





special  
collections  
DOUGLAS  
Library



QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY  
AT KINGSTON

KINGSTON ONTARIO CANADA











# FREE THOUGHTS

Upon these HEADS.

Of { *Predestination,  
Redemption,  
The Salvability of  
the Heathen,  
The Judaical Co-  
venant,  
Justification,  
The Judge of Faith  
and the Scripture,  
Venial Sin,*

{ *Liturgical and Con-  
ceived Prayer,  
DEMONSTRATIVE  
Preaching,  
The Authority of  
the Laws of Men,  
The Power of the  
Magistrate about  
Religion,  
Subjection to our  
present Queen.*

---

By JOHN HUMFREY, Born in Jan. 1620. and Aged  
now past 89 Years.

---

Not intending a Common Place upon any of them,  
but to say something only to supply what is  
wanting to be said ; or, if said already by him,  
to cultivate it, and save all other new Editions.

---

London ; Printed for T. Parkhurst at the 3 Crowns in Cheapside, and  
Jonathan Robinson at the Golden-Lion in St. Paul's Church-yard ;  
and sold by J. Morphew near Stationers-hall. 1710. Price 1 s.



100



A Testimony to Mr. *Humfrey's* former Writings, by two of  
his Brethren, Ministers, while living.

To Mr. *J. H.*

**I** Think by studying of the Scriptures, and things more than others have  
said before you, you escape the Temptations to Siding and Partiality:  
And I think you hit on many considerable Truths which many overlook, and  
improve many which some do lightly pass over.

*Richard Baxter.*

I am of the same Mind,

*Tho. Manton, D.D.*

To a Book of Mr. *Humfrey's*, entitul'd, *De Justificatione*, printed  
but lately, An. 1706: there is this Testimony.

We have carefully read over that Treatise of Mr. *Humfrey*, and do judge  
that he hath truly and rightly stated the Controversy, and so well consider'd  
the Argument, as will be of good Use to the intelligent Reader.

Simon Ely,  
John Chichester.

To a former Book of the same Subject, entitled, *The Righteousness of  
God revealed in the Gospel*, printed in the Year 1697. the same Bishop  
of Ely, Dr. Patrick, has an Epistle to the Book; and Dr. *Stillingfleet*,  
Bishop of Worcester, a Letter to Mr. *Humfrey*, of Consent to it;  
and Dr. *Stratford*, Bishop of Chester, another to him, which has these  
Words in it.

Mr. H. I have received piece-meal all your Book, and read it over  
with Profit and Pleasure. The great Doctrine of Justification is by you sta-  
ted more agreeable to the Scriptures than I have met with in any other Au-  
thor.

To



# To the READER.

THE Title of this Book was left to be printed till the last, with a spare Leaf to it, for an Epistle of a Friend to commend the Book; but it is judg'd modester and better, upon Advice, to fill it up thus as it is on the other side, and to have no Epistle, no Encomium, no other Character of Mr. Humfrey, or Letters of Recommendation, but those from the Dead.

T. P.

J. R.

---

## ERRATA.

Page 20. Line 30. *Unwilling*, should be, *Willing*; p. 11. l. 31. *Of it*, should be, *Of his Meaning*: p. 9. l. 16. *By the by*, should be, *by and by*: p. 11. l. 28. the Interrogation-Point should be a Colon: p. 14. l. 32. the Parenthesis should be at *Lady*, and at *belong* a Colon: p. 33. l. 16. *To be in se*, should be, *to be his in se*: p. 37. l. 1. *Acceptation*, should be, *by Acceptation*. Mend the two first Faults, and the rest may pass.



