, as is showed before; who now is guilty of confusion? And although the work you mean, should be the writing of the Law in the heart; yet it follows not to be by the law; for how then should the law in sanctification be established by faith? Lastly, it is not the word in general, but with restriction, the word of the Kingdom, that is, the Gospel, that is compared to the seed sown. {Matt.13:19}

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "the first instance is John 17:17, Sanctify them, &c., I answer that the word Sanctify, when applied to men, doth not signify only justification or renovation, but setting apart to some peculiar office, or charge."

Assertion: The words in the Assertion, are, to sanctify, in the sense of the Hebrews from whence it is taken, is to separate anything from a profane and common use, and so to consecrate it to God; or to convert it to a sacred and divine use. So that, if you have learned men {for your great and full Library, may well exceed my poor and diminished Study} who so take it, that Christ prayed here for the fitting of the Apostles for their great charge; yet that is of fishers to make them fishers of men, and so to separate them from their former profane and worldly calling and trade, unto a sacred; which thing my words do include and import

also. 2. But then to sanctify them, must be more than to ordain them for that function, even to endue them with a great measure of holiness and gifts requisite for so high a calling. Yet, 3, all that I read, do take the word as I say. And since Christ doth include others also {even all that the Father gave him} in that prayer, I still incline to their judgment. 4. You say the word doth not only signify, &c., whereas the word only is not there, but now is foisted in by you. 5. And your mere reason why to sanctify cannot comprehend justification or renovation is, because these cannot be applied to Christ; who saith, "for their sakes I sanctify myself, that they also may be sanctified through thy truth." This is much against you, as I conceive. For did not Christ sanctify himself, viz. his human nature that he might be the root, cause, and means of communicating righteousness and holiness, both to justify, renew and change them? Neither will it follow, on the other hand, that a word of so extensive a sense, may not, as it is applied to Christ, be taken more strictly, or in one sense only; and to his Elect, more largely, as it agreed to their condition.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "if sanctification do here include justification; how by the Antinomian principle can our Savior pray for the justification of them that were already justified?"

Assertion: Answer yourself; how do you ask forgiveness of sins in the Lord's Prayer, and yet believe they are forgiven in your Creed? His prayer is extended also to all that afterward should come to believe through their word and ministry.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "but in the next place, grant sanctification for renovation, how doth this prove, that the law is not used instrumentally? For our Savior's argument is universal, they word is truth; and may not this be affirmed of the Law, as well as of Gospel?"

Assertion: Our Savior's words be indefinite. But why pass you over these words in that very place, which be so material, so pertinent, and satisfactory to this your query? If we note well what this word of truth is, it will be more evident; for this end, compare with this that place, Eph.1:13 & Col.1:5,6, where the word of truth is said to be the Gospel of Salvation, and the antithesis used in John 1:17, which sets forth that it is a special and peculiar prerogative of the Gospel to be called by that name by way of excellency, as also Calvin, Piscator, &c., affirm. Thus far in the Assertion, unto all which you stand not only mute without a word of reply, but here you ask a question, which they answered before you formed it, and so would have prevented. It's granted, the Law strictly taken, is truth; but, as it is observed by all the learned, the Gospel in many like places is so called the word of Truth.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "the next instance is Tit.2:11-12, for the grace of God bringeth salvation, teaching us, &c. All this may be granted, and nothing maketh against this opinion; for none deny the Gospel to be instrumental."

Assertion: But the place doth import it to be peculiar to the Gospel; for that word of grace, or the grace of God appearing in that word, that bringeth salvation, teacheth to deny ungodliness, &c., and I put not in that word effectually ambiguously, as you charge me, but to avoid and prevent all ambiguity; for I grant, the Law teacheth these same things materially, but not with efficacy and success as doth the Gospel, the Spirit being pleased to utter such divine force and virtue in that Ministry unto the Elect.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "but is not here a contradiction? The Author before made the Gospel and promise all one; whereas here it doth command holiness

and godliness. Is not this with the Papists, to make a new Law? Let him reconcile himself."

Assertion: You are better skilled in tying knots than in unloosing any. If the Gospel and Promise be all one, that is not of my making; I found them so Gal.3:18, as is showed before; and see that you both take and leave them so, according to the true intent of Scripture. You say, it commandeth, but there is no such word in the text; but teaching to deny, that is, instrumentally. The Holy Ghost is that spiritual unction that teacheth believers, and doth it effectually by the Gospel, {Piscator on I Jn.2:27,} and this they receive, saith he, as the members from the head, the branches for the vine. But this is not wrought by, nor effected only by a literal and outward command. The Spirit moveth and teacheth a spirit, and cometh from the union with Christ. I wish your Tenets did not more interfere with Papists. But I forbear. Now you may see how your thoughts need reconciling, not my opinions; the light by this hath happily done it. Lastly, do you deny that grace moveth or teacheth effectually, because that all are not thereby effectually turned unto holiness? Then God worketh nothing effectually in any, because he doth not in every one; not in Peter, because not in Judas; else to what purpose do you make this flourish?

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "beside, the Argument may be retorted upon him. What word teacheth to deny ungodliness, &c., that sanctifieth, &c., but the law doth so, {Psalm 119,} a young man whose lusts are strongest, &c., may be cleansed by attending thereunto."

Assertion: But as it is retorted, it hath no force in it, for every word that teacheth doth not sanctify; therefore although the Law do teach, it is no consequence; your proposition is not universally true, so you conclude nothing. What say you of Philosophical

precepts and instructions? And of the dictating and teaching of every natural conscience; do these sanctify? Only this word of grace that bringeth salvation does so indeed, if you mean Pharisaical washing of the outside only, as of hands, cares, eyes, &c., these laws have washed their disciples and hearers, witness Paul before his conversion to the faith, a man touching the Law blameless; the whole generation of the Pharisees, Aristides, Socrates, &c., but what soul insides had they? Full of pride, malice, envy, infidelity, &c., and many that I know of your legal stamp; which, like him that was born of the bond-woman, condemn and persecute the children of the promise. {Gal.4:29} That place in Psalm 119, proves no more, but that a young man may be cleansed by attending to the word; and who is against that? Or what maketh it for your opinion? But that of Peter Martyr is most for our assertion; for if the Law attain such effects only when it is written in the hearts or bowels {which cometh by the new Covenant, Jer. 31,} then it is not by the outward commandments or ministry of it. And surely he could not conceive, as you say, that the Spirit doth use the Law to write itself in the heart; but, as both he and others affirm, this is effected by the Gospel, so the law is supported by faith alone. The Law is established by the preaching of Faith, which is the thing we contend for, and you have brought nothing to weaken, much less to overthrow it.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "a third and last instance out of Scripture, in answering of which, all is answered, from Gal.3:2, 'received ye the Spirit by the works of the Law, or by the hearing of Faith?' That of the Gospel or doctrine of Faith. In the opening of this Text, we must take heed of three errors."

Assertion: A Caveat against all error is necessary; but it is well, that you accuse your Antinomian of none of those three. And it had been

wisdom in you to have taken heed of affectation of singularity; for in rejecting all other of the Orthodox, you substitute a most doubtful opinion of your own; as may appear by and by.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "first, I may demand, whether any under the Old Testament were made partakers of God's Spirit or no. If they were, how came they by it? There can be no other way found, but that God did give his Spirit in all those public Ordinances unto the believing Israelites; so that although they did in some measure obey the Law yet they did it not by the power of the Law, but by the power of Grace."

Assertion: You might beware of coincidence with the first error you named, of having Faith before the Spirit; forever we come not to Faith by our reason and will; yet you grant a giving of the Spirit to believers, as if they first believed, then received the Spirit; but the gifts and operations of the Spirit are divers. It is by the Spirit that the soul cometh to union with Christ; and after the woman touched the hem of his garment, she received a healing virtue; but let this pass. By your next expression, you might seem to be an Antinomian; for, they obeyed the Law, say you, but not by the power of the Law, but by the power of Grace; what difference now? But I like not to force the joining of hands, where the parties hearts be not first linked; yet the Reader may take it, as if you contradicted yourself; for why are your words so exclusive? But if it be not by the power of the Law originally, as by the first and principal efficient, yet you mean still it is a subordinate and secondary cause or mean of conveyance.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "again, in the next place {which hath always much prevailed with me} did not the people of God receive the grace offered in the Sacraments, in the Circumcision, Paschal Lamb? They were partakers of Christ as well as we; and yet the

Apostle doth as much exclude Circumcision, and these Jewish Ordinances from grace, as anything else; wherefore that there may be no contradiction in Scripture, some other way is to be thought upon about the exposition of these words."

Assertion: When a man willingly of himself is going down a steep place, everything will further him. If you had not first conceived this silly and weak opinion of yourself, out of a humor of contradiction, and desire to be accounted the vindicator of the Law, you needed not to be so puzzled and put to such shifts, nor to seek out such sandy grounds, and tottering pillars, to support what you see cannot be upheld. I may so far credit you, that this hath prevailed with you, as you tell us; but I cannot think it always did so; for you have not always thought of this, nor always been of this private opinion, that the Law is the doctrine of regeneration.

Grant, that this prevailed to keep and continue you in that mind; yet would I learn, if I might be so bold, what brought you into it at first; sure it came by some immediate inspiration; for I see neither clear Scripture, nor author for it; and as it hath so prevailed with you, so I am sensible of no force at all in it, whether to incline or carry the judgment unto it at first, or to keep the mind the same still. Consider better of it; for it is granted, the people of God did receive the grace offered in their Sacraments, &c., and were partakers of Christ, as well, that is, as truly and as really, as we; now what is this to your purpose? I ingenuously profess, I see not wherein it maketh one jot for you, or to confirm your tenet; what would you infer hence? You say the Apostle did as much exclude these ordinances from grace as any things else and as well, and as much as the Law; that must be your meaning.

Your self have seemed still to exclude the Law from Grace; and to make a direct opposition between

them. As for Circumcision and these Ordinances, being in their prime institution types, yea signs exhibitiv of Christ, and, if not essential parts, yet appendances of their Covenant of Grace, {which cannot be said of the Law, it being a doctrine of another nature and use,} therefore neither the Apostles nor Prophets in that case and sense did exclude them from Grace; but only as the hypocrites, and unbelievers did use them, as resting in the things done, or using them being antiquated and out of date; or joining them with Christ and Faith, as necessary observances to salvation, &c. Now as this assertion will be too bold, as unjustifiable, that the Apostle doth as much exclude the Jewish Sacraments in their prime, pure, and right use, from Grace, as he doth the Law; so that Argument is too childish, viz. If the believing Jews were partakers of Christ, and did receive grace by these Ordinances; so did they receive grace by the Moral Law also. If you look again; there is neither contradiction in Scripture, nor occasion given to seek out such an uncouth and unwarrantable exposition of the words.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "some there are that understand by the Spirit, &c."

Assertion: Here, you first present your Reader with Beza's interpretation; but that is distorted, as not to your purpose. Again say you, thus it may be explained, as by faith is meant the doctrine of faith, so by the works of the Law is to be understood the doctrine of the works of the law {thus far I approve} which the false Apostles taught, viz., that Christ was not enough to justification, unless the works of the law were put in as a cause also.

If you look into Acts 15, and compare verses 1 & 5, it seemeth that they taught Christ for justification, for it is said verse 5, that "they believed; {and what should they believe in Christ for, but for righteousness,} and

yet they required Circumcision and the keeping of the Law of Moses as necessary to salvation, viz., when we are justified, we must work to get heaven. So many now hold and teach, that good works, and observing of the Law are not needful to justification, but they are to salvation; of which sort you will prove one, if I mistake not, contrary to Acts 15:10,11, "now therefore why tempt ye God, to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear, &c.," that is, as though he could not save by Christ alone; and salvation now not to be sought by grace only in Jesus Christ, saith the margin. "But we believe that through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ we shall be saved, even as they." {vs.11} Learned Zanchy states the question between Paul and the false teachers to be, whether besides Christ, good works also be necessary to salvation.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "and if this should be the sense of the Text, then it was clear, that the Galatians were not made partakers of God's Spirit by the corrupt doctrine that was taught them of late by their Seducers, but before, while they did receive the pure doctrine of Christ; and therefore it was their folly, having begun in the spirit, to end in the flesh; this may be a probable interpretation."

Assertion: Yet these exceptions may be against the latter part. 1. The question made by the Apostle is divisive, whether they received the Spirit by the doctrine of faith or by the other? For by one they must needs have it; and not whether they received the spirit by both doctrines conjoined and confounded; so that you mistake the form of the question. 2. They began in the spirit, while they abode in the doctrine of Christ for righteousness and salvation only; and their folly in ending in the flesh was, in that besides the righteousness of faith, they would have also works of

the law for salvation, for this is to end in the flesh, that is, in themselves, having begun in Christ by the spirit; or, as saith Piscator, this is called an ending in the flesh, because it is a way both heavy and impossible.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "that which I shall stand upon is this, the Jews and false Apostles when they went furthest, joined Christ and the observance of the Law equally together for justification and salvation; whereas the Law separated from Christ did nothing but curse and condemn, not being able to help the soul at all."

Assertion: It is as probable, if not more, as I said, that they held Christ sufficient to justify, but not to save, without works. 2. They joined Christ and the Law for justification and salvation say you; and you join them for sanctification and salvation; so no such great difference. 3. If the Law separated from Christ did nothing but accuse and condemn than it seemeth, if it be joined with Christ, it will acquit and justify; or you think it hath left that power to condemn being joined to Christ. Came Christ to take that power from the Law, or to mitigate and diminish it by uniting it to himself, or to redeem his elect from under the Law, to live and abide where no Law is to accuse? "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth." {Rom.8:33} Is not Christ also our sanctification and redemption, as well as our justification, without the Law? "But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption." {I Cor.1:30} This doctrine is of God, saith Paul there, but yours is but of man. Also you disclaim that the Law of itself is able to stir up the least godly affection in us, but Christ and Law together can; and not Christ without it. If the soul be married to Christ her husband, he cannot make her to bring forth fruits to God, but Moses the former dead husband must be raised up again; and so the believer

hath two husbands to make him fruitful, and both at one time; a thing utterly against the Law, and the Ordinance of Marriage, civil or spiritual; for as in the civil, two are thereby become one flesh; so they that are joined to Christ are one spirit. {I Cor.6:17}

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "more places of Scripture are brought against this; but they will come in more fitly under the notion of the Law as a Covenant."

Assertion: It is true, there are many more of the Assertion unto which as many might be added, but you have enough of these, the rest you reserve to a more fit occasion. And I had thought to have enlarged this point, but that it is lost labor; and I may ill spare any.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "thus therefore I shall conclude this point, acknowledging that many learned and orthodox men speak otherwise, and that there is a difficulty in clearing every particular about this question, but as yet, that which I have delivered carries the more probability with me."

Assertion: I thank you for your ingenuous and free acknowledgement. I am not alone in this my opinion, as yet I think you are in yours, for anything, I mean, that can be read in the Orthodox; for otherwise the whole College would not have given you such hearty thanks, and your book so superlative commendation, if they inclined not your way. Whereas you find difficulty, that is because you have taken the staff by the wrong and worst end, contending against the clear truth, I will not say against the light and checks of conscience. But the more difficult, the more fit for one of your quality and parts to encounter with, that so your victory might happily have been more glorious. Yet you have brought it no further even in your own thoughts, but to be a mere probability, and you found it in as perfect condition and state when you entered upon it; nay, I say more, I never read that it was controverted by any Protestant till

now; but your words imply that you may be of another mind tomorrow. The Lord instruct, and establish us.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "and I will give one Text more which I have not yet mentioned, that is Acts 7:38, where the Law is called the lively oracles, that is not words of life, but living words, so is as much as giving life; not that we could have life by virtue of obedience to them, but when we by grace are enabled to obey them, God of his mercy bestoweth eternal life."

Assertion: Before you were only defensive, shielding yourself as busily as you could against those Scriptures that fought against you; but now you are disposed to give your adversary one stroke; and yet the arm, or weapon rather, will not serve to fasten one blow either to hurt or fright; this is but a childish skirmish or flourish. It is granted, the Law may be called lively oracles or words; and so it is in its own nature; yea and in the Ministry of it, life is propounded, as Deut.30:19, "I have set before you life and death;" and Lev.18:5, "ye shall keep my statutes and my judgments; which if a man keep, he shall live in them;" but this life it promiseth to give, is upon such terms and impossible conditions, that as yet none was quickened by it, but contrarily it brought death upon all, by reason of that poisonous enmity and maliciousness of our common nature; whereupon Paul is bold and peremptory to affirm, that all that are of the works of the Law are cursed. This inbred enmity is discovered but not cured by the Law, Rom.3:20, Rom.7:7. Also you are much deceived, when you say that living words are as much as generating or quickening. See I Cor.15:45, "and so it is written, the first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit." The first Adam was made a living soul, not as if he could quicken himself or others; for that is peculiar to God himself, no man as yet quickened his own soul. And the opposition

in that place sheweth the great difference between those two words; for it follows that the last Adam was made a quickening spirit, in that he both quickened himself being dead, and quickens all his members. Lastly, see that place, Gal.3:21, "if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law." In which words Paul intimates that there was never a Law given that could vivify, or which had any quickening virtue to impart or communicate unto any life. I will not trouble you with commentaries directly contradicting, and overthrowing your exposition of that place, because I perceive you so abound in your own sense, that their judgment is not esteemed by you; and you have greater store of them to satisfy you when you please, then I have. And lest you should be mistaken, you add, not that we could have life by virtue of any obedience, but when we by grace are enabled to obey them &c. Now I thought that you rather should have thus said, {as more pertinent to the question in hand,} but that they do instrumentally vivify, convert and give us life to obey them. But in this saying of yours you grant as much as we contend for; for if grace that cometh by the Gospel do enable us to obey the Law, then it is not the Law that instrumentally doth convert and give life and strength to walk in it. And your last clause is dangerously ambiguous, seeming to import, that Christ is not our salvation of himself, without our works or obedience to the Law, you will speak out more plainly and fully in some other place.

And you give us a poor reason why you inclined to this your opinion, viz., because Socinians deny grace and justification under the Law or Old Testament; as if there were no middle way to take which could like you, but either you must run on the rocks on one side or the other.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "and thus I come to another question, which is the proper and immediate ground of strife between the Antinomians and us, and from whence they have their name, and that is, the abrogation of the moral Law."

Assertion: Completely mistaken! This is not the controversy, except you mean, that you do assert the Abrogation of it, for it may sooner and more easily be concluded from your tenets than any of ours, who hold the Law to be inviolable; but this may appear afterward. 2. If their name be from hence, then if you prove them not guilty of the Abrogation of the Law, you and others have falsely accused and slandered them for Antinomians, and now you forever quit them from that aspersion. I will be bold before the encounter; if he that shall prove guilty of the abrogation of it in whole, or in part, shall be the Antinomian, then look to yourself.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "Paul maketh an objection, and he doth it for this end, to take away the calumny and reproach cast upon him by his adversaries, as one that would destroy the Law. Do we make void the Law?"

Assertion: If you and your partners in your ministry did go with a right foot in the foot of the Gospel, or tread in his steps, the same would be charged upon you, and you might be glad to pretend or wipe off such aspersions. Christ himself, saith Calvin, who is the wisdom of God, could not so preach the doctrine of free-Grace, but some took occasion from his words {as you from ours} to say or think he destroyed the Law; hence was that prohibition, "think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil." {Matt.5:17} Do you think yourself more wise or wary in your preaching than Christ, or Paul was? If not, suspect yourself, in that you bear not the like reproach. When innocency is thus

traduced and condemned, who will stand? The Disciple is not above his Master; if Christ and Paul were counted Antinomians, Abrogaters of the Law, who will not take up the same Cross? And it is remarkable, by whom they were so opposed and aspersed, even by the preposterous Zealots of Moses Law; a generation which ever have and will hinder the free passage of the Gospel, and disturb the peace of the Church, like Cain, Ishmael, &c.

I thought here to have ended, but that in the closure I observe that you approve of Augustine's interpretation, viz. "the Law is established, because by the Gospel we obtain grace in some measure to fulfill the law, {we obtain it not then by the Law} and do obtain by faith in Christ {still not by the Law then} obedience in some degree to it." Your eyes are strangely shut if you see not how this interpretation maketh fully for us, and wholly against yourself. You add, which obedience though it be not the Covenant of grace, yet is the way to salvation. Now there is nothing out of the covenant of grace can be proved to be in a strict and proper sense the way to salvation. To believe in Christ is the only way to it, Acts 16:31, Christ dwelleth in the heart by faith, and he that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life. {John 3:36} By attributing too much to the Law, and our works, you obscure the glory of Christ and of free-grace, mingle Law and Gospel, entangle and deject the hearts of the faithful, carry them from Christ and that union in spirit with him, hinder the right exercise of faith and prayer, &c., for you teach that by the Law we receive grace, conversion, sanctification, so that the Law enlivens, fills, builds and satisfies. It doth not make us poor, feeble, humble, empty, nothing in our selves, that so we may seek out for all, receive, and live by faith in Christ our head, grow up in him, and so be built up in this way of faith to the everlasting Kingdom.

You thus swerve from the truth, and the old and good way.

LECTURE XX

"Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid; yea, we establish the law." {Rom.3:31}

Here you tell us, it is hard to set up Christ and grace, and not thereby to be thought to destroy the Law. But it is easy with who was never suspected. 2. You say, your Antinomians still are mistaken in this point, and plunged into a dangerous error. You should make your words good, and discover the error, if not help them out; we expect this from you. 3. But now like blind Sampson, unto whose fact you allude, you have raised a doctrine which will lead you to lay your hands on the chief pillars of the Antinomian edifice.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "the question then at this time to be discussed, is, whether the Law be abrogated, or no, by Christ, to the believers under the Gospel?"

Assertion: Who would question it? For Christ came not to destroy the Law, but taught that every jot and every tittle of it is imperishable. "Think not that I am come to destroy the Law, or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." {Mt.5:17,18} Indeed your doctrine is, the Law is deprived of all power to justify, accuse, or accurse, but who can receive it? If these be no tittle or part of the Law, I understand nothing. And yet you tell us often of promises of great rewards for your legal obedience and good works; therefore, there is a power to justify,

command, and bless established by you; or else, which I rather think, your tenets be inconsistent and mutually overthrow each other.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "if we would speak exactly and properly, we cannot say in any good sense, that the Law is abrogated at all."

Assertion: If you would keep there, denying according to the truth of the Scripture, any mitigation at all, either total or partial, we might soon agree, shake hands, and lay down our weapons.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "we may say it is mitigated."

Assertion: It is then because your tongues are your own; or that you will speak before God say so, and so without your Warrant. Such teaching of mitigating and evangelizing the Law, of God's accepting the will for deed, &c., hath occasioned such dangerous confusion of Law and Gospel, these sad controversies in the Church, much instability, and many mistakes in the people's minds, &c.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "but you must still distinguish, when we speak of the Law, some parts of it from the whole. Some parts of it may be abolished, and yet not the whole nature of it for there are in the Law these parts: 1. Commands. 2. Promises of life to him that doth them. 3. The threatening's of eternal death to him that fails. Now the Moral Law, although it be abrogated in respect of the two later to a believer, yet in respect of the former it doth still abide, yea and will continue in Heaven itself, as we have already proved, that one part of the Law may abide, when the other doth not."