# O F

# Predestination.

**P**REDESTINATION I will understand to be God's Counsel within himself, about choosing or refusing the particular Persons he will bring to Salvation : And the first Thing may be ask'd, is, What is the Object of it ? This Object is the Mass of Mankind, as it contains the Elect and Reprobate, for out of it God chooses some, and leaves others. I am tender of saying more. I own a Decree of God to give Grace to the Elect, but no Decree to deny it to others : For I distinguish between a *not decreeing*, and a *decreeing not*. To require of any to believe and repent, and decree not to give them that Grace to do it, without which it cannot be done, is too hard for me to say or think. But to say, there is a *not decreeing*, or *no decreeing* as to such, because not to believe, and not to repent is nothing, and there needs no Decree for that which is nothing, is soft, fit to say, to think, to believe. Now because Election is said to be *before the Foundation of the World*, there are some, and great Divines, will have the Object to be Man consider'd before his Creation, and these were called *Supralapsarians*. But the most do make Man, *Fallen*, the Object : And as to these call'd *Sublapsarians*, when they go so far as to the Fall, I ask, and why not Mankind *Redeemed* also ? I will give my Reason for it, and it is this, because Redemption is not any of the Links that are in the Chain of Predestination. It is not said ; *Whom he predestinated, them he created* ; and therefore is Creation presupposed to Election ; it is not neither said, *Whom he predestinated, them he redeemed* ; and therefore is Redemption to be presupposed



posed before Election also. *He hath chosen us in him*, saith the Text; and how can that be, I may ask, but upon this Presupposal? The Calvinists say (not all, and not I) that Redemption is only of the Elect. - But the Scripture says not so, for then it would say, *whom he predestinated, them he redeemed*; but it says it not. Election is but of some, but Creation and Redemption of all the World. And as it is so, what does hinder but we may make Man created, fallen, and redeemed, the Mass, Lump, or Clay, out of which the Potter does choose his Vessels of Honour or Dishonour as he pleases. Not that God decrees Man's Sin, or that his Decree makes them sin, however the Metaphor be understood.

But forasmuch as I see not any great Matter depending on it, I think it indifferent as to me, whether we make Man *fallen* the Object of Predestination, or Man consider'd in the Mind of God before the *Foundation of the World*, and so long as we may speak of it after our human manner, as we can, seeing God's speaking so of himself in Scripture does warrant it, I will speak accordingly the best to his Honour I am able, in our *Analogical Conceptions* of him.

Let us suppose, speaking with Reverence, *secundum nostrum concipiendi modum*, that God intending to make the World, which consists of Animate and Inanimate Creatures, he determines among the Animate to make a Man, a middle Creature between Brutes and Angels, endued with Understanding and Will. With *Understanding*, to reflect on himself and his Maker, and consequently, from what is agreeable to his own Nature and God's, to know his Duty according to the Law of Nature; and with *Will* to choose or refuse the doing it at his Liberty. Let us suppose this first as part of God's Decree or Determination concerning Man, for we must conceive of God's Decree, (when it is but one single Act altogether in him, that is, his Will, or Himself willing these things) in several Parts, as we can.

To proceed then, God's determining to make such a Creature, that he may be happy if he will, in obeying the Law of his Nature, or destroy himself by Disobedience, he does then consider (reverently still speaking) which is best for Man and his own Glory, that the Felicity of this Creature be obtain'd in way of *Merit*, or in a way of *Grace*. There are two ways which the Scriptures (St. Paul especially) holds forth whereby that Men may be saved, the way of Works, and the way of Grace; that is, by the Terms of the Law, or Terms of the Gospel. And it is this God chooses, for in the one his



his *Righteousness* only would be shewn ; but in the other his *Mercy* also ; and the Mystery of our Redemption and Salvation by Christ depends upon it. But we are to know, the way of *Works* originally should have been by Mans performing of the Law of his Creation, or Law of Innocency, which if he had kept, his Reward would have been of *Debt*. But the way of *Grace* now is, since the Fall (through the Redemption of the World by Christ from that Law, as the Rule of Judgment, to a new and remedying one) by Faith and Repentance only, which is accepted to Salvation through Christ's Merits, and so rewarded of *Grace*. And here then is a second Part of God's Decree, to wit, the determining that Man's Salvation shall be in a way of *Grace*, and not of *Works*. *It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth Mercy.*