Assertion: Like Foundation, like Building. This makes all your opposition, dispute, and discourse so weak and soon annihilated, in that your ground is so faulty and failing. 1. Why are you so inconsiderate thus

to distinguish where God doth not? And so audacious, as to mutilate his good Law, which he delivered, and would have still to be preserved entire and perfect? 2. All this tendeth to nothing, but to make the Kingdom and way of the Law so easy and tolerable, that the soul may here find a requiem where to settle her abode, and never enjoy nor come to Christ, and dwell under his shadow and Kingdom, where Grace through his righteousness reigneth to eternal life. {Rom.5:21} 3. What is the reason your discourse is so loose, and improper? Did you not even now tell us, that to speak properly and exactly, we cannot say in any good sense that the Moral Law is abrogated? And have you so soon forgotten what you said? Or are you regardless of any good sense or propriety of words? You make three parts, and I would know what parts they may be called? Homogeneous, as all of them truly law, as a drop of the Ocean is as verily water as the whole Sea; or Heterogeneous, as Timber and Stones be parts of a House but not of the same kind and nature in themselves? And the Soul and Body be two essential parts constituting the man; yet the one as flesh, the other as spirit; and not of one of these alone, but the composition of both is the man. So here I demand, when you tell us we must distinguish some parts of the Law from the whole, whether these parts be essential and requisite to the making or constituting of the whole Law? If these three be all parts, then to take away two will mutilate, if not destroy the whole Law, the whole consisting but of three, cannot be entire and perfect, having lost two. And the rather I ask this, because you say, {but prove not, for it is not your manner; your Disciples, and so all others, must be accustomed to swear in the words of no master,} that the Law most strictly taken is mere Mandative, without any promises at all. Now if the mere Mandative be a Law, why do you call the other two, {there excluded as

not needful,} parts of it? And not rather, with Dr. Taylor, appendices to it? 4. To distinguish between part and part, may be granted, and useful; but as to distinguish between soul and body, between Christ and his Church, or between the sign and grace in the Sacrament; but to separate and sunder one part from the other, you know here its intolerable, and destructive; and you so distinguish, that you plainly separate and cut off two parts from the third as abolished. And yet the whole nature of the Law remaineth, if we can believe you, not abrogated to the believer. You have often put your Adversary to reconcile his tenets, when there was no such cause as you see here is to agree yours. The Law in regard of the threats and promises {say you} is abrogated. A very bold assertion indeed, which never can be made good. When you promise eternal life unto every good work a believer doth is it not a legal and conditional promise, so as no good work, no eternal life? And how then can you here say, that the promises of the Law be abrogated to a believer? And when a believer, with Noah, David, Lot, &c., doth fall into open and scandalous offences, do you not threaten and terrify him, that he may be moved and stirred up, if he be secure, to seek for healing by faith in the blood of Christ? And doth not this also convincingly argue that the reproofs and threats of the Law are of force, and not abrogated? Lastly, if the preceptive part continue in Heaven, you cannot say that justice there shall be without power for the two other also; what though it doth not actually condemn any? Is God without power to make another world, because he maketh it not? And whereas you say, that you have already proved two parts to be abrogated, and one still abiding; you either forget yourself, or your own assertion must suffice; for you said so much indeed but proved not one syllable there nor here. Much more might be added to discover

the vanity and error of your opinions and exceptions against us, but this shall be all at this present.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "those that say the Law is abolished, as it is marriage bond, but not as it is rule, say true. The Law may be considered as it is a Covenant, or as it is an absolute Rule requiring conformity unto it. Now it may be granted, that the Law is abolished in the former notion, though not in the later."

Assertion: Those that say the Law as it is marriage bond, is also a rule, and where it doth regulate, there a bond is a Covenant; and that the Law is neither abolished as bond nor rule, say most truly and properly according to the Scripture. If you look upon the Law and consider it, as God propounded it, you never find an absolute rule, where it is not a Covenant; we want your scriptural proof. Though God deal with his people in a Covenant of mere mercy, it follows not, that his justice in his Law is abrogated, or any whit diminished; beside, Christ having once answered and fully satisfied that, hath also made a clear way for this manner of God's dealing; but this is only the object of the faith of the Elect. 2. You are ready to grant what favors you, to any one, save the truth to the favorers of it. In your last page, Law was not abrogated at all in any good sense, say you; but now it may truly be granted; thus you play fast and loose as you please. In whom now is inconstancy? You promise to show {but take time for it, and till then we will wait} that the Law given by Moses was a Covenant of Grace. If you understand it of the Moral Law, it will be denied; therefore look well what you affirm.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "whosoever expects life and justification by the Law, he sets up the Covenant of works again; nor is it any advantage to say, these works are the works of grace, and wrought by the Spirit."

Assertion: 1. By the Law you must needs understand the Law of nature, or as it was given to Adam, for your opinion is, that the Law given by Moses was a Covenant of Grace; by which then, till it was antiquated, it seemeth the Church might expect life and justification; so that when God said by Moses, "whosoever doth these things shall live in them," herein they were to seek righteousness and life, and not by faith. I know not how you can evade, but leave it to your second thoughts. 2. You set up the Covenant of works again, when you teach that salvation is due to good works by virtue of God's promise, though not of merit; this doth none other but set up man's righteousness and the Law as a covenant bond; yet in words you would seem sometime to deny it. And remember also your own words, viz., that it is no advantage to these works, or works of grace, for still it is by doing. 3. And by this now we may learn what you mean, when you say the Law instrumentally regenerates and converts, for it did so in David's time, and in the Old Testament; that Law by your opinion was not the Law of works but the Covenant of grace, but seeing you say withal, that that Covenant of grace is now abrogated, then it is not now to be used to quicken and convert. It was of use and force in David's time, but not now, say you; therefore the Argument is inconsequent. Or may we take you thus? Christ hath obtained that the Law given to Adam may be instrumental for the Spirit; but how is it then that you bring no other Scripture but Psalm 119, which you grant to be meant of the Law comprehensively, that is, as here, for the Covenant of grace? You see, this will not prove the Law of works to be a converting word. Thus you are found further from the truth, and at great variance with yourself, here is much need of reconciling and pacifying.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "the Law is a rule to walk by, though not a Covenant to be justified by."

Assertion: The just both lives and walks by faith, II Cor.5:7, then not by the Law. 2. If the Law by Moses be a Covenant of grace, then it was to be justified by. If you object, you mean the Law largely taken for the whole dispensation of Commandments, Moral, Judicial, and Ceremonial; I reply, you cannot make all these of one nature, so not all to make a Covenant of grace. 2. To say the denomination is given to the better part; I answer, as no text warrantees this, so the nature of the Law is not thereby changed. If you say of the whole heap in the floor, it's as corn that makes, nor proves not chaff to be wheat. Also, so the judicial, which was for the government of the Jewish Commonwealth, is as much the Covenant of grace, as the Moral Law. But this is to decline the question, and to confound what you should keep distinct.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "the Antinomian distinction, of the Law abolished, as a Law, but still abiding in respect of the matter, is a contradiction. The Law, saith the Antinomian, in the matter of it was not denied to be a rule according to which a believer walketh and liveth."

Assertion: You much wrong your Adversary, and more endanger yourself, if there be any evil in a false accusation, as the ninth command; for he saith not the Law is abolished, as a Law, but that it is inviolable and forever. Neither can, nor yet would any man so conclude from his words but you; his words are, as you say, the Law in the matter of it, is not denied, &c., but what ground is here to infer an abolition? And where he saith, a believer walketh according to the rule of the Law; yet it is not by virtue from the Law regulating him, but from another power within, renewing and disposing the heart thereunto. He is like the honest Traveler, who keepeth

the high way freely of his own accord, and taketh pleasure in so doing. And yet the work here is so imperfect, and he cometh so far short of what is in that Law, that he findeth and acknowledgeth a power therein threatening and condemning for it; so that his free justification by grace is his continual Rock and refuge, and his faith therein the sole preserver of his peace and safety. But by your doctrine, there should be no more need of justification, Christ, or faith, after conversion; for the Law hath only a Mandative power, say you, but none to condemn or curse. I muse, that your own experience doth not convince you of your error. Thus we teach and say that the Law, or more properly and plainly {that there may be no evasion} God in his Law obligeth and bindeth unto that rule of perfect righteousness, and also to the curse inevitably for every failing and disobedience. You tell of a contradiction; but it is in your own tenets, which cross and overthrow one another. And you deny God to have any Sovereign or Reigning power in his Law, but only a Ruling, and that also with much mitigation and abatement of rigor in his justice, which yet is as indefinite as unwarrantable. In ruling and commanding by his Law, he may promise no peace, life, nor good, say you, unto the obedient; nor threaten and condemn the disobedient. Thus you ex-authorize God in the Kingdom of his Law, and put him down from two parts of his justice and power regal.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "the Law is no more abrogated to a believer under the Old Testament than to one under the New Testament."

Assertion: You mean, it is as much abrogated; that is, nothing at all.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "they carry it, as if it were abrogated only to believers under the Gospel. Now how can this ever be made good? For either they must deny, that there were any believers under the Old

Testament, or if there were, then they are freed from it as much as any man."

Assertion: Indeed we hold and teach according to the Scriptures, that in the days of the Gospel, God calleth unto, and maketh his elect partakers of a far more free, excellent and comfortable state and condition than was before Christ. "Now I say, that the heir, as long as he is a child, differeth nothing from a servant, though he be lord of all; but is under tutors and governors until the time appointed of the Father." {Gal.4:1,2} You say, either we must deny that there were any believers under the Old Testament, or that they were freed as much as any now. Let any of a mean capacity but mark the Apostles words, "the Heir so long as he is a Child, differeth nothing from a servant, &c.," this represents the state of believers in that infantile age, which differeth not from a servant; how then say you, that they were freed from the Law as much as now? Will you make the condition of the Child being six or seven years old, and so kept under his Guardian and Tutor, to be as free as when being of full age, he is at his own disposing? You say, if the Law be taken for the whole administration, you grant it was pedagogical and more servile. But was not this servility principally, yea, and as concerning the conscience and the spiritual state of the soul, solely caused by the Law, which like a thick dark cloud, of sin and wrath {Rom.3:21, Rom.4:15} did interrupt and hinder their light, and make the Heavens black over their heads, so that they could not, all that while, break perfectly through that veil which lay so on them? The sacrifices and other ceremonies indeed were a burden and bondage in respect of the outward state, but not as pertaining to the conscience, which is chiefly intended by Paul. And therefore it must be understood of that servility they were in by the Law more than now; and in regard of this Moral Law especially, saith Calvin,

were they said to be under a heavy yoke, as Acts 15:10. And how can the Law pedagogically taken, be the same to them, as to us, in respect of justification and salvation, as you tell us, whereas you granted this Administration to be altogether antiquated?

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "if then we speak of the Law in regard of the essential parts of it, which are directing and commanding, threatening and promising life upon perfect obedience, these are still equally in power, or else equally abrogated to all believers under the Old or New Testament."

Assertion: If these all and every of them be now confessed to be essential parts of the Law, then none of these be appendices or mere accessories, as Dr. Taylor accounteth them; and you as likewise do make direction and obligation the only essential parts of a Law, and threatening's and premises to be but consequences required conditionally; so inconsistent and mutable are you in your positions. And if these also be essential why did you oppose it in the Assertion of Grace? Again, then to abrogate any of these, is more than to diminish one apex or iota of the Law; and so who now is become least in the Kingdom of God? But lastly, the Law in regard of these, is not equally in power to the faithful under both Testaments; for it is more than evident that the believing Jews were put under the teaching and government of it, as a Child in non-age is made subject to his Schoolmaster or Tutor, and that by the will and appointment of God. "But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed. Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster." {Gal.3:23-25} Now the time appointed by God the Father, was till the resurrection of Christ, which he calleth the coming of

faith, or the time of preaching the Gospel to all for the obedience of faith; and hereby he calleth and bringeth his Church into a more nice and happy condition; therefore now is the Church said to receive the Adoption of the Sons, Gal.4:5, that is, say interpreters, the liberty and right pertaining to Sons, which was not granted before Christ was exhibited. And saith Calvin, "truly Paul doth not speak here only of the ceremonies, nor of the Moral Law severally, but comprehendeth the whole economy or Ministry of Moses, by which God then governed his people." And if the whole, then it follows that the Law Moral is not now equally in power, as then. Also, do not you say, that the Moral Law is only now of force to a believer in the mandative and directive part, but not in the permissive or threatening. So that it concerneth you to consider, that those arguments for subjection under the Old Testament, are not so strong and valid against believers now, since the Church is in the condition of the Heir that is grown up, and of ripe age.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "therefore it is wild divinity of an Antinomian, {Honey Combe; pg.6,} who makes three different estates of the Church. 1. Under the Law. 2. Under John the Baptist. 3. Under the Gospel."

Assertion: Why is it wild? In that it groweth not in your Garden, or liketh not your fancy; so also there are other precious truths, like choice flowers, which are disliked, and cast out as unsavory weeds, by your Doctrine and Ministry. You should have showed some cause of distaste, which you do not, unless you include it in these words, "he compares these together, and sheweth how we under the Gospel exceed those of the Law, &c.," but here I see, that as you cannot receive it for truth, so you dare not plainly reject it for error. The Author in that point hath given full satisfaction to the

indifferent Reader, otherwise I should add much more. There is great difference between the time of promise, and of exhibition, or performance. It was revealed unto the Prophets that not unto themselves, but unto us they did Minister the things that are now reported unto you. I Pet.1:12.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "there are two notorious falsehoods. 1. That God indeed saw sin in believers in the Old Testament, but not in these of the new."

Assertion: To see sin is as an Act of God's justice in the legal Ministration, under which they were in the old Testament; but now {as is cleared} we are not under that Ministration, as sometime you yield; so that it may follow, that God might see sin in those, and not in these. You conceive and think of God, without reference to his word, and would have sin the object of his eternal and incomprehensible sight in a carnal sense and imagination. Can you believe that God remembers the sins of his people no more, as his Covenant is, Heb.8:12? And why not then be persuaded of this?

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "was not that place, God seeth not iniquity in Jacob, spoken of the Church in the Old Testament? And besides, if the Godly were in Christ, then doth it necessarily follow by his principles, that God must see no sin in them."

Assertion: The Author took that place, as I remember, to be a Prophecy of a future state. Though they were in Christ, yet not being adult, but in their time of minority, under that legal government, God might see and impute sin temporally unto them; so there appeareth no absurdity or contradiction, but that you love to have your own words.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "the second difference he maketh is, that God seeing, did therefore punish and afflict for it; but he doth not so now. So Moses was stricken with death, &c. Now who seeth not how weak

and absurd these Arguments are? For doth not the Apostle, speaking of those under the New Testament, say, that some were sick, some did sleep? {I Cor.11:30} Were not Ananias and Sapphira struck dead immediately?"

Assertion: Your words indeed are, that his Arguments are weak and absurd; but you make no such thing to appear. As for that of I Cor.11:30 his Answer to it still may suffice; for you show not any invalidity of it, nor regard his distinctions there given. Besides, it will not be granted that those Corinthians, nor yet Ananias, and Sapphira, were believers, and so your reason falleth short of the point in question.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "the Arguments of the Antinomians, for the greater part, do not only overthrow the use of it to believers, but to unbelievers also."

Assertion: Their Arguments, if rightly conceived of, and used, do not overthrow the use of the Law to either; but then you must keep it within its own proper limits, and use it lawfully. I grant, if you understand those words. The Law is a Schoolmaster to Christ historically only, {for some make a mystical and spiritual sense of them also} then the meaning is, that the same believing Jew who before was under the Law, yet since Christ is freed from that servitude, and so his state is changed; that Pedagogy is no longer; yea, and believer or unbeliever in the days of the Gospel, we are not to meddle with that administration by Moses, but only to give care to the Gospel, which is preached to all for the obedience of faith, Rom.1:2,5, but then it will necessarily follow, that he that believeth is actually freed from the yoke of the Law; if from the whole economy, then from every part. And he liveth by his faith only under mere free grace. "For sin shall not have dominion over you; for ye are not under the law, but under grace." {Rom.6:14}

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "we will grant that to a believer the Law is as it were abrogated in these particulars. 1. In respect of justification. 2. Condemnation. 3. Rigid obedience. 4. It is no terror, nor are the godly slavishly compelled to obey. 5. It doth not work, nor increase sin, as in the wicked. 6. It is abrogated in many accessories and circumstances."

Assertion: You say you had rather use the word Mitigation than Abrogation; as being proper, &c., and I dislike both as they are used in reference to the Law for both Scripture and Experience show that neither word is incident nor can possibly befall the Law of God; for it is inviolable. If the Fire burn you not, not Sea drown you, it's not because they have lost that natural power to do it, but in that you happily are kept out of either; and such as abide under the Law find no true abrogation or mitigation. And if the Law justify not, it is not because the power of it to justify is lost or lessened, for then it could not promise life to the observers, saying, Do and live; but in that it doth not justify, and give life actually to any, that weakness is not in the Law, but in man through the flesh, Rom.8:3, for the Law neither can, nor ever yet had power to justify a sinner, nor one that failed the least in the observance of it.

And the like may be said in respect of condemnation. The Law curses and threatens upon Sinai, but cometh not on Mount Zion. In Christ we are freed from the Law, and so from its Condemnation; so the change is in the state of a Christian, but no alteration in the Law at all. Your own expression clears it, "while the Law by reason of sin doth pursue me, I run to Christ for refuge, and seek to be found in him;" this 'I' implies that the Law hath not lost any of its threatening or cursing power, and that my security is not that the Law lacks power to condemn, but that I am in Christ, and under his protection. "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." {Phil.3:9}

As for your third respect of mitigating the rigid obedience, as you call it, yet I see you are forced to yield what Taylor and others did not, that it cannot be maintained. If we fail in the least tittle, we are presently gone by the Law. And as Christ hath not obtained at God's hand, that the Law should not oblige and tie us to a perfect obedience; so you might as truly say, he hath not procured, that the Law should not justify us being sinners; for this it could not do before. But I am glad to have such words from you, that all our obedience is accepted, not because of any mitigation in God's justice, or for dignity in the duty, but only in and through Christ alone, I Pet.2:5, which is the best piece of Divinity I find in your Book; but then there is no mitigation of rigid obedience in the Law.

To the fourth, to speak properly, the Law is therefore no terror, because a believer is not under it; for it is a terror to all that be under it; the Christian being under grace, is free from terror. And if he be sometime or something afraid, that is not because there is not fullness of security in his condition by grace, but through the imperfection of faith; as children, we fear, where and when, we have no true cause; neither doth it argue any less terror in the Law. And you have some strange and unsound expressions in this Section; for grant a regenerate and unregenerate part, yet the man is but one, and his state but one, not two; and put the Law with its terror and compelling power to the flesh, what availeth this? Can this draw the flesh to the ways of piety, as your words are? You imagine either that the flesh, being and remaining flesh, can move in the ways of piety, or that the terror of the Law can change the corrupt heart, but can clear or justify neither. It is

simple and free believing that leads and carries the soul into the right way; and all the forcing and terrifying of the Law can provoke only unto an external and hypocritical obedience, such as is in the Children of the Bondwoman. If the spirit in the godly be not always so willing, the Law cannot give aide and quickening to it, but rather damps and deadens the spirit of faith and love, and doth vivify the corruption in nature, for so saith Paul, when the Commandment came, sin revived and I died, Rom.7:9, and again, the strength of sin is the Law, I Cor.15:56. It's only faith in the Gospel of Christ that animates to all goodness cheerfully and joyfully, so Hebrews, chapter 11, Noah, Abraham, Moses, are said to do all by faith. Apart from this, though doing many things, there is nothing that we do aright. What caused life at first, must preserve, and quicken it being dead or dull.

And your fifth Assertion is false; for the Law doth {as is said and proved} increase sin even in the faithful, this being the bitter effect of it through the viciousness of our nature. "For when we were in the flesh, the motions of sins, which were by the law, did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death;" {Rom.7:5;} and all along the chapter, Paul saith, that it wrought no otherwise in him, in his regenerate estate; but that all the power to resist, weaken, and overcome sin and the flesh, was from Christ the head, and his Spirit. Therefore thanks be to God through our Lord Jesus Christ. This take notice of, that if infidelity be accidentally nourished, and faith hindered and opposed by the Law, as is most true, then sin cannot decrease, but doth increase by it. Besides, is not flesh and corruption in the regenerate of the same kind with that in the unregenerate? If the Law then be the occasion of the reviving of sin in the one, why not in the other? The nature of the flesh, nor the

operative virtue of the Law is not altered by grace, though they both be overmastered and subdued.

In the sixth you slander your Antinomian again for disparaging the Law, in that it was written in stones. What good can it do, say you? Answer: It doth good many ways, else God would not have writ it there; but that cannot make man good. God therefore hath promised to write his Law in the tables of the heart by his Spirit, whereby the Gospel also is made effectual as he pleaseth; but this inward writing of the Law, is a promise and branch of the New Covenant. Jer.31:33, &c.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "but the Law continueth to them as a rule, which may appear, first, from the different phrases used concerning the ceremonial law, nowhere applied to the moral; as which Chemuitius doth reckon up, &c., which are not used of the Moral; but when he speaks of it, he saith, we are dead unto it, we are redeemed from the curse of it, which phrases do imply the change to be made in us, and not in the Law."

Assertion: Your supposition is still false, for we hold no abrogation, mitigation or mutation in the Law, as is already cleared. 2. This maketh wholly for us; for if there be no change in the Law, then it continueth in all other offices and regards, as well as to be a rule; and so hath power to promise and to condemn also. "This sword is to your own throat." 3. You reason nothing to the point, viz., if the Antinomian could bring such places, that would prove it were as unlawful to love the Lord, because the moral Law commands it, as we could prove it unlawful to circumcise, &c. Answer: The rule of comparison requireth that it should be unlawful to circumcise, because the ceremonial Law commands it. And if that Law were of force still, and not repealed, it were as lawful to circumcise; so that the unlawfulness to do it, is not from the nature of the thing, but in that the ceremonial requiring circumcision is abrogated, but so is

not the moral; for then to love were not required. But though the moral Law command love, yet your heart wanting it, it giveth it no power to do it. Thus you have gained here nothing to your purpose, but lost both labor and credit.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "from the sanctification and holiness that it requireth of the believer, which is nothing but conformity to the Law."

Assertion: Though the Law require, yet it proves not it to be a rule, regulating, disposing and framing the soul to holiness; for the Law doth not sanctify; but Christ is of God made to be sanctification, whereby cometh true conformity to the Law. The Law requireth to be just, but doth not justify; so it willeth us to be Saints, but sanctifieth not. There is a mutual relation between Christ and faith; as a quality, or virtue, faith purifieth not; but as it fetches and derives virtue from Christ. Purity is not in us naturally, the Law requiring it, doth convince us both of the want of it, and of the necessity to have it, but it supplies us not with it; {for then Christ need not be our root of holiness, nor we by faith to have it from him;} but drives us to Christ, in whom all fullness dwelleth. You have your Answer to the rest of the Section, in what precedes.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "in that Disobedience to it is still a sin to a believer."

Assertion: As Disobedience is a sin against the Law, so it is condemned by the Law, as was David's adultery, Peter's denial, &c., else what need have they of Christ to be justified from them? So still by this the Law hath power to condemn, as well as to rule. As for the evasion you mention, I know it not; you have not as yet brought us into any such strait or danger, as that we need seek evasion. The residue of this Lecture maketh nothing for your purpose, nor at all against us.

LECTURE XXI

"Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid; yea, we establish the law." {Rom.3:31}

Here you do not invalidate the Authors assertion, nor his Arguments. If the Law and Prophets lasted but till John; and as John was greater than any before him, so the least in the kingdom of Heaven is greater than he. You will then find it hard to put John either under the Old or New Testament, or to evince your Adversary. "Was interposed between the Law and the Gospel of John, an intermediate office, and allied to both." {Calvin} It is true that the Law, or Moses and the Prophets wrote of Christ, and agreed in that; and did not only typify him in the ceremonies then used, as you imply.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "in what sense the Apostle argueth against the Law."

Assertion: Truly he argueth not against it in any true sense at all, but for it, to give and maintain all its rights.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "the proper state of the question in those days, appeareth, Acts, chapter 15, where you have a relation made of some believing Jews of the sect of the Pharisees, who pressed the necessity of circumcision, &c."

Assertion: "But there rose up certain of the sect of the Pharisees which believed, saying, that it was needful to circumcise them, and to command them to keep the law of Moses." {Acts 15:5} Note that expression, "which believed;" so that the question was then, whether that circumcision and the keeping of the Law were needful to be conjoined with the faith of Christ, in the point of salvation, and verse 11, makes it

more plain, "but we believe that through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ we shall be saved, even as they." I confess your first words might import as much; but you are not constant, but shrink much from this; and tell us what opinion the Jews were generally of, who thought that the observation of the Law without Christ was enough for their peace and comfort. In your prosecution of it, you rejoin, what in the proposition was rightly conjoined. Those Jews who thought, as you say, that the external performing of the ceremonies, and a life outwardly conformable to the Law, would secure them; they did oppose Christ, and persecute his Gospel, as I Thes.2:14,15. But the other, mentioned in Acts 15, did receive and preach the Gospel, though not according to the simplicity that is in Christ, II Cor.11:3, but added and mingled other things to that of faith, and so overthrew the whole Gospel, and salvation also. Hence it was the Apostle peremptorily said, that, if they were circumcised, Christ profited them nothing; implying that they would have Christ and Circumcision too. Your words are, that the Apostle speaketh seemingly derogatorily to the Law, because they took it without Christ. But he indeed derogated not from it, but acknowledged it to be good, if used lawfully; but they did otherwise; not in taking it without Christ, as you affirm; but in conjoining it with him, as if he alone were not sufficient to salvation as well as to righteousness, without the works of the Law. Take you heed of this way, and this kind of teaching.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "now where the Law seemeth to be abrogated, it is taken either synecdochically put for that part which actually condemneth, as Galatians 5. Against such is no Law; for he speaks, as if there were nothing in the Law but condemnation. Whereas we may say, the Law is by way

of direction and prescription; for a thing, as well as against it by accusation."

Assertion: If it be said, the Law of our Land hath nothing against you or to accuse you of in point of homicide, is this any seeming abolition of the Law? While your innocency is cleared and justified, the Law suffereth no diminution by it; how trifling and childish is this your discourse? If the Law be for a thing in direction, and against it by accusation, then by Paul's doctrine still it hath lost nothing of its power. Thus the constant mistake is not ours, but yours, who most abolish the Law indeed.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "first, he is without the Law, that is without the understanding of it; thus the Gentiles. Secondly, without the sense and experience of the terrifying power of it, as Paul, Romans 7. Now the godly, though they be denied to be under the Law, yet are not said to be without it."

Assertion: It is true, the faithful have both understanding and experience of the Law; but now, saith Luther, it is their chief point of wisdom to be ignorant of the Law. Is not this a Paradox or Parable? You say Paul, Rom.4:14, cannot mean the Law of Moses, for that was long after; a poor reason. Doth he not, in Galatians 3, deny the blessing and inheritance of Abraham to be by the Law, but by promise? And yet in verse 17, he saith that the Law was 430 years after. When the blessing was promised to come in that way to Abraham, there was no question; but now since the circumcision and the Law were after added to the promise, and have been of so long continuance, is that question thereby occasioned.

In the fifth Interpretation of what it is to be under the Law, your words are nothing against us, but rather confirm that exposition of Rom.6:14, which is in the Assertion of Grace against D.T. But observe withal,

how here you oppose Law and Grace in sanctifying and healing, which formerly you so much contradicted. You say, the Law is never so much alive, as in the godly, who most obey it. But I say, it is the Spirit of Christ that quickeneth them by the Gospel, to love and obey the Law; and their obedience floweth from this life of faith, as an expression of it. He that liveth by faith, as Gal.2:19,20, keepeth the Law joyfully, and freely.

LECTURE XXII

"And he declared unto you his covenant." {Deut.4:13}

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "I have already handled the Law as a rule, and now come to consider it as a Covenant, that so the whole Law may be fully understood."

Assertion: Your undertaken be great, and your promises plentiful and fair, but never knew I worse success, nor less performance. I muse that these points so weighty, and so much controverted, should be so slightly handled, and your Affirmative part so weakly confirmed by a man of your learning. Suppose all be clear and unquestionable to yourself; {which I cannot believe now;} yet others need more light than as yet you hold forth. And your Adversaries see nothing to convince and satisfy them. You tell us that he that is so blind that he cannot see by the light of one Sun, would not see any more if there were a thousand Suns. Alas, do you think that he that readeth then, shall find these your elaborate and judicious Lectures so clear, and beyond exception, that he is like unto him that hath the noonday to walk in; and is strangely blinded, if anything be rejected as erroneous, or questioned as obscure? To

give you my ungrateful opinion, I neither see light of one Sun, nor yet of one beam of it. I fear you are too self-conceited, and self-confident. I say no more, for we are now, being made public, to be censured by others.

Now you come to consider the Law as a Covenant, &c. Answer: Then it is not simply a rule, but it may be you will help this somewhat, by telling us of a more large acceptation of the Law; yet that is not to speak precisely to the point in controversy; also, though your considerations be divers, yet the Law is constantly the same. Your doctrine, that the Law was delivered in Mount Sinai in a Covenant-way, or it was a Covenant God made with his people; I list not to meddle with by-matters. You then show what a Covenant is; and as here you say, you find much difference of judgment; so I say that you are unhappily persuaded to incline to the most unlikely, unsound and palpably erroneous opinion of all others, if yet you have any to travel and go with you, in your way; but you love cross and by-ways, that you may be better noted, to become famous or infamous.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "the Law as to this purpose may be considered more largely, as that whole doctrine delivered on Mount Sinai, with the preface and promises adjoined, and all things that may be reduced to it; or more strictly, as it is an abstracted rule of righteousness, holding forth life upon no terms but perfect obedience. Now take it in the former sense, it was a Covenant of grace; take it in the later, it was not of grace, but of works."

Assertion: This is first to be premised, and we take it as granted by you, that however you consider the Law, yet you mean only the Moral Law. Yet you will not be contented with the simple and entire law as it is an absolute law in itself, but do take in also unto it, the preface, promises and all things reducible; your extent of it is now become large indeed, and to me indefinite.

What you draw in and reduce to it, who knoweth? But I smell some fear and diffidence in this great enterprise; for your own thoughts being apprehensive of the unjustifiableness of this strange and bold assertion, you would not therefore be too narrowly kept in, but will take more scope and ground than is allowable; but let this pass, and to come to a more particular reply.

Methinks the Preface itself should have been sufficient to have stopped you in this your way or opinion. Thus it is recorded, Exod.20:2 and Deut.5:6, "I am the Lord thy God, which brought thee out, &c.," out of which I collect, and it is plain and undeniable, that God was their God, and Israel his people, before the giving of the Law; and that he did not in these words express his willingness and consent to be their God, if, or upon condition, they will keep these his Commandments, which you call the first thing belonging to a Covenant; therefore he saith, "hear, I am thy God," that is, I am now already thy God, namely, by free promise in the seed of the woman, Gen.3:15, or as it was made to Abraham and his posterity, Gen.12:3, Gal.3:16, "to Abraham and his seed were the promises made." And unto this Promise or Covenant of Grace, {then which I know no other in simple nature and essence, or substance,} they had given and professed their consent formerly by their faith, and externally by receiving circumcision the sign of the Covenant, and so avouched God to be their only God in Christ, and themselves his people through him. And he being their God and King, it pleased him now to deliver unto them his will in this way and form of Government, according to which he would rule them, and they were to conform themselves to his pleasure herein.

And this promise given by God, and believed on by them so long before this promulgation and solemn delivery of the Law, was entire of itself, containing

perfection of doctrine, and holding out a free and clear way to pardon, reconciliation, and life. And therefore it was singly made and preached at first to Adam, and Abraham, with his posterity; so that Paul saith, Gal.3:18, that God gave the Inheritance {that is, all the blessedness belonging to a Child} by promise, denying and excluding the Law in this. And hence is it, that {to prevent all objections against the doctrine of free grace} Paul saith, Rom.5:20, "moreover the Law entered, that the offence might abound;" that is, the Law entered besides the promise of grace, which was the prime and principal doctrine; and it entered into the Church, or among the people of God, and yet neither to disannul, nor to add anything unto the former Covenant or Promise, Gal.3:15, as if, of imperfect before, it was to be perfected thereby; nor yet as if it were to be mingled with the promise and so to adulterate it; but it was to be kept distinct from it, as being of another nature, and for another end, contrary to that of the promise. The Law was to uncover sin, terrify the conscience, exclude the soul from God's favor and presence; the promise to cover, to pacify and comfort, and to admit or give entrance again with confidence through faith in Christ's blood. The Law was to make sin abound, that upon that occasion the ampleness and efficaciousness of the grace promised in Christ, might be more abundant.

And as for the promises of the Law, Piscator telleth you that they are to be excluded; the Covenant of grace, as being of a diverse nature or quality from those promises of grace. The promise of grace are bare, simple, gracious and free; and the legal promises are conditional. But now we will consider by what Scriptures and Reasons you would confirm it.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "there is nothing more ordinary with Paul in these controversies, than to consider the Law so differently; as take this instance,

Rom.10:5,6, where he describeth the righteousness of the Law, from these words, Do and live, &c. We find this in effect, Deut.30:16, and yet from this very chapter the Apostle describes the righteousness which is by faith. And Beza doth acknowledge, that that which Moses speaks of the Law, Paul applies to the Gospel."

Assertion: We might expect a more plain and clear text than this, {which is so knotty and difficult, that it hath troubled the best commentators;} if yet you could produce any; but your poor shift and nakedness is manifest. If you stand here to Beza, his words make directly against you. What Moses speaks of the Law, Paul applies to the Gospel, saith he; Moses said thus of the Law, and Paul of the Gospel. Thus then by his interpretation, the Law is not one with the Gospel, nor doth it comprehend it, but contains a doctrine in kind differing from the Gospel or Covenant of Grace. He seemeth to be of that judgment, {with many others,} that Paul doth but allude to that place in Moses, and doth not directly and purposely cite Moses for confirmation; and this is most probable, in that something is added, some left out, and something altered. Calvin thinks the knot may easily be untied thus, for if by the word we understand not the law, but the whole doctrine of God in general, as it comprehendeth the Gospel; for saith he, the word of the Law never cometh of itself to be in the heart, no not in the least syllable of it, until it be there implanted by the faith of the Gospel. {Note you well this by the way.} And however the learned vary somewhat about this, yet I can read no word favoring your odd Opinion. Now come we to your Arguments.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "the first shall be taken from the relation of the covenanters, God on the one part, and the Israelites on the other. God did not deal as this time as absolutely considered, but as their God and

their Father; hence God saith he is their God. And when Christ quotes the Commands, he brings the Preface, Hear O Israel, the Lord thy God is one; and Rom.9:4. Now unless this were a Covenant of Grace, how could God be their God, who were sinners?"

Assertion: God dealt with them now, not absolutely indeed, but yet with relation to his promise formerly made, by means of which he had freely chosen, and taken them to be his peculiar people; having long before said to Abraham, I will be a God to thee, and to thy seed after thee. Gen.17:7. And hereupon the constant Martyr Mr. Bradford, intending to comfort one dejected and distressed in mind, upon consideration of some failing or want of obedience, as I remember writes to this effect. Let this cogitation be still in your mind, that before God ask anything of us, he saith, he is ours, I am the Lord thy God, giving himself, and then all he hath, to be ours. And this he doth in respect of himself, of his own mercy and truth, and not in respect of us; for then were grace no grace. In consideration whereof, saith the Martyr, whatever he commands, though of duty we be bounden to accomplish, and be culpable and guilty if not; yet he requireth the same no further of us, than to make more in love, and more certain of this his covenant, that he is our Lord God, which is made in respect of his grace in Christ Jesus, and depends nothing on our obedience. So this Covenant is most free and most sure forever, and the only refuge and plea of the soul in the hour of temptation. It is more than evident then, that God as now, so from the first, stood reconciled to his people in Christ Jesus, and in him became their God, and took them into that happy relation of being his people, his peculiar treasure, and Children. And all your Scriptures, if now you look on them again, do hold forth this, and can speak no other truth. What infirmity is this? Cannot God take a people

into Covenant with himself, and become their God and Father in Christ his Son, and yet govern and put them under the Law, but we must then infer, either that all his grace and favor is conditional, or else the Law we are made to live under for a time, is a Covenant of grace?

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "if we consider the good things annexed to this Covenant, it must needs be a Covenant of grace, for there we have remission of sin, whereas in the Covenant of works, there is no way for repentance or pardon. In the second Commandment God is described to show mercy to thousands, &c."

Assertion: If God promise and show mercy in this way of obedience, {as we Parents also commonly do deal with our Children, looking pleasantly upon them, using them kindly, &c., when we find them most dutiful; and tendering and receiving them lovingly and gently, upon their submission after some failing,} will you so far forget the truth and yourself, as to infer and conclude thence that the Covenant is established on our obedience? It is one word and way by which we are begotten and become Children to God our Father; and he may rule us, and show us favor by another word and way, especially whilst we be in minority, as Gal.4:1,2,3, and what could keep the Children of Israel in the conscience of their many faults and failings from despair? Or what could erect their spirits, and preserve still a confidence and cheerful hope in them? Was it not, as Mr. Bradford said, that knowledge and inward persuasion, that God was their Father, and they his Children, by a free and faithful promise of mere grace in Christ to come?

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "if we consider the duties commanded in the Law so generally taken, it must needs be a Covenant of grace; for what is the meaning of the first Commandment, but to have one God in Christ, our God by faith?"

Assertion: What is said to the other, resolves this also; for this Commandment presupposes that God was their God, {and did not now by his Law become their God,} by promise in the Messiah to come, on his part, and by faith receiving it on their side. And to keep them to his faith in Christ, and to prevent defection or Idolatry, he propounds himself to be known and acknowledged only in Christ the promised seed, saying, I am thy God in my Christ; that so they might love him, trust and delight in him.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "from the ceremonial Law, all Divines say, that this is reduced to the Moral; so that sacrifices were commanded by virtue of the second Commandment. Now all know that the sacrifices were Evangelical, and did hold forth remission of sins, &c., then there must be grace included."

Assertion: Now I understand what you would have reduced to the moral Law. And in this passage of yours, I observe divers strange things; as that the ceremonial should be reduced to the moral, as if the one were not entire and absolute of itself, without the other; or that they were not distinct species, under the same genus, the whole Ministration by Moses, being divided into Law moral, ceremonial, judicial, so that every of the three is absolute of itself, for the matter and doctrine contained in it, and in respect of the end and use it was given for. You cannot let us see one syllable concerning the sacrifices in the second Command. The Lord delivered by the same authority he had over them, and as equally and immediately required the observation of each of these, which in nature and office were so distinct. And the charging of Israel with all and every of them is grounded still upon this, I am thy God; therefore was it that his people were to be instructed, governed, and ordered as he pleased. He signified his will and mind, in the matters of faith, by the ceremonial Law.

Touching morality and duty in the moral, and what concerned the polity, and republic, in the judicial Law. I see not, but that you may as well reduce the judicial to the first Commandment, or to the second Table, as the ceremonial to the second Commandment, and thus confound all, making but one Law.

And I mark another thing, viz., that in this you have one eye, and respect to the consent or opinion of divines, as the best, yea sole reason and warrant you have for this, whereas you regard not their concurrence in other things. Your inference is as strange, viz., that there must then necessarily be grace included in the moral Law; for suppose your reducement be true, yet the same grace was still contained and kept in the ceremonial as before; and it could import no whit of its native virtue, or as a physical ingredient, infuse its spirit, strength, or force, to alter and qualify the Law of works; for then grace were no more grace, nor works no more works. If you make the moral so capacious, as to receive into it the other, as a greater orb the lesser, or as your Chest doth a box of ointment, or the Ark the Pot of Manna, yet there is no necessity of any influence from one into the other, or of anything to be poured out of one vessel into another; but all that grace of remission of sins, &c., was still preserved and kept in the ceremonial Law, and so no grace in the moral.

If the Apostle did speak as much against the ceremonial, as moral Law, was it not because the people had no further respect than to the act, observance, or thing done, resting in the bare use, without faith in Christ, the only treasure hid and propounded in and by them? And so they made that to be work, which was grace; and so no difference between ceremonial and moral things. And being thus perverted, the continuance and use of circumcision and the sacrifices did oppose Christ, and grace, though they did not so, as they were

instituted and commanded by God to be used. Sacrifices and Sacraments be God's Ordinances, which rightly understood and taken, and purely used, are not properly man's works, but God's. He propounds and commends thereby unto us his grace, and the work of redemption by Jesus Christ, the sole object that our faith is to look at, and to be exercised about in the use of them. If we handle them sincerely, we bring no work, nothing for acceptation with God, but only are receivers of what he freely giveth unto us. It's an easy and too common an error to turn all into works, even Baptism and the Lord's Supper, whereby the simple nature and verity of them is extinguished and lost. Christ profiteth none, but such as despairing of Law and Works, do by faith alone look unto the promise of his grace. If a man seek help or comfort in any one act, or work, he is then bound to seek the same in all the works of the Law, and so is a debtor to fulfill the whole Law; and is quite fallen from grace. So is it Gal.5:2,3,4, "behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, {namely in that persuasion, that that act will avail you anything,} Christ shall profit you nothing, &c."

Lastly, this say you hath been always a strong Argument to persuade you, &c., and there appeareth no strength in it, but it is as weak, silly, and poor as any; and whereas you say, always, I understand you thus, viz., since you entertained that conceit, that the Law of works is a Covenant of grace; by a mistake herein, you might be confirmed in that error; but what bred or occasioned that opinion at first? And we now having the same moral Law, how is it {if the ceremonial be included in that second Commandment} that it doth not bind us also to sacrifice, be circumcised, &c., as it did the Jews? Else we have not all in the Law.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "this will appear from the visible seal to ratify the Covenant, which was by

sacrifices and sprinkling the people with blood; and this did signify Christ the Mediator of this Covenant."

Assertion: Interpreters vary about the meaning of that Covenant-book or Testament that was sprinkled with blood. Exodus 24. If you will contend it was the Law largely taken, even for what was delivered on Mount Sinai; in which large acceptation, that Law, blood of sprinkling, and other ceremonies then used, were typical, and shadows of future good things, Heb.10:1, then you exclude the Moral Law strictly taken, as a rule of righteousness; for it was not typical. And now what have you gained by making this a Covenant of grace, which the Jews lived under? Or where, or what grace is found in the moral Law? But when Moses took the blood and sprinkled it on the people, and said, behold the blood of the Covenant which the Lord hath made with you, Exod.24:8, your Marginal note telleth you, it was to signify, that the Law being broken by us, could alone be satisfied by the blood and death of Christ. Let Moses be typical Mediator, yet it follows not, that it was not a covenant of works, {if you take it for the Law moral,} but contrarily, that it was no other; for a Mediator was therefore needful, because by the Law the people were convinced that there was dissention and variance between God and them, in that they were proved to be transgressors of that his Law, and the enmity was to be slain and abolished, and a reconcilment made by a middle person. The residue of this Section, I leave as dubious and obscure; of whom you mean, I know not.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "if the Law was that same Covenant, with that Oath God made to Isaac, then it must needs be a Covenant of grace; but, &c., therefore God remembers what he had promised to Abraham, Deut.7:2, it shall come to pass if ye hearken to these judgments, and do them, that the Lord thy God

shall give unto thee the covenant and mercy which he swore unto thy Fathers."

Assertion: Nothing is more evident by this place, than that the Law {requiring these judgments to be hearkened unto and done} was a distinct doctrine from that Covenant made with them in their Fathers. For God requires of them the doing of the one, but promises that he himself will keep the other, the Covenant and the mercy; so that this wholly rests and relies on him. He calls and commends himself first to be the Lord their God, not upon condition of their doing or obedience, but before he required it, and as the ground of commanding it. The Covenant and mercy was made long before, and confirmed by Oath in the days of their Fathers; these stand all in that text fully against you, and for us. Yet he dealing with them, as a Father with his Children, is willing to manifest his faithfulness and love in keeping Covenant and promise made long before in that way of their obedience and dutifulness; but that he made that Covenant the same with the Law, is denied, as utterly false. If you say to your Child, he shall find you a loving and kind Father to him, so that he will be dutiful and obedient to you; now you are not his Father nor he your Child upon this condition, though in this way you may manifest and express your affections at your pleasure.

Now take a view of your six Arguments, and let us know what be your second thoughts of them; and also your answer to those places so fully meeting and opposing you in this your way, as the angel did Balaam in his way, is infirm and nothing satisfactory.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "if that in Gal.3:18, and Rom.4:14, be rigidly and universally true, then the doctrine of the Socinians would plainly prevail, who from these do urge there was no grace, nor faith, nor nothing of Christ vouchsafed unto the Jews, whereas they had

the adoption, though their state was a state of bondage."

Assertion: 1. Truth is to be received in love to it, for itself, though no error nor danger {a thing impossible} should be prevented by it. 2. If Socinians do urge those places, to infer, that no grace, &c., come by the Law, but by the promise only made and given long before; let us see how you would except against this; but both you and the Socinians are wide and deceived, though not in the same way. 3. They had the adoption indeed, but that was by faith in the promised seed; and the putting them under that pedagogy of Moses made their state so servile. What you say in the rest of this Lecture, hath been presented to us before; where also the answer and satisfaction is to be found.

LECTURE XXIII

"Where is boasting then? &c." {Rom.3:27}

I cannot cease to muse, that you so prosecute your matter in this large acceptation and sense of the Law, knowing that the question is of the moral strictly taken. You chose rather to keep the thickets and bushes, than to appear in the open plains; we may guess why. Yet take notice that the doctrine you raise doth not grow from your text, no not in your own exposition; for you expound it of the Law of works strictly taken, as it is opposed to the Law of faith. But your doctrine you so frame and carry, as that you tell us that the Law, as a Covenant of grace given to the Israelites, in some sense doth oppose the grace of the Gospel; which assertion,

suppose true, yet is no fruit of this tree; hath not its rise from your text. 2. Being witty to coin and devise things of your own head, without Scripture-ground, you say it is for this end, viz., to discover the nature of the Law and Gospel; a fair pretense and promise, without reality of performance; for you rather cover and darken, than otherwise. 3. You bring in Calvin to little purpose, who distributes the Law into three kinds; and he doth not say that the moral Law differeth only from the Gospel in regard of clearer manifestation, but denies it to have or contain any grace in it; and so in nature and kind to differ from the Gospel or word of grace, and not gradually only. And the like may be said of Pareus. 4. You have often received what is thought of your so often twice-sodden coleworts, presented here again to the Reader, that they under the Law did enjoy grace, &c., viz., that they had it not by the Law, &c.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "that the doctrine of the Law, in the more preceptive nature of it may be compared with the doctrine of the Gospel, having the grace of God annexed to it, and going along with it; now this in some respects is an unequal comparison."

Assertion: Why do you now more straiten the Law than did Calvin, in that his testimony, who takes the Law for that rule of life, in which God requireth of us that which is his own, giving us no ground of hope unless in every respect we walk according to it? And you tell us of the Gospel having the grace of God annexed to it, &c., as if the Gospel could be separated from that grace, which is the subject matter of it; for doth the Gospel speak of or hold forth unto us anything else? Beside, the grace of God is so proper and peculiar to the Gospel that not one word of it is mentioned in the Law; for the Law is of works, and the Gospel is called the word of his grace. But perhaps you will say that by grace, you mean the spirit of life, that reneweth and

quickeneth the soul; if you do so, yet it hath been cleared that although the Spirit do not always, and in all, produce and work this work of renovation, yet the Gospel is the ordinary instrument that is used for this, and not the Law. That expression of yours {if you take the doctrine or letter of the Gospel without the grace of God} is very improper; for it is, as if you could take the writing without the matter it specifies and entreats of. Again, observe, that the difference between the letter of the Gospel, and the letter of the Law {as you call them} is, in that the Law is said then to kill, when the Spirit worketh effectually by it; for then sin revives in the conscience, and "so I died," saith Paul, Rom.7:9, and so the Commandment was found to be to death, verse 10, but the Gospel then killeth and leaveth in death and condemnation, when the Spirit worketh not in the heart to receive and mingle it by faith. {Heb.4:2, Jn.3:19, II Cor.4:4} Your counsel is good, to make the parallel equal; but this is unequal in you, still to make Law and Gospel equally and alike the instrument of grace and life.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "I come to the Antinomian difference, and there I find such a one, that I am confident was never heard of before. In Honey Comb, God, saith he, saw sin in believers of the Old Testament, but not in the New, &c."

Assertion: Our weakness makes us stumble and to be offended, where no cause is sometime, and with too much confidence to condemn or reject such precious truths as are received and justified by the children of wisdom. I have spoken before to this phrase. In sobriety of mind, ponder this. The Scripture doth not say, that Christ did actually take and do away sin, till he came and shed his blood for that purpose; and the object of their faith in the Old Testament, was the promise of future good things, to be done and wrought by Christ

when the fullness of time appointed came, Gal.4:4, so that God is said to have patience in bearing with his people till he received full satisfaction by Christ, Rom.3:25; and this finished and plenary work of redemption, that the Gospel holds forth to us, was the object of their hope, who only lived in a certain expectation of it, according to the promise; yet did that faith and hope both sustain, save, and serve them sufficiently according to that their condition, wherein it pleased the Father to place them. Their Gospel in brief was, that Christ should appear and take away sin; ours now is, that he is come and hath done it; he loved us and hath washed us from our sins in his own blood, Rev.1:5; they had the promise of this, but we the performance. This might content an indifferent mind. The Sun of righteousness was not risen in their days. Mal.4:2. I hear of another of better abilities and helps, who is much engaged in this controversy, and hath promised to vindicate both the Honey Comb, and Doctor Crisp; I shall not prevent him.

What Doctor Crisp asserts is solid and clear; neither do you bring anything of any great force to overthrow it. I perceive his Scriptures and reasons to prove them two distinct Covenants, carry such light and weight in them that you have little mind to meddle with them. And to the judicious, your dealing here is neither satisfactory, nor reasonable.

You tell of a heap of falsehoods and much error in few lines; but make not one truly to appear. Also you cannot justify your charge afterward; for he saith not that all the legal sacrifices were only for sins of mere ignorance; but alleging that place, Num.15:28, the soul that sinneth presumptuously shall die. Here, saith the Doctor, is a sacrifice for sins of ignorance, but that soul that sinneth presumptuously shall die, no sacrifice for that. The Scripture is plain, and will bear him out, in all

that he inferred from it. See your many errors and mistakes in this. 1. He saith, Num.15:28, here is a sacrifice for sins of ignorance; and so there is, but your charge is, that he saith, all legal Sacrifices were for sins of mere ignorance. 2. That they were only for those sins. 3. You put in the word mere, which he uses not. Is this candid, or as a Minister? Let me ask, was there not divers sins, for which no sacrifices could be admitted? And again, was not pardon of sin sued out upon those sacrifices that God required? If you grant those two, as the evidence of truth in them will prevail and enforce so far, then I see no cause herein to except against the Doctor.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "Christ the true sacrifice was represented in every sacrifice, and all the virtue and benefit to come from Christ's blood; and then could not that take away all sin, as well as some?"