Upon the Supposition now of these two preceding Parts of God's Decree or Determination concerning us, two things are to be conceived. The one is, that the Permission of the Fall, and our Redemption by Christ, must necessarily antecede (in the Nature of the thing) the determining particular Persons to be saved ; upon which account the *Lutherans* do so grievously fall out with the *Calvinists*, because they affirm the Decree of Election to be made without respect to our Faith, or the Merit of Christ, when the Scripture says expressly, *God hath chosen us in him*. The other is, that Man being redeemed, and brought under a new Law, according to which he must be judged, it is necessary that he have Power to perform the Condition of that Law, as *Adam* had to perform the Law of Works, which seeing none can without God's Grace, we are to conceive here, that this Grace is purchased by Christ for all the World, whom he hath redeemed, or that it does flow from him as the true Light and Life, in regard to his Divinity, to every Man *coming into it*, enabling him to live up to the Terms of this remedying Law, if he do but cooperate with this Grace, and reject it not. And here then is a third Part of God's Decree or Determination concerning us, that having determined Man to be a Creature endued with free Will, and yet to be saved only in the way of Grace, and not in the way of Works, there is no one but shall have so much Assistance from the Redeemer, that if he be not himself wanting to it, he be may saved, and reap the Benefit of his Redemption.

Whatsoever now does appear in the Execution of God's Decree, is to be apprehended to be in the Intention. It is plain in Scripture, that Man is created, falls, and we thereby become all Sinners, and



liable to Wrath ; that Christ came therefore to redeem us, to die for us, to make Satisfaction for us, and procure Pardon and Salvation upon Condition, which is the Terms of the Gospel ; that the Gospel therefore is to be preached to all the World, which some embrace, and are converted, and others not ; so that *many*, as Christ tells us, *are called, but few chosen*. By which Speech of his, it seems that Election, in the Execution of God's Decree, comes after Vocation, the Sinner's effectual Conversion being indeed actual Election : And though an Eternal Decree as to us does import Time *à parte ante* & *à parte post*, yet as to God there is no Time either past or to come. So that whatsoever is done by God, the time when it is done is to be look'd on, as it were, to that thing, the Beginning of Eternity, though it has none, but is one continual, everlasting, *standing Now*, and there can be with him no other but *actual Election*. Upon the Supposition then of the three Parts fore-spoken, of God's Determination concerning Man, it must be apprehended, that God, who is infinite in his Attributes, foreknowing those to whom he will give his Grace, whereby they are converted, believe, repent, and persevere ; for the last part of this Decree does determine all them unto Glory, and leave the rest to Condemnation.

Having thus compleated a Conception of God's Decree of Predestination, (craving Pardon for the human manner of expressing the same) I will pause a little on the Matter, for to make some Observations upon it.

For the first and second part of the Decree, there is nothing, I think, to be gainsay'd ; inso much as upon account of the second, I have been sometimes prone to think, that when the Apostle speaks of *Election of Grace*, and God's shewing Mercy on *whom he will*, he may be understood of an Election of *the Sort* of Persons, rather than of Particular Persons, that is, of such as seek to be saved in the way of Grace, and not such as seek it in the way of *Works*, or the *Law* ; for therefore he tells us it is that the *Jews* are rejected, who sought to establish their own Righteousness, and the *Gentiles* saved by receiving the Gospel. The Choice of *Isaac* and *Jacob* before *Ishmael* and *Esau*, as Children of the Promise, and Types of such as are so by Faith, confirms the same, they being personally named in regard to their Posterity, and what was to befall them in their future Generations. The Truth is, the Election and Reprobation of the 9th, 10th, and 11th to the *Romans*, seems (as already intimated) to be only God's choosing the Gentiles that believe in Christ, and seek Righteousness



ousness by *Faith* for his People, and rejecting the *Jews*, that trusting on the Righteousness of the *Law*, believ'd not in him ; which yet includes Election to be of Faith, and not of Works, as to both : When for the choosing one Jew to be of the *Remnant*, or one Christian, and not the other, to *Salvation*, it belongs not to Revelation, but to the secret Counsel of God ; though consequently that must and is to be understood. And yet I must honestly acknowledge my Remembrance, that *Augustine* (somewhere when I read him) speaking of that Text, *It is not of him that willeth or runneth*, gives it this Meaning, *It is not of him that he wills and runs ; he wills and runs, and must do so, but it is not of himself, or his own Strength, but of God's Mercy*. It is of his Electing Grace, that one is made a Vessel of Honour, and another of Dishonour.