Assertion: It's true Christ was represented, and sufficient virtue from his blood to take away that sin the party then was guilty of, and was troubled with; but the blood of Christ was not held out in every particular sacrifice, to expiate all sins present, past, and to come, as in the time of the Gospel. Even as the brazen serpent was erected to cure as they were wounded, and in the sense of their fear and smart made use of it; therefore you are too rash in saying, unless the Antinomian Author were a Socinian, he can never expedite himself.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "in the New Testament is there not the sin against the Holy Ghost, for which no pardon is promised?"

Assertion: What is this against the Doctor, or to the point in hand? The Doctor speaketh of the sins of the Elect of God; {for who else receive forgiveness;} and of the manner of God's dispensing pardon to them, how differing it was from this under the Gospel; but the sin

against the Holy Ghost is unpardonable, and therefore the Elect are kept from falling into it.

Moreover, as I conceive, the differences which the Doctor insists on, are to be understood in regard of the application of the sacrifice and blood of Christ, and that not only on man's part through faith; but on God's part also, in his Ordinances and manner of administration. The Apostle in the Epistle to the Hebrews brings all, or the main and most differences between the Churches state, before and after Christ's death, unto the condition of the conscience, which could not be peaceable, comfortable, and joyful under the Old Testament, because there was still on God's part new remembrance of sin, and so also sacrifices appointed to be offered upon the commission of fresh and new sins. And God did not appear unto them, neither could they in conscience so receive and apprehend him, as actually satisfied and reconciled, till after their sacrifices; but now Christ by one sacrifice and offering of himself, hath perfected forever them that are sanctified; so there is no remembrance of sin, for God hath said, that in his Son he is well pleased, and that forever.

So that the opposition is not only as you say, between Christ and those legal sacrifices, being considered and used without him, or without faith in his blood; {for so they were effectual to take away no sin at all, when as yet it is said in many places of the Epistle to the Hebrews, that they did, though not to the perfecting of the conscience, in that there was a remembrance of sin again;} but it is evident to be between the estate of the Church in the days of Moses, and now after Christ's resurrection, which is the time of reformation. Christ by his Eternal Spirit having offered himself without spot to God by his blood, to purge the conscience from dead works to serve the living God. And hereby all may see how insolent, impertinent, and vain all your reply is.

First, the blood of Christ in the virtue and efficacy of it, did extend and reach unto those times also, and did cleanse from all sin; but God did so carry it, that he was pleased to reveal and apply this his grace unto them as they needed. All pardons by Christ were purchased which they had; but these unsearchable riches of forgiveness, peace, favor, adoption, and inheritance were manifested and dispensed by some and some, as Fathers do things of worth by small pittances at once unto their Children. Secondly, it's true, in this is no difference between the faithful Jews then, and Christians now, that all the good God did to either was only for his own names sake, and no good in them, and so are prevented by him, in being made his people freely and of free grace. "Not for your sakes do I this, saith the Lord GOD, be it known unto you; be ashamed and confounded for your own ways, O house of Israel." {Ez.36:32} Yet while God did govern his Church under the Law, most of his favors and good things, he {after they became his} did tender, dispense, and communicate, upon antecedent conditions. So that although they were children and free, yet their state and manner of education was servile. And in the way of their obedience therefore they received their peace, the conscience whereof gave them boldness towards God. And yet if God veiled his paternity, graciousness, and favor, as sometimes parents do not show the like pleasant countenance to their Children, when they have not carried themselves dutifully, it will not follow then, that God ceases to love them, but is wise in the opportune manifestation of his love. Thus it is a perpetual truth indeed that Christ's sacrifice was as efficacious to those before his death, as those after, viz., to procure and purchase all things necessary to salvation; but these treasures being in the Father's

keeping, he did dispose and dispense them as he pleased, more sparingly then, than now.

LECTURE XXIV

"Where is boasting then? &c." {Rom.3:27}

Whatever your reason or ends may be for it, yet I see not any good or warrantable ground thus to take and handle the Law and Gospel in a large sense, as you say; and when you have done, I would know what of the Gospel you conceive to be legal, and how much Law you take to be Evangelical. Also you prefix a text as your foundation, but the discourse you erect doth not touch it, is not at all supported by it, but stands like a Castle built in the Air. Neither do I find the Lutherans posing the Calvinists about the Law in this; for both affirm the Law to be a Covenant of works, and superadded to the promise; holding forth all favor and peace upon such hard conditions to the Jews that they might experimentally be convinced of their folly in seeking it by their own righteousness. You must go over it again, else what is done will not serve to prove the Law of Moses a Covenant of Grace. Indeed we grant the godly Jews did enjoy what Christ premised; but it was by such Ordinances as were of grace, and not of works, as is the Law; they eyed or looked at Christ in the promises, and not in precepts.

And as you began, so you proceed; laying down differences, not between the Law and Gospel, but between Gospel and Gospel, I mean the administration of grace before and now, of which others have writ more particularly, plainly and profitably. Then you tell us that

the Jews had a twofold consideration, as being servile, and another as being sons, but under age. Now that is it that we say, as Sons they were free, for they were so by Christ promised; but their condition was servile, and their immunities and privileges were in a great part veiled and kept from them.

But note that the Mosaical pedagogy is antiquated; what need was it to handle Law or Gospel otherwise than in their strict and proper sense? To run over everything is long and tedious. What is said by you of these differences, may be granted with these two exceptions; first, that the law strictly taken, is not as you say, only for those who have a perfect and holy nature; Paul doth directly cross and contradict it, saying that the Law is not made for the righteous, but for the lawless and disobedient. {I Tim.1:9} And Adam was not charged with this law in his integrity, but had a Law touching a thing in its own nature indifferent; for the keeping of this law was then natural to him, as is flying to a Bird, and bearing fruit to a Tree or Herb. Also it is clear that the law was added because of transgression, Gal.3:19, as if there had been no sin, there should have been no occasion of giving the law. And this contradicts yourself elsewhere, affirming the Law to be an effectual instrument to regenerate and sanctify. Now who needs to be regenerated and sanctified? He that hath a perfect and holy nature, or he that is a sinner and impure? If you think otherwise, what a deceiver are you, when you would persuade the filthy and the vile, that they may be changed and renewed by the Law of works? And thus as your fourth difference is utterly false, so your third is found to be defective, and not plenary; for all is of grace. It is the Gospel or word of grace that justifieth and sanctifieth. God in that ministration we live under, is a free giver; and man, a mere receiver; for God having discovered and made bare the root and heart of man, so

as he seeth his spiritual poverty and wretchedness by his Law, doth then open his graciousness and his bountiful hand by his Gospel, that the believing soul may be satisfied with his goodness in every kind. So that now as a Beggar he must live by Alms of Divine liberality, being thus made to walk humbly with his God. "Open thy mouth, and I will fill it." {Psa.81:10}

And in your last difference, you set up and pull down, say and unsay. At first you tell us that the Law is conditional, but the Gospel absolute; but this is too clear a ground for you to abide upon; therefore presently you say, I find this question a troublesome one. Thus you trouble yourself and others without cause. Repentance and Faith are no Gospel-conditions, but are said to be the reason and end of the preaching of the Gospel. It is preached that men may repent and believe, Rom.16:26, Lk.24:47, yea, and that they may be holy too. Tit.2:12, Eph.4:22. Secondly, the Gospel is the seed of them all, as is to be cleared afterward; they all grow and arise out of the doctrine of grace; then how then can they be conditions of it? For what is a condition, but that which is necessarily required that a thing may be so? So that it will follow that it is no Gospel, where there is no faith or repentance, or at least none preached to me. What am I called upon to believe then? Christ as set forth in the Gospel is the object of faith, and in believing are we said to receive and obey it. II Thes.1:8. The Gospel proclaims pardon, favor and eternal life to sinners, that they may come, receive, and partake of all freely; yea, beseeches men to be reconciled, and doth not bid them go and get repentance, and faith, and holiness elsewhere, as they can; and then upon condition they bring these, they shall be forgiven all their sins, be reconciled and saved by the Gospel. Indeed where God maketh the Gospel to be effectual, there it bringeth forth these fruits, there is repentance and faith to believe; and it giveth no peace

nor consolation to any, but the believing soul; so as faith is after the hearing of the Gospel, so comfort is after faith. Rom.15:13. The God of all hope fill you full of peace and joy in believing. In order one precedes another. The Gospel is preached before Faith, that men may believe; and then comes peace and consolation upon believing. But who would argue hence, that Faith is a condition of the Gospel, or Peace a condition of Faith? They denote a certain Order that God is pleased to set and observe in his works and dispensations.

As for Mortification and Sanctification you speak of, they are the effects of the Gospel; for the soul thereby called and implanted into Christ, beginneth to die unto all things, and to live only unto Christ and God in him; so increaseth with the increase of God. Col.2:19.

And Repentance admits of divers considerations, in regard of some whereof it is Legal, and of others Evangelical, but more of this next Lecture.

LECTURE XXV

"Where is boasting then? &c." {Rom.3:27}

If this Question, whether the Gospel preach Repentance or no, be as you affirm the foundation of Antinomianism, it then much concerns you in this to play the man, that the foundation being razed, all may fall to confusion; and this the rather also, in that you say, that this made the great commotion at first, between the Orthodox and the Antinomians.

Before I intermeddle with this dispute, let me deliver my option; which is, that Repentance cannot be said properly to be the doctrine of the Law; and yet the Law is not by this wholly excluded, as you say it is by

the old Antinomians; whom you mean, or what their Tenets were, I know not, neither think it much material. I shall love the truth in any, and maintain them no further. Now my inducement hereunto is, because the Law never mentioned Repentance, nor hath any word to exhort and call thereunto. It worketh indeed preparatory in the soul, by revealing sin and misery, so as a man findeth himself undone, without help or hope, in great distress; but this is not Repentance, for here Man is a Patient, being convinced subdued and brought in his spirit under the work of the Law. And this may well be called the former Mortification, which is not of sin in Man, but in the Man for sin, as Rom.7:11, "for sin, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it slew me." But to repent is an act, a thing to be done, put upon man being plunged into this great depth of woe and horror, as a hopeful and initial channel of mercy, pardon and salvation; and this is clear to me, from Acts 2:37,38, where those Jews being beaten down, and exceedingly terrified in the conscience of that horrid fact, the killing of the Lord of Life, and crying out as sinking in despair for advice and council, presently Peter said unto them, Repent, &c., from whence I collect with Ambrose, that all that former sight and sense of sin and legal terror was no part of Repentance, for it was yet to begin; yea, and secondly, it was prescribed as the first course to be taken, with hope of recovery. Not that Repentance was in their or any man's power; for it is the Lord alone that giveth it, II Tim.2:25. None are bid to Repent, without a promise of mercy annexed withal to move him to it; which promise holding forth the grace of the Gospel, is doubtless first hearkened unto, received and credited; and so the burdened conscience conceiving now a good hope through Faith in this promise, begins to repent and seek unto the Lord. Hence Isaiah saith, 55:7, "let the wicked forsake his

way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts; and let him return unto the LORD, and he will have mercy upon him; and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon;" so likewise, Joel 2:13, "and rend your heart, and not your garments, and turn unto the LORD your God; for he is gracious and merciful, slow to anger, and of great kindness, &c." So that to me it is clear, that in order of nature the doctrine that holds forth the graciousness of the Name and Nature of God in Christ, {in whom he is propitious,} ought first to be published; both because our conceits naturally are, that God will not favor and receive sinners, but the just and good are they only, unto whom the promises of acceptance and blessing do belong. And also in that God, in that Ministry of the Law, hath already appeared unto the dejected soul in another form, and under a contrary notion, revealing wrath, threatening a casting off, and shutting up all mercies in displeasure against it because of sin; for how else possibly can these natural and inbred conceits and imaginations of God be raised out of the mind, and the soul be persuaded, that notwithstanding and beyond all that it apprehends of God in his Law, and is become sensible of, yet there is hope of mercy, forgiveness and redemption with the Lord? So that the effectual and immediate incentive and introduction to repentance, and turning to God, is the promise of Grace by Jesus Christ. When Benhadad King of Syria and his servants being in great strait and danger of losing their lives considered what they had heard of the Kings of Israel, how that they were merciful; see their humble resolution. "Let us put sackcloth on our loins, and ropes upon our heads, and go out to the King of Israel." I Kings 20:31. But on the other side, Adam not so conceiving of God, out of the inward privy of his disobedience, and being then altogether ignorant of any mercy to be showed by God in that way, that afterward God acquainted him with; he

instead of repenting and falling down in a sorrowful confession of what he had done, and crying for mercy; in his inward horror and fear ran away, hid himself, and then would fain have excused the matter. Now if the way be thus freely set open for all, he that comes not in is inexcusable; and he that desires may come; but this is not, that any soul should rest contented with hearing that it may be freely welcome; but that it come indeed, and so it find an effectual entrance into that state and kingdom of Grace; for too many do hover and dally with these weighty things; and the inward terrors ceasing to pursue the soul to the utmost, the bare knowledge, and having of the letter of this word of Grace sufficeth them, being never truly converted, healed, and comforted. And this is the main reason of their hankering after the legal way, for a supply of what they want, or of turning this Grace into wantonness.

So that I cannot but marvel, that you, or any experienced Christian should so oppose Doctor Crisp, {whom the Lord raised up, and used as a choice instrument to open this free way to poor sinners, that if God had given them a heart to come, whatever their sins were, they might come and welcome, and nor be rejected or denied,} as if his doctrine were against repentance; whereas it tendeth to breed and bring forth true Repentance, not to be repented of. I had thought to have writ a Treatise only upon this Subject, seeing how opposite men's minds are to that so acceptable truth of God. Who will seek unto him that smites him, humbling, and casting down himself at the foot of the Lord willingly, if he do not first hear and know, that God pardoneth iniquity and delighteth in showing mercy? God draweth the froward heart of man with the irresistible chords of his love, and overcomes his evil and rebellious nature, by showing and commending his kindness, even as afterward he frames their heart, and

puts his own into the same way, to follow him in labouring to overcome evil with good. {Rom.12:21, Eph.5:1,2}

And lastly, who will not be contented to be numbered amongst transgressors, yea and willingly sit down with the greatest and chief of sinners, when he heareth that God is merciful to sinners, justifieth the ungodly, and where sin aboundeth, maketh his Grace to abound the more? Thereby taking occasion to manifest and magnify his graciousness in the eyes of all the World, as Rom.5:20, Eph.2:7, Eph.1:6. By this you may see still, that the Law excludes and keeps out the sinful soul; and that it may convert and turn unto God, the word of his Grace only is to be preached. Now I come to consider what you write.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "the word 'repentance' is taken sometime largely, and sometime strictly."

Assertion: By what is said, it is apparent that repentance may be taken, as it is often, for the whole turning to God, because after the soul apprehending its danger, and seeing no hope of safety any way else, yet hearing what is reported of God's Grace in Christ, to poor, wretched and lost sinners; it is moved, drawn and persuaded {through the hand and means of Faith taking hold hereon} to repent, and cry unto God for mercy and pardon; so that sorrow and tears arising from the sight of his forlorn condition, is but the pining away in their iniquities, doth hasten death, and to tend utter despair.

Your second position, as it may be construed, shall pass now; somewhat being before to like effect, and the subservience of the Law as preparatory being now granted by you.

Your third conceit is ambiguously and confusedly set down; but enough hath been said about it, viz., that neither Repentance, nor the Faith of the Elect can be said to be wrought by the Law. As for that legal Faith

you mention, it may be in a Reprobate, and of itself it is the mother and breeder of despair. If you or others will have a legal repentance, meaning thereby that conviction, fear, or trouble wrought by the Law when it revives sin, or at most such as is ascribed to Judas, from whom by inward force and violence was squeezed out that confession, I have sinned, &c., by a heavy hand upon his conscience, as to clear the innocency of Christ, so partly may be in hope by that venting, to find some ease and mitigation of anguish within, {which yet is not that in question,} I shall not much contend about words; so we accord in the thing.

Also besides that faith or persuasion of mercy in God according to his promise, there is also another special Faith after the soul is come in to God, which is an effectual that the parties sins are done away, God reconciled, and he accepted in Christ; and so this being the end of his coming, his desire is satisfied; and now follows, as it is called, another Repentance upon this, for now the love of God entered, and is shed out into the soul by the Holy Ghost, which doth marvelously refresh and establish the heart in grace, and renew and inflame it with love reciprocal unto God, who hath appeared in such mercy and kindness; and thus is the soul in love gained and given up to be the Lord's, and to serve him in holiness and righteousness without fear all the days of his life; thus Lk.7:47, she loved much in affection and expression, who had received forgiveness of many sins; and this renovation and change of mind, doth far exceed your legal reformation, which you so much press and stand for.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "unbelief is a sin against the Law, as well as against the Gospel. The Gospel declares the object of justifying Faith, but law condemns for not believing in him, &c."

Assertion: I question whether the Law condemn for positive infidelity, or for not believing in Christ. Under favor, I am of that mind that the Law only condemneth for the not believing or obeying of those things which the Law propoundeth. Now the Law propounds not Christ to be believed on; besides, your doctrine is, that Christ is to be propounded to none, but the broken in spirit, the penitent, and I know not how otherwise qualified. And I see not then but the Law should condemn for not being broken and penitent first, and for not believing after. I confess the same God requireth Faith to whatsoever he shall speak by Law or Gospel; but by the Law I can be bound only to believe those things the Law declares unto me. Legal doctrine requireth a Legal, but not an Evangelical Faith. Whatever the Law saith, it saith it to them that are under the Law; but you present us with much strange divinity; so this is most uncouth to me, and untrue, that the Law should be enlightened by the Gospel, and so fasten a new Command upon us; how differeth this opinion from that of theirs, who say, Christ be added to the Law? Which you say yet is infected with Socinians poison.

LECTURE XXVI

"Christ is the end of the law, &c." {Rom.10:4}

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "take notice of a foul error of an Antinomian, who denying assurance and comfort by signs of grace laboureth to prove that an unregenerate man may have universal obedience, and sincere obedience; bringing in this instance of the Jews,

Rom.10:3. Your answer is, that the Jews zeal was not Hypocritical, because they did not go against conscience; but it was not sincere, in that it was not a true gracious zeal."

Assertion: The Author you mean would have you leave the streams and those waters which are questionable and impure, and to seek to the first rise and spring-head, where the water floweth out freely, purely, and in an undoubted truth. What foul error is this, if prejudice be not; for he speaketh of Legal obedience, for such was this their zeal in seeking to establish their own righteousness; and you tell of sincerity taken for the truth of grace, whereby the soul is freely subjected to the Gospel, and submits to the righteousness thereof {for so I would fain understand you} which is passive, and not active; thus far then you are wide.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "I shall explain that place, II Cor.3:7, because it may be wrested by the Antinomian, as if the law were to be abrogated."

Assertion: I wish the Scriptures were not more perverted by yourself; you pretending to fear others, are too confident in yourself; you may see, if ye will, the men you fear are better establishers of the Law, than those who oppose them. How is it that still you so mistake both them, and yourself? Thus, you give an undue exposition, but explain not, but rather do involve the place in greater obscurity.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "the intent of the Apostle is to show the excellency of the Ministry of the Gospel, above that of the Law, and that in three respects. 1. In regard one is the Ministry of death and condemnation, the other of life and righteousness, therefore one called Letter, the other Spirit; which you must understand warily, taking the Law nakedly, without the Spirit of God, and the Gospel with the Spirit; for as Beza

observes, Gospel without God's Spirit, is also the Ministration of death, &c., and what good is wrought by the Law, it cometh from the Spirit of Christ. 2. In regard of continuance; as the Ministry of Moses, understanding it of the Jewish pedagogy, was to be abolished; but not the Moral part, which still obligeth Christians; but Gospel abideth forever. 3. In regard of glory, God caused some material glory to shine upon Moses, &c., but what cometh by the Gospel, is spiritual."

Assertion: Both Beza, Piscator and Augustine, and the express words in the text, do make it more than manifest, that the Apostle's comparison is taken from the very substance of the Ministry of Moses, to wit, the Moral Law, and not that part only which is Ceremonial, as you would have it; for verse 7, it is called that Ministry that is written and engraved in stones. Whence it is easy to gather that Paul speaketh not of the Ceremonial, but Moral part; for it was the Decalogue that was so written and delivered in Tables of Stone.

Your words imply, that there is no difference in truth and strict sense between Law and Gospel, so that the Spirit be taken with them both; which directly contradicts the Apostle, who calleth one the Ministry of death and condemnation, and the other of life and righteousness; for the Spirit working by the Law, doth kill and condemn, and therefore is also called a Spirit of bondage, Rom.8:15, but the Spirit by the Gospel quickens and giveth life, being a Spirit of adoption and liberty. The Spirit is one and the same, but the Ministrations be different; and so are the effects produced by either. You say the difference is, because Christ the Author of the Gospel is the fountain of Life, but is not Christ the Author of the Law also? He is called the law-giver; and though Christ be the Author of Life, yet you cannot show where the Law is called the Ministry of Life, as if Christ did use it to convey and give

Life. Also to say that the Spirit quickeneth by the Law, is to enforce a sense flatly against the Apostle. Moreover your expressions do make the place more obscure and dark, in telling us that the Gospel also without God's Spirit, is the Ministration of death, because it is as impossible to believe, as to obey the Law. Whereas Paul therefore calleth the Gospel the Ministration of righteousness and life, in that the Spirit thereby begets faith in the hearts of the Elect, whereby they come to righteousness and life. So Piscator, "the Law then having the Spirit working by it, killeth, as we see in Paul, Romans 7, but the Gospel maketh alive, justifying all the Elect of God."

You fail much in your second respect also, for as is proved and cleared, that the opposition is chiefly between the Law and the Gospel. However in a proper and true sense the Law is done away in the kingdom of Christ, yet where infidelity is, the Law remaineth; but where the word of righteousness and life is, there can the Ministry of sin and death have no place, even no more than the darkness of midnight hath at noonday, but spiritual things are spiritually discerned.

Paul intends that glory to be of the Law, whereas you interpret it to be that accidental glory which did shine upon Moses. A word of these things shall suffice.

LECTURE XXVII

"Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, &c. " {Mt.5:19}

See and consider the words of the Prophet, Psal.7:14-16. This Lecture, above all yet, sheweth much gall to be in your ink. Now your task is near an end; the residue is but to make a grave or ditch for your Antinomian, and to describe and delineate the man, that all mistake being prevented, he may forthwith be sentenced and sent to his appointed place; but stay, where, or who is he? You are in a golden dream.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "when there shall be a reformation, and truth break forth, &c., then those corrupt Teachers, who would poison men, should be discovered, and be of least, that is, of no account."

Assertion: Seeing this will be when the truth breathe forth, now Lord send forth thy light and thy truth that all false teachers and doctrines of lies and vanities may be put to shame and confusion. And if your dream be true, look to yourself. You fear not, perhaps presuming upon your own supposed innocency, external sanctity, the present state of our times, the reputation you are in, the authority and multitude of your combined fraternity, &c., as being now set upon a mountain that will never be moved. But the Church, the Truth, and quarrel is God's. He is strong that is Judge, to put down the mighty from their seats, to scatter the imaginations of the proud, and to return all the intended evil upon the head of the authors and devisers. In him the fatherless find mercy, he preserveth the simple and meek that trust in him.

Read Isaiah 66:5, "hear the word of the LORD, ye that tremble at his word; your brethren that hated

you, that cast you out for my name's sake, said, let the LORD be glorified; but he shall appear to your joy, and they shall be ashamed;" and John 16:2,3. Some look for no better from your hands, if left unto your will; and have already found the like dealing, for the Scripture must be verified.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "they overthrow the law, when they hold such principles that will necessarily by way of consequence infer the abrogation of the Law. And thus though some Antinomians do expressly and boldly assert the abolishing of it, at least to believers. Yet others, &c., disclaiming it, hold such assertions as necessarily infer the abrogation of it."

Assertion: You cannot prove and make it appear, that any do assert the abolishing of it; so it may be taken for a slander and false accusation. 2. In way of correction, as having overshot yourself, and would eat some of your own words, you say, at least to believers. Now first, what need believers a Law? So far as believers, they live by Faith, and walk by Faith, yea and war by Faith. The Law affords nothing to nourish or supply any defect in the faith of a believer. 3. Yet you, nor none can directly and duly infer hence, that they do abrogate the Law; so much now to vindicate them. But to return your words upon yourself. I think that you do hold such principles that necessarily by way of consequence, at least, do abrogate the Law, yea, and make void repentance in great part after Faith is come, and bring in carnal security and a false peace into the soul; for one principle of yours is, that direction and obligation to obedience be the sole essential constitutes of the law. So that that which condemneth, justifies, promiseth and threatens, is not properly the Law; but it hath been not only asserted, but proved already, that these are as essential to a Law as the former. Again, what will you call that which doth condemn, and promise

favor and peace to the good, if it be not Law? I am sure it is no Gospel; have you a third name for it? Whence have these power to condemn, &c., if no Law be in them? The Scripture saith that the Law doth curse, reveal wrath, &c., I argue thus, whosoever denieth the Law a power to condemn and justify, he destroys the Law; but Mr. Burgess denies this to the Law; therefore he destroys and abrogates the Law, and so is the true Antinomian, and least in the kingdom of God. This is so plain, that I leave it to your consideration, with what hath been said formerly. In the next place you say that the Law hath power over a believer, to direct, command, and oblige to duty, but not to condemn. Now I reply, suppose a believer hath no will nor disposition to obey in some things, or at sometimes; hath the Law no further power to threaten and condemn? Then the Law will soon become a fable, vilified and brought into contempt. Also grant a believer having the Spirit, is freely disposed and willing to obey, yet his obedience will be but partial and defective; and if then the Law have no power to accuse and threaten in that way of new obedience, he may trust henceforth in his own works, have his peace in that way of duty, {and not by his Faith in Christ,} and thus grow self-confident and secure; but Paul who consented to the Law, delighted in it, &c., yet in that he attained not to that perfect righteousness of it, cried out, "O wretched man that I am," Rom.7:24, and if the curse be now gone to a believer from the Law, what further use or need hath he of his justification, and of the preserving and maintaining his continual peace only thereby? Lastly, confession of sin, self-humiliation, self-judging and condemning the accounting of our own righteousness as dung, the fear of it, and the constant desire to be still found in Christ, not having our own righteousness, &c., these will have no more place in us. What need Noah to keep in the Ark, if there be no

drowning waters without? What need Christ a refuge or protection, where no power of the Law is to pursue, nor no danger to be feared?

These and many such like be the consequences and fruit of your doctrine or assertions. And note, that either to curse, &c., is not so much as an iota or tittle of the Law, {a hard thing to affirm, much more to prove,} or you offer too much violence to the good and inviolable law of God, in daring to part and separate these from the Law, every whit of it being imperishable, and incur that danger yourself, as Matt.5:17,18, yet you have such an evil eye and spite against us, that you say, that "the Antinomians do more fall against this text than any, who teach the dis-obligation, not only of the least Command, but of the whole Law." To this I reply, that the contrary is apparently true, let the judicious Christian Reader, looking through all our discourse hitherto, judge how untrue and unreasonable your charge is. The law bindeth continually to duty and to the curse for the least failing; and faith incessantly acquitteth and looseth, setteth free the soul, like those two keys which Christ left to his Church to continue with it until the end. In the law I am bound, in faith set free.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "it argues impudence of those who would make Luther on their side because of his disputations against the Antinomians."

Assertion: But if his disputations be against the Antinomians, then they may be against yourself, and in no wise against us; we establish and maintain the Law in the utmost extension. 2. You show nothing asserted by any you quarrel withal, which in effect may not be found in Luther; so that he is for them. 3. Yet it is not his opinion, but the truth we contend for; and whose those scattered Propositions were, that you have so collected, I know not; but with a good construction, divers of them may be received and justified, and are

held affirmatively by such as are not suspected guilty of Antinomianism.

You spare not still to take and scrape together what you can to make us odious, that we may be utterly cashiered, saying that Luther calleth those the enemies, and instruments of Satan, and that their doctrine is more to be taken heed of, than Papists. And also present the world afresh with those unsavory and false records of D.T. & M.B., which two have writ more than you list to defend, or they could justify; yet you love to have a hand in their sin, and had rather side with them, whose tenants are so erroneous and unsound, than give a favorable construction to one more Orthodox than yourself. But I see great mercy from the Lord shining through this thick and dark cloud of your malice. "Wherefore ye be witnesses unto yourselves, that ye are the children of them which killed the prophets. Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers, &c." {Mt.23:31-33}

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "in their Books every Error is more warily dressed, than in secret."

Assertion: And still no Error can come to light. The Proverb is true, you muse, as you use, I think your ordinary, or Pulpit-divinity is more gross, or not so pure, as we find you here; and yet upon your review, this may be re-provable. If you can see in secret, you may judge what is done in secret, as God doth; else, the secret is now judging the Church.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "it cannot be denied but in some parts of their books be some good passages; as in a wood full of brambles be some violets and primroses."

Assertion: What wise man, so clear sighted as yourself, would not gather the fragrant and useful flowers, and forbear rather wholly to meddle with the bushes, then so to trouble, prick, and endanger himself, as you have here done?

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "the Author of the Assertion of Grace disclaims the opinion against the Law, yet there affirms such principles, from whence this conclusion will necessarily follow."

Assertion: It is but your conceit of such a conclusion; to make it indeed, you must be forced to add of your own unto the premises, but proceed to justify your Accusation.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "for first, he makes no real difference either in Scripture, or use of words, between the Law reigning and ruling; so that if the Law rule a man it ruleth over him; now then they deny the Law to reign over a believer, therefore they must needs hold it cannot be a rule."

Assertion: If your Adversary say there is no real difference between reigning and ruling; it is your part, who oppose him, to make the difference appear by Scripture, or some way else; but this you do in no place, so often as you repeat it; which maketh me think verily you cannot. And you are not of that credit with me, that your bare word can carry it. Yet since you thus slightly pass over that which you make the main ground of your opposition, and this failing all you say falls to nothing; I yet shall add a little, to occasion and provoke more diligence and better inquisition hereafter. 1. I argue thus; to grant or leave unto God only a power to rule in his law, and to deny him the reigning power, is to make God in his law like an inferior Magistrate, who hath no Sovereignty by right ascribed to him. 2. That God makes and imposes his law with such a command to be obeyed in it, doth argue his Sovereignty in his law, and man's subjection to him in it, as his Sovereign. 3. But, in the Scripture-language and use, I find no difference between them. It is said that "the LORD hath prepared his throne in the heavens; and his kingdom ruleth over all." {Psal.103:19} Is not this all one with Reigneth?

{Psal.110:2} God saith to Christ, rule thou in the midst of thine enemies. As did he not rule and reign as Lord and King? {See Luke 19:14} "We will not have this man reign over us;" and verse 27, "but those mine enemies, which would not that I should reign over them, bring hither, and slay them before me;" which is meant of Christ, whom the Father appointed to be ruler over all; so that in ruling, he reigneth; and they be indifferently used still. "As I live, saith the Lord GOD, surely with a mighty hand, and with a stretched out arm, and with fury poured out, will I rule over you." {Ezek.20:33} Here is the word Rule, and yet dominion and sovereignty in ruling unto the utmost extent. Also, Rev.2:27 & 19:15. He shall rule them with a rod of iron; doth God rule, where he reigneth not? It's a strange conceit, and a bold assertion of you and Doctor T., therefore let it vanish as the smoke. The law hath a kingdom, and so hath Grace another; if we can discern and distinguish the one from the other, we need not to lessen the power of either. Lastly, and in what sense it is said the Law doth not reign over a believer, in the same, and no other may it be said, the law doth not rule him; but this is not because either reigning or ruling power be taken from the law; but that in a true and proper sense, the Scripture affirms the believer not to be under the law, but under Grace. Rom.6:14. He that knoweth not this mystery, cannot stand fast in that liberty, wherewith Christ hath made him free, nor endure in temptation.

You only and vainly repeat what you read, but confute nothing; there is reason why, as you do not like, so you cannot oppose the clear truth; your spirits fail you; yet add to that you bring in out of D.T., that a Christian by Christ is freed from the law, and also freed to it, to love it, live and walk in it. In regard of that righteousness and salvation he standeth in with God which is the object of his faith, he is freed from it; but in

regard of his holy and unbearable conversation and life here below, Christ by his Spirit doth set free and enlarge the heart actively to run the way of God's commandments, so that yet in walking according to this rule, he is not ruled by the law, but by the Spirit within proceeding from Christ, unto whom he stands in subjection, as unto his Sovereign Lord and King.

I hope you will now be satisfied, and the world too, at least so far as to account of us no more for Antinomians. If anything yet be dark, we must consider the Gospel is a great mystery.

You might well have kept in those reviling and hateful words, or have been better advised ere you had shot so reproachful speeches; though they be Arrows taken from the quivers of other men, yet is it, that you might vent some spite by them; and when they return, you will find the point of them towards yourself.

Then you give antidotes, where there is no danger of infection. If any need them, he may use them instead of better.

Objection: Mr. Burgess, "he sets up free grace and Christ, not who names it often his book, or in pulpit, but whose heart is inwardly and deeply affected with it."

Assertion: A private Christian, not gifted to preach or print, may be more affected with it, than the Minister; and yet not so set it up in the hearts of others, for want of those means of communication. 2. Out of the abundance of the heart, the mouth speaketh. If you were inwardly more affected with this doctrine, you would preach and commend it more, than any other, as Paul, who desired to know nothing but Christ Crucified, and sought that he might be magnified, whether by his life or death, the main subject of his ministry was the unsearchable riches in Christ. {Eph.3:8} Consider these words of Luther, in his preface to the Galatians, "in my heart this one Article reigneth, even the faith of Christ,

from whom, by whom, and unto whom, all my divine studies day and night have recourse to and fro continually;" and I perceive that I could not reach anything near &c., but it is a sure Argument of small reigning or power it hath in that soul, whose mouth and pen is so busied to cavil and write against it.

Also, may not another as truly say, that he sets up the law, not who names it often, but whose heart is most sensibly and deeply affected with the power and inward work of it? Some would be Doctors of the law, not knowing what they say, nor whereof they affirm. {I Tim.1:7}

And now also, who will most heartily and experimentally set up and endear Christ and free-grace; but he who teacheth the law to be only a rule of life, yet to have no reigning power, but disables it from cursing and condemning, so that a man may bless himself, and find peace and rest in the righteousness of his own works? Or he that teacheth that the law is ever revealing wrath, threatening, and pursuing with the dreadful curse and vengeance all that are of the works of the law, in that when they have done their utmost, they are come short of what it requireth; and therefore it will suffer them to have no rest nor confidence, save in the righteousness of God by faith?

Certainly this man's doctrine will much more make Christ and Free-grace desired and prized by all that have any discerning spirit, and a broken and believing heart.

FINIS

Sirs, As I have in part vindicated and cleared the lovely Truth, so unworthily aspersed, and used by your hands; so in recompense of my great pains occasioned by you, I desire that in patience you would suffer both your selves, and others to see your own face and portrait in your nature, lineaments and color, without the least painting or mixture at all. Truth rejoyceth in the light. I have only contracted, and placed together some few of your assertions that were dispersed, and doubting but time may produce a fuller and more perfect Inventory.

A Model of New Divinity; or, certain Miscellaneous, Anti-evangelical, inconsistent, or ambiguous Positions and Tenants, which the Adversaries {having decried, depressed and defaced the doctrine of Free-Grace} do assert, substitute, and publish in Pulpit and Press.

Mr. Burgess:

1. The Law includes Christ secondarily, and occasionally.
2. The Law given to Adam, was not cursing and condemning.
3. The Law hath no power to curse and condemn, yet it hath power to rule, command, and direct.
4. The Law with the preface and promise added to it was given as a Covenant of Grace.
5. The Law is taken most strictly, for that is mere mandatory, without any promise at all.

6. God doth use his Law, as he doth his whole word, to beget and to increase the life of Grace.

7. While a Minister is preaching any commandment, he doth thereby mold, and new-frame the heart.

8. I suppose, that Christ hath obtained of God by his death that such efficacy and virtue should go forth in the Ministry, that whether it be Law or Gospel, the souls of men may be healed, and converted thereupon.

9. I cannot yield to that, that the Law worketh only preparatory.

10. There was never in the Church of God mere pure Law, or mere pure Gospel.

11. Only two things go to the essence of a Law.
1. Direction. 2. Obligation.

12. In the Moral Law is required justifying Faith, Repentance; and our Sacraments be commanded in the second Commandment.

13. The Moral Law contains more than the Law of Nature.

14. Good works are necessary to Salvation, in regard of the presence of them.

15. Our holy duties have a promise of pardon and eternal life, not because of their worth, but yet of their presence.

16. To every godly action thou dost, there is a promise of eternal life.

17. Good works be conditions without which a man cannot be saved.

18. Good works are in their own nature a defense against sin and corruption.

19. Our good works be a motive moving God, as a King that prefers one that salutes him.

20. The State of reparation cannot be absolutely said to be better than that in innocency.

21. We are not by Christ more righteous than Adam was; or imputed righteousness, though infinite in Christ, is only imputed to us for, that we lost and ought to have; and we need no more.

22. The Gospel makes known Christ, and then the Law; thus as it were enlightened by the Gospel, doth fasten a command upon us to believe in Christ.

Mr. Rutherford:

1. God's decree of grace, in the execution of it, may be broken in a link by some great sin, but Christ cannot but feed the chain, and raise the fallen sinner.

2. The Law hath power to convert by the Spirit.

3. Sinners remaining in that damnable state, are not to believe; but as thus qualified, that is humbled, wearied, self-condemned only.

4. Yet, though thou were upon the borders of hell, the Gospel excepts thee not from the duty of believing and coming to Christ. They that sin against the Holy Ghost are condemned for unbelief.

5. Saving humiliation is conjoined with Christ.

Dr. Taylor:

1. A man may get from under his dangerous state by the attaining and exercise of three saving Graces; Faith, Repentance and Obedience.

2. Repentance wipes off old scores, repealeth all the actions of the Law, getteth all sins cast into the bottom of the Sea.

3. Inchoate obedience hath promise of acceptance, and is accounted as full and complete obedience to the Law.

4. The way to escape the yoke and coercion of the Law, is to become a cheerful and free observer of it.

5. That these are not of the substance of the Law, but circumstances, appendices, and consequences, viz.

a. That the Law worketh every man to a personal performance of it.

b. To exact personal and perfect obedience upon pain of eternal death.

c. To urge and force itself upon the conscience with fear and terror.

d. That no life or salvation must be expected by the Law, but by keeping it wholly and exactly.

e. That the Law arraigns and condemns the sinner, and is the Ministry of death.

f. Without the law, no man can know what God is, nor his worship, nor how to perform duties.

Good works be conditions of blessedness.

Mr. Bedford:

1. Christ hath freed us, provided that men by faith lay hold on Christ, keep close to him and walk according to those rules of holiness that he hath prescribed; for in so doing, we obtain what the Law promised, life and salvation.

2. Believers are not under that condition of full and perfect obedience, but under a condition of sincerity of obedience.

3. The Law as circumstantial, viz., as it is a covenant of life and death, is abolished.

Mr. B.L. in a Sermon:

1. Christ came to save none but holy ones.

2. Setting up of Family-duties, like the sprinkling of the blood of the Paschal lamb, will keep out the destroying Angel.

Mr. Allen in a Sermon:

1. As Christ was glorified because he first glorified his Father; so we must first glorify God by our obedience, and serve him, if we will be saved.

2. There is a general equity, that if God save any, he save them that serve him.

3. To be glorified of God, is to be received into communion, have acceptance, peace of conscience, joy in the Holy Ghost, adoption, and the inheritance; these we shall have by honoring and serving of God here, so that by honoring God, we do good to ourselves.

4. The law is the word of Grace that bringeth salvation. Grace cometh by the Law as well as by Gospel.

5. God made man for happiness, and the Law must be his rule and guide unto it.

6. The Covenant of Grace is not absolute and free but upon condition of our good works; or, works are considerations, or an indispensable cause or condition; as when a great treasure is promised for going a hundred miles.

7. The Covenant of works requireth perfect obedience; and the condition of the covenant of Grace is at least a purpose and endeavor to keep the Commandments.

The Lord give us a good understanding in all things, and make us rightly to discern between things that differ. To God belongeth glory forever. Amen.

FINIS

Monomachia

*OR, A Single REPLY To Mr. RUTHERFORD'S
Book called
CHRIST'S DYING AND DRAWING OF SINNERS.*

*Vindicating and clearing only such Positions
and Passages in THE ASSERTION OF GRACE,
as are palpably mistaken and perverted, and
so mis-called ANTINOMIAN. Wherein also it
appeareth, that the Adversaries dealing is
neither just nor candid.*

By Robert Towne

"Blessed are ye, when men shall hate you, and when they shall separate you from their company, and shall reproach you, and cast out your name as evil, for the Son of man's sake." Luke 6:22.

"And Jesus said, for judgment I am come into this world, that they which see not might see; and that they which see might be made blind." John 9:39.

**London, Printed by J. C. for Nathaniel Brook, at the
Angel in Cornhil. 1654**

CHRISTIAN READER,

After about fifteen years expectation, and the frequent threatening's of my many Adversaries, {Mr. Rutherford & Mr. Burgess,} a reply unto and a pretended confutation of my Answer to D. Tailor's REGULA VITAE, is come forth; and that from men of such eminency for learning, and gifts, that if these cannot effect what they intended and aimed at, others, not comparable for art, and qualifications, are not much to be feared. And yet to say the truth, {whatever contrary thoughts may be in others, through a different seeming light, or partiality of affection,} I see nothing they write having any power and evidence to prevail, or to convince me as guilty of the least Antinomy, or error; but where they make any appearance of such in me, it is there where they pervert, and palpably mistake my words, and meaning.

There is a great interval, or space of time between our comings into public view, their printing and mine; but the reasons are: 1. It was long ere I knew, or heard of their books. 2. I dwell in an obscure and remote place, amongst such who little meddle with anything controversial. 3. My bodily infirmities, and little leisure, do much retard me. 4. And lastly my own thoughts will not easily, nor hastily give way; but there have been divers months, ere I could obtain, and get free and full leave of them, to do anything in this way of contention; although the bent of my mind, and weapons be only defensive, and in no wise to render my Adversaries weaker or worse, than they have manifested themselves, without one syllable of mine. Otherwise I find it as easy to refute, as it is to read their Objections.

In this my latter rejoinder, or reply to Mr. Rutherford's Book, called, "Christ Dying and Drawing of

Sinners," I have singled out, and spoken only unto such places or passages, as he excepted against in my "Assertion of Grace," not intermeddling with anything written against Mr. Saltmarsh, Denne or others; because: 1. I have not their Books, and so cannot know how candidly he deals with them. 2. That may be clear truth to them in their own notions and conceptions, which I may misapprehend or darken. 3. They are better able to vindicate and clear themselves, if they see occasion; and may have done so, for anything I know.

If my Adversary think himself wronged, or discredited hereby; I answer, I should be sorry to stand guilty of doing that wrong to him, as he hath done against me, and the truth itself. As for discredit, he knoweth that the truth when it cometh forth will shame all that oppose, or contend against it; his chief wisdom had been, not to have meddled. Otherwise I have been cautious in aspersing him {only sometime returning his own words, I ask, who now is the Antinomian, Libertine &c.,} but have tendered his credit as my own. Their own doings have procured all unto them.

It had been much better {I am sure more easily effected, and more love had been in it, and the peace of the Church had not been so disturbed} if they had cast the mantle of a favorable construction upon what seeming errors or failings appeared in Doctor Crisp and others; and given some caution to the people, not to mistake and abuse such words of Free-Grace, and precious consolations.

And if they will still proceed in this way, after such conviction and evidence, they may. The Philistine, having found their Dagon fallen before the Ark of God, yet would set it up again {a base competitor} till it lost both hands, and head, and nothing but a filthy stump was left. Let them presume of parts, place, and repute in the Church {as a Knight of the Parliament said once

to me, in the same case; it makes no matter what such a man's doctrine or opinion be, his worth and esteem will win him the field,} yet let them consider withal, that the righteous God dwelleth with the humble; and seeth every one that is proud in heart, to abase him, and none, exalting himself against him can prosper.

Indeed, as the Pharisaical and Antichristian spirit will live and breathe in some unto the end; so the more any are found to walk in the pure steps of Christ, Stephen's or Paul's Ministry or Doctrine, the more will that Spirit be disposed and ready to cavil, and except against them as Antinomians, Libertines, Seducers, Heretics, &c. Oh how reproachful, odious, and bitter are their words! How do they defame and declaim against us, and breathe out threatening's still, if ever the sword come into their hands! And alas, what have we done! What error or fault do they make to appear in us! You may see, good Reader, what cause and color they have.

Yet some Object, if we be not Antinomians, why do we not make it appear so? And why do we not speak against them that are, as do others? My answer is: 1. I hope now it is most apparent, we are not Antinomians; and that charge to be most undue and unjust. 2. I have preached over the whole Decalogue, and the Lord's-Prayer; and yet, they say, I cast out the law, prayer, and all duties out of the Church; how can their mouths be stopped? 3. And in truth I know not one Antinomian; and to rail or to speak so bitterly, and constantly against such, and the overspreading of that sect, as do many, is to confirm that false opinion in the hearer's minds, which I wish much rather might die and perish.

I hear of Sects in our Land, and Kingdom, incredible for number, and nature; and I bless God, that I am acquainted with none, that adhere to any, as I know; for I have determined to know nothing among my people, but Christ, and him Crucified; and I both wish

and strive, that they, and I may live only by the faith of him; for therein is all spiritual peace, rest, and consolation, and thence freely and continually flows humility, meekness, patience, confidence, self-denial, obedience, love, goodness. Many endeavor in vain to hammer and beat out an unwilling service, and ungrateful performances by a legal Ministry, and do sometime change and reform the outward life; but the heart is still the same, unmortified, not purified, nor pacified. God doth draw his elect with cords of love unto him, and the word of the Kingdom {which is the Gospel of salvation} is like leaven hid in the Meal, which effectually alters and turns all into its own nature. "But the wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be intreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy." {James 3:17} "They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain; for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the LORD, as the waters cover the sea." {Isa.11:9} But, alas for me, the fruit of doctrine, nowadays is, that the Wolf shall not dwell with the Lamb, &c. It is time for the Lord to put to his hand.

Reader, thou art now to judge and determine whose be the errors and mistakes. Be thou wise, and impartial, and if any can in love clear them to be mine, he may call for my retraction, and have it. The Lord keep us in that faith and love, which is in Christ Jesus.

Farewell

Monomachia

*OR, A Single REPLY To Mr. RUTHERFORD'S
Book called
CHRIST'S DYING AND DRAWING OF SINNERS.*

*Vindicating and clearing only such Positions
and Passages in THE ASSERTION OF GRACE,
as are palpably mistaken and perverted, and
so mis-called ANTINOMIAN.*

The first Exception that I find, is against this passage in my Assertion, page. 37.

Mr. Rutherford: "Holy walking and good works can no more be means, or the way to the kingdom {as Mr. Towne and other Antinomians say,} than motion within the City can be a way to the City, in regard the man is in the City before he walk in it."

Reply: If all must be Antinomians, who so have held and said in our sense, then you will condemn, with us all the Orthodox. But 2. If you can put a good construction upon their words, why will not charity do the like for us? Will you be partial? 3. Where is your confutation or conviction of error? 4. The kingdom of grace and glory is but one in nature and kind, as all do assert; the difference is in regard of degrees. And the entrance into it, is by regeneration, {Jn.3:5,} which is before all works; therefore we do rightly teach, that a man must first be in the New-Jerusalem, the City of God, before he can walk in it. 5. If you will take the kingdom strictly for the future state of glory and felicity,

{which you know your Antinomians do not in this their position,} yet even then it is the free gift of God without condition of our works, as Romans 6:23. The free gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord. As the mean through which it can be received, is Christ; so faith is the instrument by which, as a free gift is received, and taken by the hand from the giver. Lastly, there is one in your bosom will tell you, that we are not against good works, which God hath ordained that we should walk in amongst men; only as you grant them to be improperly conditions of life, so we according to the Scriptures and the Orthodox, do affirm that opinion to be false and dangerous, from which it is most hard to withdraw men's minds and thoughts, being so natural unto them; and in the best construction, it doth obscure the free grace of God in Christ Jesus. Importing, that Christ saves not without works; or faith cannot receive Christ in the promise for both righteousness and life, but he is held forth for salvation upon condition and after our good works, so that faith also must be kept in suspense and God's promise too, until the end of our holy walking.

Mr. Rutherford: "Neither do these places make justification and regeneration all one, as Mr. Towne, along with other Antinomians do; for we are not regenerated by faith, but that we may believe, but we are justified by faith. 2. Regeneration putteth in us a new birth, the image of the second Adam; justification formally is for the imputed righteousness of Christ, which is in Christ, not in us.