For the third part of the Decree, I am resolute that the Doctrines of Universal Redemption and Grace sufficient (as to the Adult, *proximè* or *remote*, *immediate* or *mediate*, according to the Schools) for all to be saved, so far, that the Blame shall not lie upon God or Christ, but on Man's own self, if he be not saved, are to be maintained against the World. And yet I will, for the Scripture's sake, acknowledge, that when God will have all to be saved, so as they may, if they will, yet is there none that will, but such as are made willing of unwilling, by a farther Grace, which is special Grace, and the Grace of God's Elect ; for both these are consistent, and maintainable by God's Word.

For the fourth and last part of the Decree, there are some Distinctions to be made. Distinguish first between *Election* and the *Decree* of it. As we conceive of God after our human manner, we must distinguish between the Counsel or Determination of what he will do, and the Act or Acts in doing it, and consequently between his determining to whom he will chuse to give his Grace, and his actually choosing him in giving it. When the Scripture speaks of Election before the Foundation of the World, that may be understood of the Decree, tho' Election it self, which is *ex lapsis*, be the same, or at the same time with effectual Vocation, which is, *ex redemptis & Evangelizatis* also. There is the *Decree* of Election (I have but now conceived) and *Election* it self, as of *Redemption*, and Christ's actual redeeming us, whereof the one was from Eternity, yet the other in its due Season. When Christ says, *Many are called, but few chosen*, the Chosen (as before) seems to be taken out of the Called, and both first Evangeliz'd ; that is, to have had the Gospel preached to them



them before Called or Chosen. Election then is not only out of the Created, Fallen, Redeemed, in regard to all, but as to some, out of the Evangelized and Called also; Nay, farther, Auxiliated, so as out of two who have common Grace, as is sufficient for them to believe and repent if they will; the one is left to himself, and he wills not, the other is chose to that further Grace which is effectual, and he *wills* and *does*, and is saved, and not the other. Distinguish, Secondly, between God's decreeing to save a Person, and the adjudicating him to Salvation. He saves or adjudicates to Heaven none but such as believe and repent, and so live and die, but he elects whom he will at his Pleasure. Distinguish therefore, Thirdly, of Predestination as it is to *Grace*, or as it is to *Glory*, knowing well that he is, and must be predestinated to both, that is, predestinate to either. And for Predestination to Glory, it is certain, that as none are saved in the Execution, but such now mentioned, so is it, and must be in the Decree. God does foresee (speaking still in our human Manner) who will believe, repent, and persevere; and them, and no others, he decrees to Glory. But as for Predestination to Grace, (the first Grace) he foresees nothing more in one than another as the Cause or Occasion for the Choice, yet chooses the one, and leaves the other. When our Divines therefore dispute so warmly about Election, whether it be *Absolute* or *Conditional*; that is, whether it be of Works foreseen, as some say, or of Faith foreseen, as others, or of both foreseen, or that it is of neither foreseen, but of free Grace, which is supposed Orthodox. They both say what is true in diverse Senses. It is *absolute* in regard to Grace, it is *conditional* in regard to Glory, and they may all be pleased to bear with one another.

*An APPENDIX to this first Head.*

**T**HERE is nothing comes to pass without God's Knowledge, or against his Will; this is certain. There is therefore in God a Fore-Knowledge and Predestination of Things to come. When he made Man, he endued him with Understanding and Will, and that Will free, and not necessitated by him. When there is free Will then in Man, and Fore-Knowledge in God, with a Decree fore-ordaining all Things that come to pass, it must be ask'd, how they are to be reconciled? For Answer to which, this already said must be premised, that Knowledge and Will, or whatsoever is attributed