Reply: You may see there {pg. 78} that it is brought in as the saying of Melanchthon, whose words upon John 3, are these, "true mortification is the sense or feeling of death, whereby the flesh is confounded and judged; vivification is, in that death, a sense of life, peace, joy of heart, &c." As also of Mr. Fox, who saith

thus; "regeneration is not a being altered into a new bodily substance from what we were, but a being turned by reconciliation into a new state of grace; so as such, who were before dead to God, and damnable creatures and children of wrath, are now accepted, purged, justified from the malediction of original and actual sin; they who were separated from God, are restored again into favor and grace." I could add others of as good judgment and sound experience, as is any adversary.

Your reasons are invalid, for if regeneration be to faith, and so be before it, then it follows that either we come not to Christ, and become one with him by faith; {which elsewhere you affirm, as do others} or else regeneration doth precede our union; which is against the noon-light of Scriptures. We are in Christ before we become new creatures. II Cor.5:17, John 15:1, 2.

Then regeneration is not the begetting of man again to God, as James 1:18, but a begetting of new qualities, or a renewing of God's Image in him, who as yet is a sinner in the state of nature, a Child of wrath, &c., and so the accident will be before and without its proper subject; there being found the likeness of a son, without the Sonship itself. Or at least by your opinion one may be regenerated, and so the Child of God, who is not as yet justified nor in favor and acceptance with God. This is clear, if regeneration be to faith. And then we are to believe, that we may be justified, reconciled, &c.

Then also, either the word is not the seed of our new birth, as I Pet.1:23, or else the word is effectual to regeneration without and before faith. But the word profiteth not without faith, Heb.4:2, and faith is first required to manifest us as sons of God, as John 1:12. The power to become the Sons of God is given to them that receive Christ, or believe in him; so, Gal.3:26, "ye are all the Children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." If by

faith, then not before it. Our second thoughts may be more satisfactory.

Mr. Rutherford: "Mortification and new Obedience, as Mr. Towne and others say, is but faith in Christ; and not abstinence from worldly lusts, that war against the soul."

Reply: Abstinence from worldly lusts cannot be mortification formally and properly so called, for it is to kill and crucify lust, Gal.5:24, that is more than to abstain from it. 2. Your accusation is false; for I say not so, see the place again.

Mr. Rutherford: "To repent, to mortify sin, is not to condemn all our works, {as Mr. T. saith, Assertion, pg.15,16,} righteousness, and judgment, and our best things in us, and then by faith to flee to grace; nor is it to distrust our own righteousness, and to embrace Christ in the promise. Because this is faith, and we are justified by faith, not by repentance and mortification, neither receive we Christ by repentance."

Reply: Your wrong is manifold; for I confound not faith and repentance; but say, that they are inseparable in the subject, and yet to be distinguished, as Mark 1:15, "repent and believe the Gospel." 2. I do not make repentance and to mortify sin all one, as I there speak of repentance. 3. Neither say I, that to repent and to mortify sin is by faith to fly to grace, embrace Christ, &c. The Law is against you as a false witness in all these; and you cannot but perceive that I speak of that legal repentance and mortification, which you with others so much stand for, as requisite before faith, which is when a man is so laid open to himself, so effectually convinced, and wrought upon by the Law, that he seeth, acknowledgeth, and renounceth all things in him and done by him, as sin and abomination before the Lord, whatever esteem he hath had of them formerly, or whatever show they may make. Yea, and as sin, the

sting of death, appears and revives in all, which is the very mortification, the wounding and killing of the soul, Rom.7:10, so all these seeming excellencies and good things become mortified within him, and his heart that lived and rejoiced in them, now dieth unto them, finding nothing but vanity, sin, and death in all things out of Christ. Thus he repents and changes his mind with shame and sorrow that ever he so exalted and established his own righteousness of works, as did Paul and those zealous Jews being converted to the faith.

And because we are necessitated to carry this body of death to the grave, and therefore sin and death will ever and unavoidably be in us and all our works; and we can by faith in Christ alone, find true righteousness, life, peace, confidence, joy and salvation; hence Christ is our only treasure who hath our hearts delight, and all else are renounced, and accounted as dung and dross. Phil.3:9. You neither may nor can rightly understand my words as spoken of that Evangelical repentance, or mortifying of sin in life and conversation by the Spirit, of which we read. {Rom.8:13-15, Col.3:5}

Also you know, that both in the Scriptures and Authors, repentance is sometimes taken largely, as comprehending faith also, with the effects and fruits of it; and so it is divided into mortification and vivification. But since all fullness is in Christ, who is made unto us wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and redemption, that all our rejoicing should be in him alone, he that liveth by faith in him is the only mortified man. "Whom have I in heaven but thee; and there is none upon earth that I desire beside thee." {Psal.73:25}

Mr. Rutherford: "There be two things in the Law. The authority and power to command and to punish. It is most false that Mr. Towne saith, to justify and condemn, are as proper and essential to the Law as to

command. It is false that we are freed from active obedience to the moral Law, because Christ came under the active obedience; for law requires obedience out of love."

Reply: These two authorities of the Law are repeated and inculcated by you and Mr. Burgess. Dictator-like, you still say, "it's false, it's most false, &c.," but where is there any truth or weight in what you say against me? I can condemn your vain and reproachful words, and do account your self-coined distinctions as windy, without warrant and weight. You have a satisfactory answer in my former Reply. I may challenge you to produce one syllable for a Law commanding, without its condemning power. Remember Matthew 5:17,18.

2. That the Law requires obedience out of love, its true; but we work from self-love, and for self-ends, viz., that we may live thereby, and not die. The first Adam by his obedience might have preserved himself, in that life and state of holiness and happiness he had by creation; but now in Christ our life and felicity is attained and kept by faith, we believe that we may live; and we love and obey freely, for no such ends, as not standing and falling by our obedience or disobedience moral. Also if our love be changed from legal into evangelical, void of selfness, yet that alters not the cords of the law, nor the chains we were in; but Christ hath happily freed us from them. The change is in the true Christian, and in his estate, but you can show no change in the Law. Neither do we destroy the Law, as you slander us again, but do establish it by faith, Rom.3:31, where I see that Paul preached the same way that we do, in that he was so put to clear and vindicate his Ministry, as you do us.

This also will serve for that exception on page 275, where you set the same coleworts before your Reader. It is your constant doctrine, that works have

reward here, and eternal life hereafter, and that they be conditions, and the way to life and glory. How this will consist with faith and Christ, let all judge.

Mr. Rutherford: "Towne in Assertion, page. 56, 58, a believer is as well saved already, as justified by Christ and in him. Divines say, our life and salvation is inchoate; but they speak of life as it is in us subject, as far as we are concerned or in respect of our sense and apprehension. Here in grace, our faith, knowledge and sanctification is imperfect; but in regard of imputation and donation our righteousness is perfect, and he that believeth hath life, not, he shall have it or hath it in hope only. Answer. If we have glory really actually, perfectly, but want it only in sense, we have the resurrection from the dead also actually, and we want nothing of the reality of heaven but sense; but we are not yet before the throne. Therefore holy walking can be no way nor condition nor means of salvation, &c., and therefore no wonder they reject all sanctification as not necessary, and teach men to loose the reins to all fleshly walking."

Reply: Justification puts the soul into a present state of salvation. The Scriptures are plain. Christ hath saved us, II Tim.1:9, Tit.3:5, Eph.2:8, and these things have I written unto you that believe, &c., that ye may know that ye have eternal life. I Jn.5:13. "This is the record that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son." {vs.11} God hath quickened us together with Christ, and hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus. {Eph.2:1-6}

I muse you stumble in so clear light. Hence, saith Musculus, "before God we are all that which he willed, and also hath caused us to be. Christ is not alone in his eyes, but we also are conjoined to him." The Assertion doth present you with testimonies sufficient, you believe

so far as you see and feel. If you deny our perfection in Christ our head, {in whom we are complete, Col.2:10,} you deny also our union with him, that we have received him, have him, and are now the sons of God. "Beloved, now are we the sons of God." I Jn.3:2. Yea, then deny that God hath given us as yet Christ, and life in and with him; but all is still kept in suspense, and reserved till future. So where the Spirit of truth saith, God hath given unto us Christ and eternal life in him, your ghost saith, nay, but he will, his promise is future, give us them upon condition of our good works, and by them as a way we must come to Christ and salvation. God hath conveyed and given nothing by promise. There is no Christ nor life in reality and substance communicated by the word, these are empty shells. The just liveth by faith, what feedeth he on to nourish and increase life? What, on the wind? Well, you teach that we must live in hope to have all in the end, upon condition of our obedience and service. And for this reason you call upon men to work and please God. But the truth saith, Christ hath received all for us, and we enjoy all in him.

You say, that because we hold works are no conditions of salvation, therefore we loose men's reins to carnal walking. It's a Popish cavil or slander, and argues a spirit in the Author too servile and mercenary, which will do no good but for lucre, and to gain by it, and such a spirit must needs accompany your doctrine.

Mr. Rutherford: "Mr. Towne saith, in sanctification as well as in justification, we are mere patients and can do nothing at all; and that the blessedness of man is only passive, not active in his holy walking."

Reply: As this is objected in your other book, so you have your answer to it. But my words are, what can you do to the sanctifying or changing of yourself, more than in your justification? It is God's act to sanctify

throughout, you cannot make one hair white or black. Who would think that Mr. Rutherford would quarrel with this? You alter my words, to make them capable of your gloss and sense. But all men may see that I speak of the act of sanctification, and not of the expression and fruits of it. If you can sanctify yourself in whole or part, glory in your freewill and power; but that is the greatest arrogance of Antichrist, saith one. So I leave you, with your absurdity unto the worlds censure; for you show neither text or reason against me.

And that blessedness is passive and not active in holy walking, you must grant; or when you say anything against it, deserving or requiring it, you may then expect your answer. Blessedness in holy walking is declarative showing how God hath renewed and enlarged the heart; but that phrase is yours, not mine.

Mr. Rutherford: "Towne, the Antinomian said that David confessed his sins, not according to truth and the confession of faith, but from want and weakness of faith, &c."

Reply: My words are that David prayed that his sins might be pardoned; which you grant were pardoned. Now then did he thus pray according to truth and the confession of faith; or from want or weakness of faith, and of the effectual apprehension of forgiveness? Is not Mr. Rutherford now the Antinomian, who against Law so palpably mistakes his Adversary? There is great difference between confessing of sin and praying for pardon. If God, my own conscience, men, yea Satan require that I confess myself a sinner, I shall readily do it; for this is to justify God in his Law, saying, there is none righteous, &c., and this may well stand with my faith, and effectual apprehension of pardon; for I confess what I am in myself, whilst I believe what I am in Christ, through that grace that justifieth the ungodly. Thus while your mistakes only make me erroneous,

{whom otherwise you find not so,} who is now the Antinomian? Is not the Author of the error? So all will return to your own discredit and disadvantage; and what a gross slander is that which followeth, viz., that Towne and all Antinomians teach, that it is unbelief, a work of the flesh, of old Adam, &c., that justified persons confess or feel sin, sorrow, or complain of the body of sin, as Paul, Romans 7? This is as if the continual dwelling of sin in us, did not trouble us, or could not consist with faith in justification by Christ; or that now the spiritual estate of the soul, being clear and safe, made up in Christ, sin in no other regard were sorrow or trouble to us. But you cannot in this neither make good your charge. You care little how falsely you accuse us, so that you make your bill foul and black enough to make us still more odious and vile.

Mr. Rutherford: "Mr. Towne contends for a complete perfection, not only of persons justified, but also of performances; so that, saith he, page 75, 'I believe, there is no sin, malediction, or death in the Church of God,' he will have a perfection not of parts, but also of degrees; this he proves from Luther's words perverted."

Reply: What perfection I contend for, you must yield me, or else, with your heart you believe not, that there is a holy Church; which is indeed, as Luther saith, nothing else; but I believe that there is no sin, no malediction, no death in the Church of God; but this is in Christ, not in our selves; by justification, not by inherent sanctification, for this is imperfect. You say I pervert Luther; take his words again. "So mightily, saith he, worketh faith, that he that believeth that Christ hath taken away sin from him, he like Christ is void of sin." Again, "Christ will have us to believe, that like as in his own person there is now no sin, nor death, even so there is none in ours; there is no defect in the thing

itself, but in our incredulity." Let us see what construction, or sense you can make of these words. But you pervert my words, or meaning, as if I meant that sin dwelleth not still in us, a fiction. But Luther addeth, as you read in the Assertion, that to reason it's a hard matter to believe these inestimable good things and unspeakable riches. Moreover, Satan with his fiery darts, and his Ministers with their wicked and false doctrine, go about to wrest it from us, and utterly to deface this doctrine; and specially, for this Article, we sustain the cruel hatred and persecution of Satan and the world; for Satan feels the power and fruit of this Article. Consider what you Read.

Mr. Rutherford: "When D. Taylor objects, as a limb of their fleshly divinity, no action of a believer after justification is sin, Mr. Towne answers, nothing, but of the way; no action is sin, the disorder of the action is sin. But D. Taylor means that there is no disorder in the action of a justified man by their way, &c., can this be any but the divinity of the flesh?"

Reply: If the Doctor say it, you will swear it, but my answer is direct to his words; yet saith you now, help me to know his meaning, I say, there is disorder in their actions, else perfection should be in us, and no need of justification if we sin not. What gain you by this? You say, by justification there is no removal of sin, but of the guilt, or obligation to eternal wrath, &c., but the Scripture speaketh not of guilt nor obligation to punishment, but of sin, and the debt itself; whereof we being discharged, the obligation to the curse ceases upon that; yet we may be discharged in our accounts with God of sin, and it be still dwelling in us; and we confess it too. Now what fleshy divinity is this? Nay, is not your doctrine truly fleshy? For it is self-liking and from a carnal principle, that our good works are conditions of life and salvation, and that Christ saveth

from eternal wrath, but we must suffer temporary punishment here; we may sin, and the law not curse us, &c., hence is your doctrine so current and acceptable to all carnal minds.

Mr. Rutherford: "Towne, 'by the word Law Romans 6, I understand, saith he, Moral law, with all its Authority.' Answer. If we be freed from all authority of the law, then hath the sixth command no authority from God to teach that murder is a sin, and that Idolatry is against the Second Commandment."

Reply: By like consequence it may be said, if there be no curse, nor condemnation in the law we live under, as you teach us, then the sixth Commandment cannot curse, or condemn for murder, &c. Your Argument holds not; for what the law saith, it is to them that are under it. The law may have power, though you in a true sense be not under it. So the Law teacheth what sin is, and what curse is annex to sin, though you agree with the profane, and secure in heart, who in their imaginations deceitfully separate sin and the curse, as they would sin without peril.

Mr. Rutherford: "Then the Believer, when he lies, whores, &c., is not obliged to know, and see, from the light of the law, that these be sins."

Reply: In like manner by your doctrine he is to see no condemnation, nor danger by the Law for these sins, but may live and continue secretly in sinning; for the Law, to him, hath no condemning power; deliver yourself, and acquit me.

Mr. Rutherford: "Mark, saith Mr. Towne, three grounds of mistake. 1. That justification and sanctification are separable. 2. To ease men by faith of the yoke of the law, is to suffer them to run after the course of the world. 3. That all strict conformity to the law is right sanctification. Answer. 1. Not any of these is

owned by Protestant Divines, they are all in Mr. Towne forged calumnies."

Reply: I hate forging, and wish you used it no more than I, for you find not me charging Protestant divines with these; but whether Mr. Burgess with the President and Fellows of Sion College {who unanimously justified and commended to the whole Kingdom his Sermons and Doctrine} and Dr. Taylor {whom yourself so much defend} be Protestant divines, I leave that to your thoughts. For, 1. Mr. Burgess saith expressly, that the Law is used as an effectual instrument of Sanctification, Regeneration, and Conversion. And Dr. Taylor saith, "if a man be freed from the Law, he may whore, steal &c.," as if there were no power in the word of Grace and Spirit to renew, guide, and keep us in the good ways of God. And to the third, I say, If hundreds teach not so then I am mistaken. Who is now the forger of Calumnies? Whether they own them, or no, I avow them as I say. Yet you say, we never make the Law the efficient instrument of sanctification; and you know it is otherwise. They, for whom you so plead, and against whom, for that cause, we except, have taught and published, as I say.

Mr. Rutherford: "I cannot see, that sanctification is anything by Antinomian Doctrine, but mere justification."

Reply: You want eye-salve, or will not see; how often may you read them distinguished in the Assertion?

Mr. Rutherford: "Mr. Towne passes by all guidance of the Saints by Commandment of Law or Gospel, and tells us of a leading by a free Spirit only. So that by the Antinomian doctrine, we are no more under the Gospel, as a directing and commanding rule than under Law. What hindereth then, but Antinomian justification bids us to live as we list? 2. A dead letter

forbids no sin, commands no duty; but the Gospel, without the Spirit is a dead letter, as well as the Law."

Reply: Is Mr. Rutherford guilty of denying all truths he ever mentioned? The Assertion telleth you of a sanctifying virtue and power of the Spirit by the Gospel, to subdue sin, change the heart, and freely dispose it to walk according to the rule of the Law, and this you read. And under this dominion and guidance of this Evangelical Spirit of Christ, are all the Sons of God. What an indirect and undue inference then do you make, saying, we teach men to live as they list? First, there is a change in their list and will from what they were; "for the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh;" Gal.5:17, and I tell you, if this Spirit have not sovereignty over you, and power to renew and guide you, you will neither follow the rule of Law nor Gospel. The unction leadeth into all truth. "Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh." Gal.5:16. You call the Gospel a dead Letter, but this is no Scripture-phrase; which saith, it's the ministration of the Spirit, II Cor.3:8, yet it makes not against me at all.

Mr. Rutherford: "If by conformity to the law in the letter, Mr. Towne means external obedience without faith in Christ, he knows that Protestant divines acknowledge no sound sanctification, but that which is the natural issue and fruit of justification, and flows from faith. And such strict conformity to the law, we hold to be true sanctification, though all enemies to holy walking cry out against it, such as are all mockers of all religion, the Prelatical and Antinomian party, who mock strait walking."

Reply: Sounds good now, but I know that Protestant divines hold sanctification to issue out of justifying faith; and you cannot but know many who deny it, and that some will have sanctification to be coetaneous unto, yea to precede justification. If it be the

issue and fruit of faith, by which the heart believeth first to justification and salvation; how is it that you teach strict conformity to be a necessary condition, means or way of salvation, which by faith is attained in order before holy walking? He that believeth is saved. Abraham did believe and work both; but he did only by faith come to blessedness; and so all his children. "So then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham." Gal.3:9.

2. You are ill-transported, when in your distemper you conjoin us with the Prelatical party {though I doubt not, but amongst them were divers as sound for doctrine, and life, as in your party} and make us both mockers, and enemies to holy walking. Sir, doth the Law now regulate you, when you are so far from charity and truth? The Lord forgive, and grant you repentance. Amen.

Mr. Rutherford: "Mr. Towne will have the believer so free, so perfect, as the law needs not to teach, nor direct him in one stop; for he doth all without a keeper, by the free compulsion of a Spirit separated from Scriptures, which is right down; as a believer is neither under law, nor Gospel, but a Spirit separated from both, guides him."

Reply: When I say the Spirit of the Lord is his keeper, do I teach then, that he hath no keeper? He receiveth the Spirit that leads him, by the Gospel; how false then is your charge? Who speaks or dreams of a spirit separated from the Gospel, and not I; and yet the Spirit breathes and blows in the heart, and the voice or sound of it is there distinctly heard, when there is no syllable of outward Law or Gospel; but you have sufficient answer before. As for your instances of Joseph, and David; I ask of you, whether it was the Spirit within, that kept them from offending or the law? I muse you omit to show what it is to be under Grace.

Mr. Rutherford: "Dr. Taylor did not omit to show what it is, if you did not omit to read his words, he is clear to any."

Reply: Before you complained that you could not see what was plain before you; but now you can see what is not extant; this is the fruit of partiality.

Mr. Rutherford: "But let your exposition stand, you are not under the law as teaching, directing, regulating believers in the way of righteousness; but the Gospel giveth power to subdue sin, without any teaching, or regulating power of the law. But what is the power of subduing sin to the Antinomians? Not sanctification, but justification; that is, a power to believe that Christ hath obeyed the law for me, and that we are obliged to no personal sanctification, &c., then to be inherently holy is unlawful to the Antinomians."

Reply: The exposition is not mine verbatim; yet even in your own expression the light of truth is so clear, and convincing on our part, that you turn your back on it, as afraid to meddle. And being disposed to take occasion to wrangle, you demand what it is to subdue sin? Whereas it is set before you; even the weakening of the power of sin within us, that it domineer not over us. Indeed the Prophet, Micah 7:19, uses the phrase of subduing by justification, and that is a true subduing it in the conscience, that it there reign not to death and condemnation. And yet by your confession, this must precede, and is the proper cause of subduing it in conversation; and then that will necessarily follow, issuing out of this faith. So that in fine, this is but a Papistical cavil, that to teach justification is the overthrow of holiness and good works. Lastly, whereas you tell of obliging to sanctification, I answer, we are to believe, that God will sanctify us, and that throughout, and put his Spirit into us, to lead us in his ways; and so in that faith desiring

and hungering after it, to seek to him {as a sick man longing for health, unto his Physician} and to wait in the use of his ordinances, that he may so perform. The New Covenant properly requireth nothing of man; but God, knowing his spiritual poverty, and utter disability, calleth upon him to seek to him, who worketh both the will and the deed of his own pleasure. "Open thy mouth wide, and I will fill it." {Ps.81:10} Your slanderous conclusion is both against the rule of God's law, and of all human arts. But such extravagancy becometh, or still pleaseth Mr. Rutherford. My statement {Assertion, pg.6} is that "I deny not the law to be an eternal and inviolable rule of righteousness; yet the Grace of the Gospel doth truly and effectually conform us unto it."

Mr. Rutherford: "I ask to whom the law is a rule. If to Believers, then they must be under it. That rule the grace conforms unto, we must be under. 3. An inviolable rule of justice cannot be violated without sin. Then the Believer cannot violate the law, and murder, but they must sin, and violate the rule, &c."

Reply: It's true, the law is an inviolable rule, but not to him as a Believer, or in the things of his Faith; but here he departs from it, for he doth not the Law to be saved; but believeth, after the rule of the Gospel. 2. If you consider him morally, I see not, but he may be conformed to the rule of the law, and yet not under it, but under grace, and the rule of the Spirit, which conforms him. 3. In this your moral or civil conception of him, you take him quite out of Christ's kingdom, where grace reigneth. And now, grant he doth murder and sin, it is death and condemnation by the same rule and law; so that he must be totally removed out of the limits of the law, before he can be freed and secured from either sin or death. You leave faith, and fall from grace in all your arguments. And they are as forcible to maintain the condemning power of the law to believers, as the

regulating; for where the law regulates, it may condemn; and so it doth the best Saint here, if you bring him, and his life under it.

Mr. Rutherford: "According to Towne, 'through faith is bred assured confidence, lively hope, &c.,' but this is a close perverting of the word of truth; as the Antinomians faith may here be smelt; then whoever once wavers or doubts, are yet under the law of works. A doctrine of despair to broken reeds, who cry, I believe, help my unbelief."

Reply. I must commend to you James 1:6,7, but observe, good Reader, what is here excepted against, viz., that through Faith in Christ is bred assured confidence, lively hope, pure love towards God, invocation of his name without wavering, fear, or doubting, not questioning his good will, audience, acceptance; which would never be effected by all the zeal and conscience towards God according to the law of works. And now judge impartially, what truth can be current with Mr. Rutherford. I ask, can assured confidence, lively hope, &c., come, or be effected any way else than by faith in Christ? If there want light at Noon-day, {Ps.37:6,} Read Heb.3:9, where your Bible-note saith, that he calleth that excellent effect of faith {whereby we cry Abba, Father} confidence, and to confidence he joins hope, which is termed a lively hope that God begets unto, I Pet.1:3, see also, Heb.10:22,23, Rom.15:13, and 10:14. How shall they call on him, on whom they have not believed? But it is like this moves Mr. Rutherford that it is said, that these cannot be attained by all the zeal according to the law of works; yet Paul clears it, Eph.2:18, that through Christ we have entrance unto the Father, and Eph.3:12. By him we have boldness, and entrance with confidence by faith in him. If Mr. Rutherford object, but these are not in full and absolute perfection, where yet true faith may be?

Who saith so, or who but Mr. Rutherford would so closely pervert the truth? That I may retort his own words. Being justified by faith, we have peace, &c. In whom believing ye rejoice, &c. God hath begotten us again to a lively hope, &c. Rom.5:1, I Pet.1:3,8. Nay, saith Mr. Rutherford, this is a close perverting of the truth; for he doubts not, but that there are many weak believers, of a trembling, timorous, and troubled spirit, whose faith is not yet able to over-master their fears, which cause torment, and dis-quietness, but I cease.