tributed to God, from Analogy of these Faculties in Man, as they are *eminenter* in the Divine Nature, they are one, even God himself: For whatsoever is in God, is God, and are incomprehensible as such to us. Not presuming then on our Conceptions, which are infinitely short, whatsoever they be, that we can have of them, we are nevertheless to believe, that whatsoever God determines to come to pass, must of Necessity do so. But if it be to be done by Man, who has this Free Will, that Necessity is *Necessitas Consequentiae*, not *Consequentis*, as the Schools speak; that is, a Logical Necessity; because it follows argumentatively, that if it be determined it must be, but not a Physical Necessity, that this Determination should Physically cause the Act so as to constrain Man's Will to it, but that it still hath a Power to do the contrary, though the Act will infallibly be done. For God does determine Things necessary to be done, necessarily; and Things contingent, contingently; so as no more is to be said but that the Fore-Knowledge or Decree of God, and Man's Liberty, that is, Free Grace and Free Will are to be reconciled in the Use; and it is not needful for us to enquire any further than so: That is, We are to set our selves to believe, to repent, and walk sincerely before God, in doing our Duty, as if we had full Power to do it, which we all have so far by Universal Grace, that we may if we will. But if we will, and do, and are effectually converted and saved, we are to attribute it yet to farther Grace, and give the Glory all to God. Thus must the *Arminian* and *Calvinist* be reconciled; the way is, for One and the same Divine to become *Both*; namely, when he hath been *Calvinistical* in his Doctrine, to be *Arminian* in his Use.



O F

# Redemption.

AS for this Head of Redemption, I am for a middle Way, as Mr. *Baxter* was, and Dr. *Davenant* in his Book *De morte Christi*, which Arch-bp. *Usher* approv'd, and was byas'd toward the Universality of it. For seeing the Scripture is so exprefs and full that Christ dy'd *for all*, that he tasted Death for *every* Man, that he was a Propitiation for the *Sins of the whole World*; and that so many more Texts might amply be quoted, there is some Sense wherein this Universality must be maintained, or the Scripture be forsaken.

The Death of Christ therefore may be considered as it hath purchased Remission and Salvation on Condition, and so it is for all, and acknowledged (as Mr. *Baxter* notes) by Dr. *Twiss*. But the strict *Calvinist* will have more, that it redounds to purchase the Condition also, and the Redeemed therefore are only the Elect. This Inference I dislike quite, and the Proposition, that Christ by his Death (whereby he hath made Satisfaction for our Sins) hath purchased the Condition also for any, I question.

For the Inference, If there was a double Redemption, one to purchase Pardon and Life on Condition, and another to purchase also the Condition, then would it be plain, that one was for all, and the other for the Elect only. But Redemption is but one, though that one may have a double Respect, and Dr. *Davenant* and Mr. *Baxter* no doubt thought not any otherwise: that is, a Respect to the whole World, or a Respect to the Elect. As it respects all the World, it does purchase Remission and Salvation on Condition; as it respects the Elect, it does farther (as they must hold) purchase for



for such the Condition also. Upon this account therefore with them it does not follow, that none are redeemed but the Elect, because that tho' in the one respect, as Christ by his Redemption hath purchased *also the Condition* (supposing it so) it was for the Elect : yet in another respect, as it hath purchased Pardon and Life *only on Condition*, it is for the World ; so that in these diverse Respects, all are redeemed, and also the Elect only. I will not wonder therefore at these two Eminent Men, Mr. *Daxter* and Bishop *Davenant*, that they affirm Redemption to be *Universal* and *Special* both, I thank them for their Pains, their great Pains, but in good earnest it is an Inconsistency I cannot fully, but half approve.

For as for the Proposition it self, that Christ hath by his Death purchased the Condition for the Elect (that is, the Grace which effects their Faith and Repentance, and sincere Obedience, which is the Condition that they may be effectually saved) I have an Objection against it, which you shall have by the by, that I think could not be answered, even by them. The strict *Calvinists* agree with these middle ones in the Proposition, and are peremptory, that if our Redemption be no more for the Elect than others, which is the purchasing Remission and Salvation on Condition, and not the Condition it self, then does our Salvation lie at Man's own Free Will ; so that tho' Christ hath redeemed all, there may not be any one saved for all that. An Allegation really inconsiderate, because Redemption is so distinguished from Election, that it is no Link in its Chain, and is to be so distinguished as either of them to have their Bounds. Redemption hath procured Pardon and Life upon Condition, and there is its Bounds ; and as for the Condition, there is no Obligation on Free Grace, but God may dispose it (he may give Faith) where he pleases, so as it lies upon Election, not on Man's Free Will therefore but on God's, for him to give it unto one and not another : and thus Election takes care that Redemption be not in vain.