And Mr. Rutherford hereby smells our faith. Know it, that it is the effect of the law of works upon the natural conscience, and the unbelief of the Gospel, that keep the soul in bondage through that slavish fear.

Mr. Rutherford: "The covenant of grace commands faith, and also good works as witnesses of faith, but Mr. Towne will have good works in any notion of an Evangelic command to stand at defiance with the covenant of grace."

Reply: What contend you for? If you grant grace to be the fountain-cause of all holy walking, then not the law. 2. If it be a lively and free fountain, then doth holiness issue out of it, as a pleasant stream; and how now do good works stand at defiance with the covenant of grace? Besides it is said abusively, and not properly, that the covenant of grace commands faith, and good works; for it promiseth to give both, to them who have power to neither. Lastly, these works are not done as conditions to obtain eternal life; for that is said throughout, to be by faith without works; faith for salvation, good works for conversation.

Mr. Rutherford: "The man under the law cannot give himself to be ruled by the law after the mind and will of God, as Mr. Towne saith, except Antinomians be Pelagian."

Reply: It is a palpable wrong; I have no such words, as that a man under the law can give himself to be ruled by it after the mind and will of God; you have a strange conscience, that no better bridleth you, though your affections be void of love to your Adversary. I might more truly reply, by your doctrine, that a man under the law can do it; for you free none from under it; or else you are not ruled by it after the mind and will of God. And that is most probable, but who now is the Pelagian?

But to deal plainly, what say you of Paul and many zealous Jews, who in earnest applied themselves to do the things of the Law? So that Paul saith, touching it he was blameless, and that before his conversion to the faith. To do it after the mind and will of God, is your addition.

Mr. Rutherford: "Paul speaks of a man under the Law in the flesh and in opposition to that under Grace, married to Christ; he that is dead to the Law, married to Christ, and serves God spiritually. And it is clear, the Apostle counts it a part of deliverance from the Law, and a fruit of our marriage to Christ, that we bring forth fruit to God, walk holy, and serve in newness of spirit."

Reply: Now we have come together. What contend you for? All is granted, that I desire or said; for then Christ, and not the Law, as a husband makes fruitful. 2. Then there was a serving of God under the Law in the oldness of the letter. 3. Where, or how then find you me to be against holy walking, and according to the rule of righteousness? Is not this your false slander?

Assertion: How can Christ redeem us from the Law, except in the same sense and extent that Christ was under it?

Mr. Rutherford: "Christ was under the Law of Ceremonies; I hope Gentiles were not under that."

Reply: The question is of the moral, and you talk vainly of ceremonial.

Mr. Rutherford: "If Christ was under the Law as a rule, to free us from it, why commands he to imitate him?"

Reply: Christ was under the Law for life, even to obtain favor and salvation for us; so he is the end of the Law for righteousness to all that believe. 2. It is by his Spirit and Power that any imitate him, walking as he did, and so do keep the Law, as he did, freely in love; not for self-life or self-ends, for so did Christ, who sought not himself.

Mr. Rutherford: "Mr. Towne hath a strange evasion. The spirit is free, why will you control and rule it by the Law? Whereas the nature of it is freely to conform heart and life to the outward rule of the law, without the help of the law; as a crooked thing is made straight, &c. Likewise, to do the will of God, merely as commanded, from the power of an outward commandment is legal, saith Saltmarsh; and Mr. Towne saith it is to control the free spirit. Three means, saith Towne are passive; to hear, read, receive Sacraments, are so many restraints laid on the free spirit."

Reply: I say again, if the Spirit rule you according to the Law, then neither Law nor you do rule it; but the Law is only the rule or pattern, according to which the Spirit forms you. What can be plainer to him that will see and grant any truth? And this makes no contrariety, but a sweet harmony between the Word and the Spirit; yea, and establisheth the Law by the Faith and Spirit of the Gospel. And here you would rank us among the old Anabaptists, Enthusiasts, &c., and love to expatiate, having burst the banks and bounds of charity and truth. I am not more strange to you, than this is to me, that you are of such a spirit. 2. Where say I, that means are passive? The Spirit is pleased to blow sweetly by all

Evangelical means, as Preaching, Prayer, Ordinances, &c., and we rightly using them, do carry ourselves passively, that the Spirit may thereby breathe and give life to our Spirits, and that we may have it more abundantly.

Mr. Rutherford: "What does Towne mean in saying, the Spirit freely conforms the heart to it."

Reply. The sense is easy and plain, if your mind were not sinister.

Mr. Rutherford: "If the meaning be, that the Law of itself cannot convert a man to God, Antinomians father most falsely such dreams on us, but if the Spirit conform us to the outward rule of the Law, then must the Law be yet a rule to our obedience."

Reply: When you please, you can spell out my meaning. But, whether it be your dream or no, I leave it. Yet you know that you're brethren so hold and teach, and may be forced to own this brat, or novel-assertion of theirs.

As if Mr. Rutherford were in a dream, he in his other book would seem to affirm and maintain it, and with a small touch he there passed it over, and here he saith, the Law itself converts not. No more doth the Gospel itself, as he often saith, without the Spirit. This is as if, with Mr. Burgess he means, that either Law or Gospel is the Spirit's instrument for conversion; and that we may preach either for that end. Mr. Rutherford is unwilling to speak out.

If the Spirit by the Gospel, conform us to the rule of the Law, it is then true, that the Law is a passive rule, but not active, as actuating to effectuate this; thus you grant what I asserted, and oppose without cause. But at last you tell us, the Apostle never speaks of our freedom from the Law, as it doth regulate, direct, and lead us. Now this overthrows what you said even now, viz., that the Spirit by the Gospel doth direct and lead us in the

way of the Law; for then the Law doth not actively lead us.

Mr. Rutherford: "Mr. Towne, 'what sets free a believer from the curse? But because he is a new Creature.' That new creation is sanctification, II Cor.5:17, and not justification. If any be in Christ, that is, if he be justified, he is a new creature, that is, sanctified; or else by the Antinomian gloss, the meaning must be, if a man be justified in Christ, he is justified in Christ. Paul speaks not such non-sense."

Reply: This new creature is the man changed in himself and his state. Sanctification is not a new creation, but a new qualifying of a man. It begets him not, nor recreates him not to God, nor yet delivereth him from under the curse; makes him not a child of God; restores him not into favor, nor doth make him heir, co-heir with Christ, &c. 2. To be justified and to be in Christ, is not all one, as your gloss is; they differ as the cause and the effect, or as the antecedent and consequent. To be in Christ, imports union, which is before justification. Or it is implantation, that work of the Father, Jn.15:1, that being engrafted into him, he may partake of his righteousness and holiness, both imputatively and inherently, if I may use the Aristotelian word. More sound or probable is their judgment, who teach that regeneration includes both justification and sanctification.

Mr. Rutherford: "How shall it follow, that Christ hath loosed us from all debt of active obedience, because he hath loosed us from a necessity of perfect active obedience? But the Law is spiritualized and lustered with the Gospel, Law, and free-grace; and drawn down to a Covenant of free-grace, requires not, nor exacts upon perfect obedience, under pain of losing salvation. It requires obedience as the poor man is able

to give it, by the grace of God that the man may enter in the possession of eternal life."

Reply: You can show no text nor reason why Christ looseth not from imperfect, as well as perfect obedience; and that from active as well as passive. Nay, if from perfect, much more may we argue from imperfect. 2. If our state and case be well considered, we are spiritually so poor, that we are as unable to pay pence as pounds. It is all one to a dead man, whether life be tendered unto him upon condition of moving his least finger, or the removing of a great Mountain, and this is our case. Again, you can produce no Law that requires not perfect obedience; that calls not for obedience, as a proper condition of life, do and live; that threatens not death upon the least failing in any iota.

But you let all see your new divinity. 1. I must obey, but not perfectly. 2. The Law is spiritualized, &c., drawn down to a Covenant of free-grace. 3. No more is required of the poor man, than what he can give, &c. From beyond the ability of man, God does not will any of their obligations. By this grace is abrogated, the promise made void, and faith is of no effect.

Mr. Rutherford: "Paul shows what Law we are freed from, of sin and death; and saith, Christ died for this end, Rom.8:4, that the righteousness of the Law might be fulfilled in us. Whence I argue, those that ought to fulfill the righteousness of the Law, by walking after the Spirit, and mortifying the deeds of the flesh, are not freed from the Law as a rule of righteousness."

Reply: The strength of sin is the Law, I Cor.15:56. Christ died that the righteousness of the Law might be fulfilled in us, imputatively; or grant, inherently; yet if this be the end and fruit of Christ's death, as you say, then the Law is no active cause of it, but the power of Christ's death effecteth it. And though this righteousness be for matter one with the Law, yet

still the Law is but a rule passively, according to which the believer is conformed and regulated, it not actively regulating. Also active walking in the Law, is but the expression and effect of sanctification, and not properly sanctification itself. Adam made holy, lived accordingly from that inward form; his holy life made him not holy. Neither is our holy life to procure or preserve peace, favor, life, as the Law propoundeth and requireth it; for these consist in faith alone, which finds and enjoys Christ to be such a true fullness and all-sufficiency to the soul, that self by him and with him is satisfied, and so needs no ends of its own in working and obeying. "I am the bread of life; he that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst." {Jn.6:35}

Mr. Rutherford: "We are freed from the Law being once justified, {so say the Antinomians,} whatever we do is not against a Law or rule, the law gives a dispensation to do those things being justified, which the unjustified cannot do, but in doing it they sin; because the unjustified are under the law as a rule of justice, which we are not under. We have an antedated dispensation to sin."

Reply: You strain your wit, if not conscience, to make anything out from anything, but I say, take justification in the full latitude, and extent of it; or consider a Christian still as justified, and so he is freed from under the Law; but if you speak of, or consider him in his active righteousness of works, so as you bring him under the Law, so he sinneth; yea and is judged and condemned by the Law; and you must raise him and bring him up to his justified state, ere he can be free and secure from the curse. Justification extends to all sins at all times throughout the whole life. But it is false, that I give an antedated dispensation; that is your indirect inference. If you put the believer under the Law,

as he sinneth, like the unjustified, so the Law threatneth and curseth both equally. Though you tell us unwarrantably {of your bare word} that the Law hath power to rule, where it hath no power to condemn; then we may live securely in sin or the works of the law, and need no more make use of justification, nor have Christ for our shadow and protection.

Mr. Rutherford: "That the Saints are mere patients and blocks in all their holy walking is gross libertinism."

Reply: But how unjustly do you charge this upon your Adversary! Who saith only in the act of sanctification; in which the Spirit only acts. Is not this to pervert what is spoken?

Mr. Rutherford: "No way cries to the conscience of the traveler, this is the way, as the law doth in its directing and ruling power, &c."

Reply: The law materially is resembled to the high-way; and it is true, the high-way calleth not to the passenger to keep his way; yet the authority of the King doth so call and require; so then it is not the law as we consider it, and speak of it; but God the Author of the law, who commandeth to walk in it. And if God in so doing, convince you of unrighteousness for your going astray. Is not his grace in the Gospel your daily needful refuge, and plea? Or you still are in no danger, nor fear, because law cannot condemn? For God say you is pleased with what the poor man can do, or give. Thus you live under a law securely, which is as weak as yourself; and will be content with anything, as you list, or can obey. Whereas, I on the other side, say, that the law hath lost no power nor part of its perfection, Matt.5:17,18, and therefore it convinceth all of sin, and condemneth such as are found under it, because in many things we sin all. In our best works we are found faulty and judged, that we may find no rest, nor safety,

but in the righteousness of Christ. Let the Reader judge, who is in the error. But it is no marvel you so mis-call, mistake and pervert your Adversary, and falsely accuse him, {as you do passion,} and yet have no check of conscience for it, seeing you are so principled that you may transgress, and do anything, impure that is, Scot-free, by your law, and are not led by a right Gospel-Spirit.

Mr. Rutherford: "Towne saith that 'the law wrappeth every man in sin for the least transgression.' Still Antinomians betray their engine. If we say {being justified} we have no sin, we lie, I Jn.1:10, then there cannot be a man upon the earth, but he is under the curse of God; yet the Antinomians say that the justified are freed from the curse; then they have no sin; nay, they cannot sin, by their own Argument; for they will have the curse essentially and inseparably to follow sin; which is most false."

Reply: 1. If we be justified from the curse, than from the sin which yet we have remaining in us, {before the justice of God,} for the cause is taken away before the effect. 2. Else by the contrary, Christ is not our righteousness in justification, {which is opposed to sin,} but only our blessedness, instead of the curse that was upon us; how then is it said, he brought in everlasting righteousness? {Dan.9:24} And that we are made the righteousness of God in him? {II Cor.5:21} So there is no man indeed, but he is under the curse, if the blood of Christ have not washed him from his sin, as Rev.1:5, "unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood." 3. In order justification is after sin, and it being extensive to all sins past, present, and to come, it must presuppose future sins also as done, before it abolish either sin, or curse due for sin. 4. You say, it's most false that sin and the curse be inseparable; but you neither prove nor can show anything to the

contrary. Indeed a carnally secure heart, is apt to separate them, and is thereby hardened, presuming to sin without danger or fear. If you allow of his engine, as better suiting with your own, you may well dislike ours. 5. Here you tell us of an unscriptural-like, and ungrounded distinction of a twofold misery and guilt, and so of deliverance, &c., but I confess I understand not your meaning, and would be loath to mistake or pervert you, as you do me. Your simile giveth me most light, viz., that as the rising of the sun, is the way to the full noon-day, &c. I answer, but so it is no act of ours, but of the Spirit sanctifying us throughout, till we be perfected in ourselves; and so it is not simply our repentance and new obedience, which are consequences effects and expressions of that renovation or sanctification. And I demand also, is not that blot itself so taken away as not reckoned to us, by the death of Christ? Though it abide physically, or inherently, yet in our accounts it is abolished, and blotted out. Lastly, I must that you will except against that expression in Assertion, page 15, "the Law of works is so enwrapped and entwined together, that if a man lay hold on any, even the least link, he inevitably pulls the whole chain upon himself; and yet what you say is of no force. Your repentance and love of the brethren, if you understand yourself, do pull the whole Law upon you, as they be your acts. You cannot oblige yourself in part and in some degrees only as you please. Woe to that life most commendably passed over, if the grace of the Gospel be not to pardon all imperfections. All our righteousnesses are as filthy rags, Isa.64:6, therefore durst not Paul be found in his own righteousness. Phil.3:9.

Mr. Rutherford: "Our obedience is not full and perfect only it's so counted and accepted in Christ."

Reply: If this were all your meaning, that our obedience or works as proceeding from us, or as we

perform them, are imperfect, yet are accepted as perfect in Christ; I could receive it. But you explain yourself otherwise. 1. You say, it is not so, and yet it is accounted perfect; doth not God account it rightly as it is? 2. You are against all sound Protestant divines, if you hold of acceptance with God of any work because of any proper, formal, inherent dignity in it; or if you do not make Christ the alone ground, reason, and cause of all acceptance whether of persons or performances. 3. It is true God accounts not us non-sinners in our selves, and free from all indwelling sin; for that were an untruth; but he both justifieth us by faith in Christ, and makes us pure and free from all spot of sin, before his Judgment seat. Col.1:22, I Jn.1:7. The blood of Jesus cleanseth us from all sin.

Now you are pleased to expatiate, and to amplify yourself needlessly and wilfully, to wrest our words; as if we did not hold the good works of the regenerate to be faulty in themselves; or as if we meant by the removal {as you call it} or abolition of sin, such an annihilation of sin in its essence root and branch, that it should not dwell in us here; whereas you know and read the contrary.

Yet, that both Tree and the Fruit, the believer and his work, are acceptable in Christ, is no new divinity; but according to Scripture and all the Orthodox, Tit.1:15, "to the pure all things are pure."

Your Scriptures, I Jn.1:8, James 3:2, do speak of works as proceeding from us, not as presented in Christ, who justifieth and freeth us from all the evil and filth cleaving to them. I retort, if God can accept of us, or our performances out of Christ, what need we then continually to deal with God in Christ? "By him therefore let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of our lips giving thanks to his name." {Heb.13:15} "And whatsoever ye do in word or deed,

do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God and the Father by him." {Col.3:17}

But this is open wrong which you do us in saying, that we hold works perfect simply in themselves, or to be accepted for any worth or inherent dignity in them; which is your doctrine rather; whereas we teach, that Abel's sacrifice was accepted by faith, that is by Christ believed on; and not for any merit in it. {Heb.11:4} The Scriptures and Testimonies of the Orthodox {which you read in the Assertion} might have prevented all this labor, if you had been so advised.

Consider that of Calvin, "those good works which follow after justification, are esteemed and valued otherwise than by their own desert or dignity; for whatever imperfection is in them, it is covered with Christ's perfection; and whatever blemish or filthiness in them it is cleansed by his purity, lest it should be questioned or examined before God's judgment seat. Therefore saith he the fault of all our transgressions being blotted out, whereby men are hindered from bringing forth anything acceptable to God; and the imperfection and defect, which is wont to defile all good works, being buried, all the good works of the faithful are acknowledged to be just, &c."

Thus may all see how palpably you have mistaken me in this, as in the other passages; and how indirectly and falsely you do infer that we may be justified by works, or we make them meritorious, &c., whereas we say plainly, that the person is first justified, without and before all works; and that then they become accepted and pleasing by the same way and reason that the person came into favor; for as God stands and appears propitious to us in Christ, and so his works and dealings with us, and disposals of us be pleasing and welcome to us; even so we being received and accepted in Christ, what we do through him is

pleasant to God; but not because of any formal and intrinsical dignity in the work. So that we study to deal with God only in Christ, and are now encouraged unto all good works; for who can have a heart to do any good work, till he by faith know, that he pleaseth God by Jesus Christ? So Christ alone is exalted and magnified.

"To seek Heaven by works and deservings is to wrong, yea to shame Christ's blood; and unto such it is shed in vain. When the Gospel is preached unto us, we believe the mercy of God, and in believing receive the Spirit, the earnest of eternal life, and be in eternal life already; and feel in our hearts already the sweetness thereof, and are overcome with the kindness of God and of Christ, and therefore love the will of God, and of love are ready to work freely; and not to obtain that which is given already, and whereof we be heirs by Grace freely."
William Tyndale - Martyr.

FINIS

A brief REPLY to the Exceptions taken by Mr. Rutherford in his Triumph of Faith, against the supposed Antinomian Errors.

Exception #1: The first Exception is against the Assertion of Grace, pg.112, where it is said that Christ only did bear our sins, and the punishment of them, so that the justified are not punished for sin; Mr. Rutherford answereth with a twofold distinction. 1. Of justice legal and sin revenging. 2. Of a mixed justice, which is in a Father; and so saith, that the sins of the Saints are not only against the legal, but also a wrong done against his mixed justice. Where God doth punish their sins, though not satisfactorily to his Law.

Reply. 1. To assert a mixed justice is to temper and mingle Law and Gospel without warrant; and to hold forth God in a Covenant made up both of free-grace and works, which yet be inconsistent. Rom.11:6. 2. Our divines distinguish indeed between punishment and chastisement; and so call these corrections of Children, and not punishment properly, for that every punishment is in some sort satisfactory. And so will that be inferred, which by them is objected against the Papists, viz. If the Saints be punished for their sins temporally, then Christ satisfied for pounds, and left us to satisfy for pence. 3. The true and intrinsically nature and property of all justice offended requireth complete satisfaction; so that our punishments must be satisfactory also, so far as the sin deserves; else who, or what satisfieth? Doth this mixed justice take its pennyworth and full due out of the flesh and bones of God's Children, so as God neither can cease beating till he hath given all the stripes the fault deserved; and when correction is past, then the Fathers justice is quieted? 4. And if you put them under the Government of justice tempered with mildness and

mercy, {which is Law Evangelized; a new crotchet and dream,} then the Law of strict justice, which is the Decalogue, is no longer a rule; our sins must be no longer examined and measured by it, but judged as they are offences of this mixed and fatherly justice. So now Christ may be set aside, we shall no more need him for Advocate, neither is there use of faith when we sin, but our sufferings must in this condition pacify, not Christ's passion, {that only was of use and efficacy to bring us into this state, and under this Government.} Who now are become the total abrogators of the Moral and Pure Law, yea and as it is a rule to live and walk by? Can you tell us how much of justice, and what a measure of mercy is in this new rule and Government? But the result is, that our sins after justification have a double relation; {and had but one before} one to the strict Law, and that Christ contented; the other is to a milder justice, against which our stripes must be opposed, that by them we may be healed.

It is granted, during the Mosaical pedagogue, that there was some show, yea ground for somewhat, but not for all that here you assert, for God did in that dispensation veil his Paternity, which now in Christ is done away. And your Scriptures are only of force for that, and during Christ time.

Exception #2: Against what is said in reference to I Cor.11, Mr. Rutherford saith that "Faith doth no more hinder a justified person to receive unworthily the Lord's Supper than it doth hinder him to commit Adultery."

Reply. 2. It is true, faith is not always effectual in all to hinder the doing of both these. But what then? Is it not for want of the exercise of faith in vigor, life, and perfection, that these or any other sins are not prevented? So if faith do not hinder, what then can hinder? What purifieth the heart, and rightly principles

and disposes the soul to all good actions, but faith? But not faith as a dead quality, or habit lying still and idle within; but as its lively and operative, according to its nature and property. What else doth the Soul in eating and drinking the Lord's Supper employ, or set on work, but faith? Nay, is the act of eating and drinking formally, any other thing but to believe? So that if faith be not to be put forth and exercised, {and then where is justification?} there may be a bodily action in using the visible Elements, which is unworthy indeed, and not befitting a Christian, but no spiritual eating, as the Ordinance requireth. You make your self-sport, saying that Mr. Towne's sense seemeth to carry, that a justified person cannot sin, nor eat and drink unworthily, because faith makes him worthy; and if so the way is a wanton merry way. My words speak no such thing, if you list to spell them aright; but if your ill-will suffer you not, the Lord forgive, and amend it. Faith includes all; it presupposes hunger and thirst before eating, and a true and spiritual receiving of Christ in his ordinances; inward refreshing and satisfaction thereby, whence followeth love, rejoicing; with thanksgiving, so that he who eateth and drinketh in faith, cannot eat and drink unworthily.

The ground out of which all your seven Arguments grow and receive their supposed strength, is, that mixed-justice or that Mosaical-Government, which we do not now live under. And therefore that failing, they will all totter and fall. It needs then your second hand and labor to uphold and confirm it.

Moreover, to the seventh and last, requiring some more particular answer, for I say that all afflictions are subservient to the Law, and signs of wrath, is no error or position of ours; neither is our assertion founded upon it. Yet as afflictions come from justice offended and provoked, to inflict them for sin, so they are appendices of the Law; and you cannot disprove it.

You add, {as a thing that we hold} that as believers are freed from the ruling power of the Law, so are they also from the Rod. Whereas your doctrine by a direct and necessary consequence doth free the believer from the ruling power of the Law, while you place him under a mixed Government of justice and mercy; for the Law is pure justice without mixture, and a strict and exact rule without mitigation. It is false that we free believers from the Rod, as your own eyes may witness while you read our positions; for we do not cry down all Crosses, and secure the justified from all affliction. In this our way, we have had, and still expect many a scratch and prick from you and others; and yet not for any desert or error that all your diligence can find and prove. Your other pretended error, is cleared before.

Lastly, though Christ paid for sins before; yet the Law acquits them not, nor conscience apprehends it not before actual justification.

Exception #3: The exception is against the Covenant. Mr. Rutherford saith that "some teach this Covenant hath no condition, so Dr. Crisp and other Libertines."

Reply. 3. We must have your lash and unworthy brand also. You may sin, and we are made to suffer; but unless you bring in Freewill, this Covenant of Grace will prove absolute, no part of it lying on us, for that presupposes some power and goodness where there is none; for this Covenant is with man being fallen, and so having lost all; therefore it behooves that it should be suitable to his broken state, requiring, neither promising no good conditionally, where nothing could be first given by him.

2. It is granted by all, that all was transacted between God the Father and the Son from eternity, and that the Covenant as it cometh and is commended to us, is as the breaking up of that great seal, the opening and

manifestation of those secrets concluded upon; so far as they concern the raising of the Elect of God, out of their sinful dust, unto everlasting blessedness in Christ, so that what is in the decree of heaven concerning them, the same is contained in the Covenant; then as God purposed to give repentance, faith, holiness, so he hath included and promised all in the Covenant; and these are truly parts and branches of it, and not properly conditions. Now we see, that as there were thoughts of peace in God for us, when we were in our lowest and worst condition; and in what way, and after what manner his mind is to recover our souls from their lost Estates, and restore and give life, favor and glory unto them; so by this Covenant also, he hath laid and cleared to us a firm ground, upon which we may with comfort and confidence expect and wait for faith, and all things to be given freely unto us. This agrees to the expressions of Zanchy, Calvin, &c., indeed God observes his due and set order, in giving and working one thing before, and another after; {so as a before and a after is granted} but the first, suppose repentance or faith, is not a condition of what followeth, except with us, and according to these Authors, you will call it a condition of state; that is, God bringeth the soul unto such a state or case, as he humbleth it, and then giveth Grace, &c. Thus many promises are with an if; if ye repent, if ye believe, then thus it shall be unto you; and denotes only order and consequence, as Calvin saith, not condition. As a Husbandman soweth not his land, till it be plowed and fitted; if he be asked why he doth not commit his seed to it, he will answer, it must be prepared first; but one part of his work is not the condition of the other, when the whole lieth on him. Again, if the promise to give faith and repentance be not in the Covenant, where is it to be found? Is there anything to be looked for, not mentioned in the Covenant?

3. You call it a Covenant of Grace; now if it be of Grace, then works are excluded; yea repentance and faith, as our acts; and if it be free, that necessarily fights against all conditions; it cannot be free and conditional. The more freely the riches of God's Grace is held forth, the more glorious and admirable is it in our eyes. Besides, it is your expression, that Christ is a party contracting, or a Covenanter undertaking for all his; so that I see not how you can make his Elect, singly and simply to be any party's in undertaking and promising anything.

Exception #4: You say that Dr. Crisp giveth this reason why it is not on condition of our believing, because man may fail in believing; and so the condition failing, the Covenant fails.

Reply. 4. His reason is good and sound, for of itself faith is failing, else Christ needed not to have prayed that Peter's faith might not fail, Luke 22:32, but all the whole Covenant being grounded on Christ as the foundation, it is established on a firm Rock, and so is everlasting.

Exception #5: They object, that God promiseth all, as to give faith, to put Law in the inward parts, to cause to walk in his ways, as Jer.31:33,34, Ezek.36:26,27, to circumcise our hearts, Deut.30:6, which the Arminians deny, yet is the clear day-light of Scripture, so that all lieth on God.

Reply. 5. But you return not one syllable of a direct and satisfactory answer unto it; you cannot deny, but what God promiseth, he is absolutely faithful to perform and do it. You infer some indirect and undue consequences, as if you would rather wrangle against the truth, which you cannot resist, or were offended that it shines forth so gloriously and convincingly in your face. What if Dogs abuse it, and Pharisaical Spirits {otherwise principled} spurn against it, or mis-construe

it, as occasioning Libertinism? The sin be theirs; yet this is the only right ground and reason of prayer, and using all God's Ordinances, in which the soul carrying itself passively, waiteth, that God may communicate and pour out his blessings according to his word. Because God had promised first, and that freely, the building of David's house, and the King saw thereby, that God had a gracious mind and purpose to do it, and that it should be his act, therefore David prayed that the Lord would bless his house, that it might continue forever before God. "For thou, O LORD of hosts, God of Israel, hast revealed to thy servant, saying, I will build thee an house; therefore hath thy servant found in his heart to pray this prayer unto thee." II Sam.7:27-29. If all fullness be in the fountain, and free access may be had, it standing open to all; it is an effectual invitation to come.

As for those opinions bred and breathed in New-England, I know nothing of them; neither am I so credulous, or uncharitable towards any, as to receive whatever an Adversary reports; for if the liquor be never so precious and pure, yet if it come out of a rusty and tainted vessel, it will taste of the Cask. I see none of you so candid, but in some things you wrong the Author in perverting his words or meaning, even when it is printed, and obvious to every eye.

But here you let all see that you cannot outwangle the truth; for at last you chide yourself to agree, and yield to it; for you say, I grant God worketh the condition. Then how is it man's condition? Or how can it be said to lie on him? Truth is, say you, it's an improper condition, for the whole bargain is pure Grace. Thus you are brought to grant all, and no thank to you, for you would fain have it a condition still. An improper one must serve rather than none. God indeed worketh orderly one thing after another; the former, as is said,

we may call a State-condition, but not otherwise properly and without danger.

But ere you cease, you tell us again of Libertinism, &c. Well, receive the love of the truth, and here shake hands, and cast your stones against abusers of Free-grace, if your side be not guilty of the like, or worse. You have a watchful eye to look into our ways; if in love to us, we thank you. It might occasion us at least {if we had any unfeigned desire, that the good and fair way of the Lord might not be evil spoken of} to walk more circumspectly; but if the word of Grace leaven not the heart, it will abide graceless. And I rest persuaded, that if it had not been either the licentious or loose life of some, who are noted; or because such as had been formerly wicked and profane, did flock after Dr. Crisp, and attend to his Ministry, as they did, in Luke 15:1,2, and that it was more glorious and effectual than others; else that you and your fellows would never have used tongue or pen against this way. My reason is, because it is so clear and undeniable, that having searched and sifted it with all diligence, there is found no solid and material cause of exception against it; but all is resolved into envy and prejudice.

As for that question of justification before faith or after, I have spoken to it in answer to Mr. Burgess. It is true, God in his Gospel dispensation only pronounces the sentence of absolution to the believer; for he deals therein with men of actual understanding; and the main end is to quiet and comfort the conscience; for which purpose faith is mainly useful, as to give glory unto God. But you grant, that the Covenant is with Christ, and all his Heirs and kindred in him; he being a public person in whom all were acquitted; and that is sufficient.

Exception #6: Mr. Rutherford: Can we, saith Mr. Towne, separate the directing or commanding power of the Law from the condemning power? Is it a Law, and

hath no power to condemn? Answer: Actual condemnation may be separated; as a lion is a lion, though chained, that he cannot actually devour; it could not condemn Adam, before sin, &c. Christ hath removed the curse.

Reply. 6. The question is, whether the lion be a devouring beast? And you answer that he cannot actually devour, because he is chained; but doth chaining change his devouring nature? And so hath not the Law a condemning power still, though it condemn not actually always? You see power to do it, is not taken from it. That it did not condemn Adam in innocency, hath no more sinew of Argument in it, than that the Law of the Land hath no power to condemn murder, because there is no actual murderer. It hath power to do it, but it is to exercise and put forth its power in a way of justice, that is, when the sin is actually committed. You say, {but they are vain words, without light or weight} that to condemn is accidental to a Law. I reply, as truly and in the like sense, that to command and direct be as accidental; {so the whole of the Law, in all its parts and offices, shall be accidental;} for the Law doth not actually rule and govern Lawless rebels; may not I then as solidly inferred, it hath no authority nor power to do it? Yea, in Hell among the damned, as in our prisons, there is Law only actually condemning and tormenting, but not ruling and directing in its way of holiness. Lastly, you should prove that Christ hath removed the curse from the Law; he hath redeemed his from under it, but left the Law with all the power it had. But you speak what Mr. Burgess objected also. If need be, see more in Answer to his book. I muse, that men of wisdom and parts, will so fight and contend against so manifest truths. You grant the believer sinneth daily, and that every sin, yea the least omission, is Hell by the Law; and thus he is daily brought under reverence of Divine

justice; now how can that be, and yet no condemnation or curse left in the Law? Hell is but a fiction or a painted fire; the man need not fear it, though he sin, nor he need no Faith, nor Christ to preserve and secure him. Thus one of your Tenets cuts the nerves of another.

Exception #7: Mr. Rutherford: They object, that holiness and good works be not the way to salvation. Answer: There be three things, 1. The will of God to save. 2. Justice or Law-right to salvation. 3. Actual salvation, now touching this last, holiness is the way to it.

Reply. 7. The way by which we can only go and enter into Heaven, is that New and Living way dedicated by blood, Heb.10:20,21, in which way the soul can only walk and continue by believing. Hence it is said, that through faith they inherit the promises, Heb.6:12, he that walketh in Christ is holy, and walketh holily; but he walketh not in Christ by his holy life. As ye have received Christ, so walk in him, Col.2:6, in walking or living holily, we as it were move in another sphere; by faith we live and walk in Christ, and in the way of peace and life, which is by his righteousness; by love we walk the legal way of our own active righteousness, saith Luther. Doth not the Scripture call us to come to Christ, to be found in him to abide, walk, and continue in him? All which can only be effected by faith. In this way the soul meeteth with the most and strongest temptations and oppositions, which it resisteth and overcometh by faith alone. I Pet.5:8,9, I Jn.5:4. You tell us what the faith of Libertines is; it may be you know it, and what your own is to you; but if you censure and asperse them for Libertines who are not so, whose condemnation is that? Be not so rash in judging; they stand and fall to Christ, not to you. Rom.14:4. And if your faith, which should elevate and carry up the soul unto Christ, and the way of free justification by his grace, for continual

peace, favor, acceptance, and everlasting salvation, do yet let you seek, and labor to receive all in the way of your own works and obedience, it may well then be questioned. Gal.2:19,20,21. Further, your expression is not home, but falleth short, when you say, that Christ only giveth a right to salvation. Christ and salvation cannot be parted; you would place Christ in the beginning, salvation in the end, and your good works maketh the way, and leadeth and guideth from Christ to salvation; this is your divinity. But eternal life is in Christ, he that hath Christ, hath life. I Jn.5:11,12. You may as well say, a believer hath not Christ, but only hath a right to him, now Christ dwelleth in the heart by faith, and his Kingdom is in you, which is in righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost. Rom.14:17. I am sure if you find and walk in a holy and clean way, it is by faith, or rather the blood of sprinkling cleanseth and maketh your way undefiled before God, and no perfect obedience of yours. But spiritual things are spiritually discerned.

Exception #8. Mr. Rutherford: In answer to the fifth object; the principle of Love and Law are not contrary.

Reply. 8. To work from a Law-principle is to work as a servant for hire, do and live, but love is free, and seeketh not her own. I Cor.13:5. You add, that the Law directing is not abolished by Grace, or by Love. True, no more is the Law condemning, for anything you have yet, or can show. We must still bear your indignities cast on us in your way, but know full well that all your logic cannot number us amongst your old Libertines. You delight yourself in your witty expressions; if you understand them, it is well.

Exception #9. Of the Law converting the soul.

Reply. 9. In this you are one with Mr. Burgess also. Read your answer there, and study a second reply

with him. A legal reformation is no Gospel-conversion, nor Christian sanctification. Unto your second objection, I say, I leave it to the Author, because he is living, and able also to satisfy you.

Exception #10. Exception against Dr. Crisp. Mr. Rutherford - Dr. Crisp objects, Christ putteth forth a general proclamation to all. Answer. It is true, the Gospel excepts no man from pardon, but the promise of the Gospel is not simply universal, as if God intended all and every should be actually redeemed and saved. 2. It is most untrue that Christ belongeth to sinners, as sinners; for then Christ should belong to all unbelievers, how obstinate soever. Nay, Christ belongs only to sinners elected to glory; and to believing sinners, as believing, in regard of actual union. 3. It is false that sinners, as sinners, receive Christ; so should Judas receive him. Only believers receive him. 4. It is false that sinners, as sinners, believe in Christ. This way of Libertines, is a broad way for sorcerers, thieves, &c., remaining in that damnable state, to believe, whereas sinners as thus qualified are to believe, that is, humbled, wearied self-condemned only.

Reply. 10. You know that Dr. Crisp speaks only of the Gospel proclamation which is to every creature, Mk.16:15, and not of God's intention, which he grants is only to gather and save the elect. Also you said a little before, that the obligation of believing lieth on all, yea though they be damned; so then the Gospel is to be preached indiscriminate unto all, for the obedience of faith. Rom.16:26. And so you here again pervert and restrain his meaning; for he speaks of the free declaration of Christ unto all, and you say he is intended only to sinners elected to glory. This argues a mind disposed to cavil, and to let nothing pass without a carp, how pure soever. Christ in the dispensation is to be preached and made known to unbelievers that they may

become believers. Gospel findeth not men believers; it is well if it leave them so. Faith cometh by hearing, and after faith comes actual union. If sinners as sinners do believe, then as sinners they receive Christ. For what is it to believe, but to receive Christ? John 1:12. Your expression is, Christ belongs to believing sinners. If sinners be wearied and self-condemned, are they not sinners still? Because they are sensibly so, are they less so? Or not formally sinners? Prove that further. And though all be not so prepared or qualified, yet it's plain by your own confession before, that they are bound to believe, for the obligation lieth on them.

In proclaiming Christ freely to thieves, &c., whoso upon that ground receiveth him, in so doing doth confess himself a thief; and if he were not self-convicted and condemned, he would never believe, or receive Christ, for the end of the action is it, that putteth him upon the action; he believeth in Christ, or receiveth him, that he may be saved; therefore he seeth he is lost, and cannot otherwise be saved. This is clear. But that expression is most strange, when you say, that sinners remaining in that damnable state do believe. For, can they possibly be out of that damnable state before they believe; or any other way, but by faith in Christ? Again, if they believe in Christ, can you imagine that they shall remain in that same state as before? What a false mist is this, or vile dust that you cast before the eyes of people! But you are in the net, and your end is perceived. But what preparations would you desire more, than that God should give a heart to such sinners to come to Christ? A heart sensible of sin, apprehensive of danger, desirous to be in a secure condition, and that is resolved that peace and safety is only in Christ, and by Christ? Else the soul cometh not to Christ; and if it come not to him, it hath no encouragement by Dr. Crisp's Ministry. Do not condemn the innocent. You often

speaking of a lazy dead faith. If yours were truly operative, we should find you more in the way of truth and charity. Faith worketh by love. Gal.5:6.

I conclude by commending to your second thoughts your own words, page 128, though thou were upon the borders of hell, yet the Gospel, though it except thee from all actual mercy, yet not from the duty of believing, and coming to Christ. Those that sin against the Holy Ghost are condemned for unbelief. Be reconciled first to yourself, and so to the Doctor.

Exception #11. Exception against Mr. Towne. "Mr. Towne saith that all our obedience, as it is the work of the Spirit, is passive."

Reply. 11. Here I observe a twofold failing. 1. In that the occasion of these words, and unto which they relate, is concealed. Dr. Taylor said, "God looketh not on their obedience as theirs, but as it is his own work in them." Now then I grant it in a sort to be his own work; but so it is passive to us; and so it must be, unless you put no difference between what the Spirit worketh in and upon us, and what we work by the same Spirit; for here we act. And your dealing is not fair, in that you leave out the words in them; for so Mr. Taylor saith, what the Spirit worketh is passive to them. But, see how you pervert this, and so infer as you please, that now it is sacrilege for us to be holy, and to add any of our active holiness to Christ's active obedience. Reply: The former clause arises not from my premises, as you cannot but see; unless this be the meaning, to make ourselves holy; which is God's work alone, not ours at all. And if you will add our active holiness to Christ's, it is no other than sacrilege, {though Mr. Taylor hath no such words,} for you steal and take from Christ, what you put to your own obedience.

Exception #12. Antinomians cry down duties. This is not the way of grace.

Reply. 12. You take it to be your duty and part unjustly to charge your brethren. Duties are to be cried and chased out of the way of Free-grace, if you rightly conceive and take it, as Eph.2:8, 9, Tit.3:5, Rom.11:6, but they are not to be denied in practice and conversation.

Exception #13. Often that which troubleth is subtle and invisible pride; he will not believe for want of self-worthiness; as, I dare not rest on Christ, nor apply promises because of my sinful unworthiness. I am not good enough for Christ. Then you add, right and saving humiliation conjoined with faith, &c.

Reply. 13. First you principle your hearers by your doctrine for such temptations and thoughts, telling them that sinners as sinners have nothing to do with Christ, for they must be better qualified, bring saving humiliation, repentance, and faith; and now you chide and reprove them for such conceits of their wants and unworthiness, as to be thereby hindered and deterred for coming to Christ. This is your inconstancy; and if now you apprehend this to be the ordinary and usual temptation of a troubled and dejected sinner, desirous of Christ, and would clear it, that self-unworthiness is no bar; why are you so invective against Dr. Crisp? Oh consider, and be better advised. But it is improper, and unscriptural-like, to call humiliation saving, as also inconsistent with self-unworthiness.

Exception #14. Dr. Crisp saith that we cannot gather assurance of a spiritual state from holy walking; whereas holy walking is performed by that efficacious grace promised in the Covenant as an argument on which we may build our peace, as a grace threaded upon the free promise.

Reply. 14. He that believeth is only in a safe and sure state. "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall

not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.” Jn.3:36. The question will be, whether the holy walking be performed by that efficacious grace of the Covenant. You must know it as an effect of such a cause; for all walking in a Legal way, will not argue it; as we see in Paul while a Pharisee. Phil.3:8. First the soul must be in the Covenant of Grace, and be certain of that, else it cannot say, this is the performance of the promise; nor, that holiness of mine is threaded upon the promise. A servant may be obedient, as well as a child; but that will neither make nor prove him free in Christ by adoption. It was not Abel’s sacrifice that did witness his faith, {for Cain sacrificed also,} but his faith proved his offering to be good and acceptable. Heb.11:4. Any experienced man should say, that there is no more light of evidencing a good estate, nor more certain ground of peace and comfort in a true faith, then is in holy walking and sincerity; or should oppose Dr. Crisp, seeing his doctrine is not only true, but so very necessary; especially considering how some of you grant, that many do seek and gather all their peace and comfort in a mere Legal way, and by their reformation and performances; in whom the Law never wrought to death and condemnation, that all their life and hope might be the faith of Christ their righteousness. He that was sensibly dead, knoweth how he was quickened and restored to life, and he that knoweth in himself what death and life is. See more in answer to Mr. Burgess, if need require.

Exception #15. Mr. Eaton brings divers Reasons to prove that we are not both righteous in the sight of God, and yet sinners in ourselves.

Reply. 15. What an open wrong is this by you, who pretend and plead for Law! Do you not care to offend? Mr. Eaton’s words are, that Proposition, that we are both righteous and sinners also in the sight of God

falls flat to the ground. But he denieth us not to be sinners in our selves, or that sin remaineth and dwelleth still in us, and that to our sense and feeling. How often doth he repeat that? And your own words immediately going before, do sufficiently clear and acquit him. But {saith Mr. Eaton} those imperfections of our sanctification are left in us to our sense and feeling, that they may be healed in our justification. Is not this then a palpable and unjust charge? And hence followeth your damnable joining hands between Antinomians and the Council of Trent in this. And thus having condemned the innocent, in your next Sermon you needlessly undertake to prove, that Justification is not an abolition of sin in its physical indwelling; as if that were any opinion of your adversaries. In chapter 5, {pg.96,} of the Honeycombe, you may read to your conviction and shame. "Thus it is plain, that although God knows the sin that dwells in his sanctified children, yet he seeth them abolished out of his own sight." Is not here a clear confession of the indwelling of sin? But I prosecute no further; though you, having by this violence got out of the way, do hasten and go far.

Exception #16. Dr. Crisp teacheth, that not only the guilt of sin but sin itself really and inherently was laid upon Christ. Again, {pg.179,} I judge it blasphemy {saith Mr. Rutherford} to say that Christ became sin, when our sins were laid on him, as really and truly the person that did all those sins, as those persons that did commit them really. And again, {pg.142,} it must be a lie, &c., to make Christ intrinsically the sinner, the murderer, &c.

Reply. 16. This accusation is as false and unjust as the former. I muse you blush not nor conscience did not make the hand to tremble when you used it in this horrid charge. There are no such words as, that sin was inherently laid on Christ; or, that Christ was the person

that really and truly did all these sins, or was intrinsically the sinner. The most, and which cometh nearest to these blasphemies, is where he saith, that Christ was really and truly the person that had all these sins, when they were laid on him; but not that he was the person that did them, as you say; the Lord charge you not with it. And as he urgeth rightly, where doth Scripture say, that the guilt of sin, and not sin itself, was laid on him? You grant as much {if you understand yourself} as he asserted, viz., that as Surety, he was really and truly the debtor, or sinner; not the formal subject of sin, in whom the blot of it was intrinsically or really inherent; you can gather or infer no such thing. You add, it was by imputation. True; but that speaks to the manner how he was a sinner, and not to the reality and truth of it; for he was truly the sinner, or debtor, in regard of his office or condition, or Law-place, as you call it. So then he was to answer justice. And, hereupon became he obnoxious to make satisfaction by suffering. So that the Doctor reasoned firmly. If he had not been first found to be the sinner in law, or debtor, not actively, that ever he committed any evil, {such blasphemy he denieth and abhorred,} but passively, he being made the debtor who must pay; God having laid the iniquities of his people upon him; and those first laid on him, otherwise he had not suffered and satisfied for them. You cannot find any blasphemy, save what you made yourself, by exchanging and putting in your own words; and who then standeth guilty of it? If any understanding and indifferent mind, free from malice and prejudice, had heard or read him, he would never have so perverted and mis-interpreted, as you have done.

But Luther's words, if you yet do think him Orthodox, may be fully satisfactory, on Gal.3:13, Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being

made a curse for us; for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree. Jerome and his present-day followers rack their miserable brains over this comforting passage in an effort to save Christ from the fancied insult of being called a curse. They say, "this quotation from Moses does not apply to Christ." How, our opponents ask, can this passage be applied to the holy Christ as if he were accursed of God and worthy to be put to death? This piece of exegesis may impress the naive as a zealous attempt to defend the honor and glory of Christ. Let us see what Paul has in mind. Paul does not say that Christ was made a curse for Himself. The accent is on the two words "for us." Christ is personally innocent. Personally, he did not deserve to be hanged for any crime of his own doing; but because Christ took the place of others who were sinners, he was hanged like any other transgressor. The Law of Moses leaves no loopholes. It says that a transgressor should be hanged. Who are the other sinners? We are. The sentence of death and everlasting damnation had long been pronounced over us. But Christ took all our sins and died for them on the Cross. He was numbered with the transgressors; and he bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors. Is.53:12. All the prophets of old said that Christ should be the greatest transgressor, murderer, adulterer, thief, blasphemer that ever was or ever could be on earth. When he took the sins of the world upon Himself, Christ was no longer an innocent person. He was a sinner burdened with the sins of a Paul who was a blasphemer; burdened with the sins of a Peter who denied Christ; burdened with the sins of a David who committed adultery and murder, and gave the heathen occasion to laugh at the Lord. - In short, Christ was charged guilty. The curse struck Him. The Law found him among sinners. He was not only in the company of sinners. He

had gone so far as to invest Himself with the flesh and blood of sinners. So the Law judged and hanged Him for a sinner. In separating Christ from us sinners and holding him up as a holy exemplar, errorists rob us of our best comfort. I am told that it is preposterous and wicked to call the Son of God a cursed sinner. I answer, if you deny that Christ is a condemned sinner, you are forced to deny that Christ died. John the Baptist called Christ the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world. Whatever sins I, you, all of us have committed or shall commit, they are Christ's sins as if he had committed them himself. Our sins have to be Christ's sins or we shall perish forever. When we hear that Christ was made a curse for us, let us believe it with joy and assurance. By faith Christ changes places with us. He gets our sins, we get His righteousness."

You may read much more to like purpose; but this may let you see your partiality and error. If you can understand and construe the one Doctor aright, why not the other also? Except your mind be sinister, or otherwise disposed. And now, if you have any conscience towards God, or love to the Truth and your Brethren, so much injured by you, you will clear them publically, and accuse yourself. By this I could easily untwist and annul what you have said against us.

Exception #17. In all this you shall find grace turned into wantonness; for in all his Sermons is much to depress and cry down holiness, and walking with God.

Reply. 17. Doctor Crisp was raised up, and fitted especially to be a son of consolation in these sad times. Yet I knew him not. But I perceive this to be your fundamental error; for from the want of knowledge of the true nature and efficacy of this doctrine of Free-grace, have you raised all slanders. Christian liberty is carnal licentiousness, to a Legal eye, a loveless apprehension, and a faithless heart. Such spirits as are

not principled for it, cannot skill of it; and misconceit breeds misreports; and too much credulity is an easy inlet for the worst you can say, into such a mind as receives not the love of the truth. Grace is by him turned into wantonness &c., and thus you bely him; and they that are not of the light, believe you; and hence is the overflowing of your gall, which hath so filled the veins and passages of your book with bitter invectives and falsehoods. If you had produced one clause rightly interpreted, crying down true holiness in its due place, and for its proper ends, you might have had credit. Yet true Evangelical sanctification will discover the vanity and unsoundness of Legal reformation. It is not all one, to serve in the oldness of the Letter, and in the newness of the Spirit. Also, Christ our righteousness is the bond of union with God, by faith in whom we abide in God, and walk with him. We cannot deal immediately with God in our own holiness.

Lastly, you think we are out of love with sin only for fear of an ill turn, and do not hate it as sin; as if the love of God and the love of sin could lodge in one soul; or the Spirit received by the hearing of faith, did not work and cause an antipathy and contrariety against sinfulness; or that the chain of the Covenant of grace could be broken and one link or branch sundered from another. If you so mistake your Patients, we will not have your for our Physician.

FINIS