To establish us the more, we are to consider, in this great Matter of Election and Salvation, that God is to be acknowledged as *Rector* and *Lord* both in it ; and consequently these Divines that hold the Death of Christ to be for all, in purchasing Pardon and Salvation on Condition, but that the Condition flows not from the Power of Man's Free Will, nor directly from Christ's Purchase, but from Election, do manifestly give God his Glory, while they make him as Lord, to give the Condition to his Elect ; and as Rector, to judge



of them as of all the World according to that Condition.

For my Objection now against the Proposition I am to offer, it is this, that instead of what they say against *Universal* Redemption, that it destroys Free Grace, I must tell them, that Redemption *Special* does indeed do it. For the Free Grace of Election we all know to lie in this, that out of the Mass of Mankind, who have no Merit one more than another, God does choose whom he will for no Cause but his own Free Pleasure. Now if Christ hath purchased the Condition for the Elect, then does God choose them from the rest upon Merit, the greatest Merit that can be, even Christ's Merit; and when the choosing the one that hath his Merit is the Reason of his Choice, and not the other because without it, this does destroy the Freeness of Election altogether. This Objection is the firmer, because the *Calvinists* do all contend about Election, that it has no respect to Christ's Merit and our Faith, but only as they are the Effect of it, that is, because God does elect, choose or determine some to be saved; therefore he sends his Son to procure by his Redemption their Salvation, and gives them Faith to that end: And why do they stand on this, that Christ's Merits must not be considered in Election, but because Election is free, and so free that there must be no Merit even from Christ to the Elect, as the Reason why he chooses one and not the other. I need not add as to them, that nothing without God, and done in time, as Christ's Death was, can be the Cause of his Eternal Will. His Will is himself, and God has no Cause:

The *Lutheran* here contends with the *Calvinist*, and stands upon that Text, *He hath chosen us in Christ*. The Preposition *ἐν* in Greek signifies *through*, and when it is join'd with Christ, *through*, is through his Merits. This appears (say they) in a former Verse of the same Chapter; He hath blessed us *with all Blessings*, *ἐν χριστῷ*, *in Christ*; and in a following Verse, *In him*, *ἐν αὐτῷ*, *we have Redemption*; now when these Words, *He hath chosen us in him*, is in the middle Verse between them, and they won't understand them as they must be understood, the *Lutheran* is offended as if the *Calvinist* would not acknowledge the Truth when convinced. He chooses us, says the *Calvinist*, that we may believe and be holy, not because we believe and are holy; and because he hath chosen us to Salvation, he hath sent his Son to redeem us (as before) as the means to procure Pardon and Life, and Faith for his Elect, that we may be saved: But the *Lutheran* says, God chooses the Believer, and that the Redemp-  
tion



tion of Christ is the Cause, the meritorious Cause of our Election, as well as of our Justification or Salvation. Here is extream Opposition: One says, Election is the Cause of Redemption; and the other says, Redemption is the Cause of Election; and who shall find out a middle-way, or any thing towards it, between them? I pray give me leave, and what if I shall say this, that tho' Christ by his Redemption hath purchased no more for any but Pardon and Life upon Condition, as it belongs to all; yet may we conceive that he hath thereby so pleased the Father, as to obtain that there shall be an Election, that he will give his Grace (the first Grace) to some, that his Sons Obedience and Sufferings shall have their Effect; but tho' he gives it, he will be free in the giving; he will give it to some, but to whom he pleases; he gives it, but without Obligation by that Redemption to give it to any one more than another. As we are all fallen in *Adam*, we are all redeemed by Christ, and all alike in the same Estate; no particular Man can say, Christ hath merited for him more than for others, that for his Merit he should be chosen, and have Grace given him, rather than the other, but all lies on Free Grace, or God's Free Will perfectly, and so Universal Redemption and Free Grace do both stand together.

For my speaking now farther of *Redemption*: Redemption is a metaphorical Word, and to speak of it according to the Law of the *Jews*, or the Law of the *Romans*, and supposing a Captivity or Slavery, to ask, what it is, who are the Captives, how they came to be so, whose Captives, what is the Price that redeems us, when and how, and to whom paid, and twenty such Questions may be ask'd, which any other may answer that will, it is not my Work? but if this Question in general be ask'd, what Redemption is, and the Apostle says it is Remission of Sins (*In whom we have Redemption, even Remission of Sins*) I will tell freely my Thoughts of it, not that it is, but that it hath obtained Remission; a Universal Conditional Remission, which will be best conceived by a Pardon at Law, an Act of Grace or Pardon by an Act of Parliament: Suppose the Nation in Rebellion, and under the Guilt of Treason, and the Prince to grant a General Pardon, an Act pass'd, and the whole Nation is pardon'd: The Gospel-Covenant is such an Act of Pardon for all the World; and if you object, then all the World must be saved, I answer, The Act must be read, we must see how it is drawn, and we find Conditions in it: All are pardoned indeed on Condi-



on, but the Conditions must be performed and pleaded for suing out the Act, and obtaining the Benefit of it.

There are none of us must question but the Gospel, together with Remission of Sin, brings a Law (the Covenant of Grace is a Pardon and Law) requiring Obedience in order to our Salvation. *He hath chosen us in Christ, that we should be holy: He hath redeemed us from Iniquity, that we should be a peculiar People, zealous of Good Works: We are his Workmanship, and created unto Good-works in (or through) Christ Jesus.* By these Texts it appears, that to make us holy, or that we should be holy, is the End (or one End) of Christ redeeming us, and yet did God create Man to this End, to be holy; he made us to serve him, and he put his Law in Man's Heart to obey it; and seeing Holiness was the End of his Creation, how can it be said the End of our Redemption? I know none have ask'd the Question, and I must take leave my self to answer, The Law of Creation was a Law of Innocency, requiring us to be so holy as to be without Sin; and when that was broke, and there was Sin committed, there could be no Righteousness according to that Law any more; and therefore was it necessary for Christ by his Coming not only to atone God in regard to the Sin, but to procure also another Law, and such as through Grace may be performed, that so a Righteousness (call'd by *Daniel* an *Everlasting Righteousness*) might be brought in (when else there could, I say, be none in the World) which together with Remission of Sin is required to Life everlasting.

And forasmuch as to the end that Men may repent, believe and be holy, Christ hath procured Remission and Salvation for all upon that Condition, which does encourage them to it, and is the Use they should make of it, and God would have all to repent, tho' none do but such as he chooseth to give his special Grace to them to do it: We are not to think that none are redeemed but they that do attain that End, no more than you may argue, that when the Scripture says that God will have all to come to Repentance, and the Acknowledgment of the Truth, that yet God indeed will have none to repent, but those that do it: For God does use the Means to all so far as is fit for him to bring them to it. And when the Fault lies on them, you must not lay it on him, as if he *willed it not*. In like manner hath Christ done all he was to do, that Men should repent, believe, and be holy, in procuring this Encouragement, so as for his part he may be said to have redeemed them from their Iniquity (and when all are so redeemed, those that become godly are  
more



more peculiarly so) but all do not take the Encouragement to do it, and so the Fault does lie on themselves, and not on him, nor on God neither, that he does not give them all more Grace, because he acts herein as *Dominus absolutus* in regard to particular Persons, in choosing freely whom he pleases, without any Merit in themselves, or procured by Christ, for any one more than another, to give them his special Grace for their effectual Salvation, when he gives but his common Grace to others that effects it not.

Against Universal Grace by Christ you may say, One Man has such a Blessing, and not another, and Christ hath procured it. I answer, Christ hath procured all Blessings (especially spiritual ones) both for him and for others, on the Condition which is required to the obtaining them; and the one has them and not the other, because he performs the Condition, and not the other. Life (Life eternal) is a Blessing, and procured or purchased by Christ for all on Condition, for whosoever believes and repents shall live. The Elect now perform this Condition and have Life, the Reprobate does not and perishes. Life here is the Blessing, and procured or purchased by Christ; but the Condition is not purchased or procured (as before) Or if procured, procured only to be given, and that by Free Grace to whom God will, but not procured to be given to this Man and not that, or more to one than another. I may yet be more easy, and distinguish between what Christ hath *purchased* for Mankind, by his dying for us, and what he *gives* in executing his Father's Will and Free Pleasure. It is reasonable that Christ taking on him our Flesh, the Flesh of all, and dying for all, to hold that what he hath purchased with the Price of his Blood is for all, and all alike; tho' what he does in Execution of his Father's Will, which is free, be bestowed on one rather than another. And consequently, that what he asks his Father, be such as he may ask for *Peter*, which he asks not for *John*, and for his own Disciples, what he prays not for others. *I pray not for the World*, says Christ, he prays not for all; yet, that he died for the World, and for all, is express in Scripture. I speak it mainly in regard to Salvation for Sinners, and Redemption to be for all, though Faith, Repentance, and the Grace for Application be given by Christ to some only, not as Purchaser, but Executor of his Father's Election.



*An APPENDIX to this Second Head:*

**I**F Redemption be Universal, according to the Scripture, it is but reasonable to believe the Grace of God, which is given for the Application of it, to be Universal also: and I will not question therefore but as to those that have the Gospel (saying nothing to the contrary neither as to others) that God does vouchsafe so much Grace to the Adult, that they may believe, repent, and be saved, if they will; and when they may if they will, who can deny that Grace to be so much as may be said *necessary*, and *sufficient*? And yet if they will, I acknowledge it to be of farther Grace, which we call *special*, or the Grace of God's Elect. This Doctrine appears by these Scriptures. God will have all to repent and be saved, *2 Pet. 3. 9.* He would, but Man will not, *Mat. 23. 37.* Whosoever will may come, *Rev. 22. 17.* And yet none do come unless the Father draws him, *John 6. 44.* The Command, *Work out your Salvation*, includes that all have *Power*, and yet is it God that must work in us to *will and to do*, or the Work will never be done, *Phil. 2. 13.* By these Scriptures and the like we may see how Truths of Scripture are mystical, deep, and to be sounded by Faith; for if I followed only my Reason, I confess I should be apt to think otherwise, that seeing the Grace which is Universal reaches thus far, that Man may, *if he will*, it seems enough to leave there; for if he will not (when he hath so much Grace that he may if he will) God is just to condemn him; and if he will, he must attribute it to this Grace, which is Universal, as that without which he could not have willed, and with it he does both *will and do*, and is saved.

In the Council of *Trent*, Father *Paul* in his History of it, does tell us of an Opinion broached by *Ambrosias Catharinus*, to this Effect, (whose Book I have seen) that there are some singular Persons, as *Paul*, the Disciples, and the like, that God does take an extraordinary Care of, so as it is impossible for them to fail of Salvation, *Mat. 24. 24.* and these only are the *Elect* (as *John* writes to the *Elect Lady*, unto whom this Grace which is special doth belong) but as for the Generality of Mankind, or Christians, they have the Gospel and the Grace of God, which is universal, and according to their Improvement thereof, some there be that are, and others that are not converted by it, and saved.



Unto this Opinion, without mentioning that Author, there is an excellent Person, Dr. *Henry More*, who gives his Suffrage, in these Words ; “ I do profess I do verily think, that there is such a thing  
 “ as discriminating Grace (as they call it) in the World ; and  
 “ that to such a Difference for Good, that some few of Mankind by  
 “ virtue thereof will be irresistibly saved ; but that the rest of the  
 “ World are Probationers, that is, have Free Will, and are in a  
 “ Capacity of being saved, some greater, some less, and that who-  
 “ soever is damn’d, it is long of himself. For as *Syracides* saith,  
 “ God hath no need of the wicked Man. Dr. *More’s Mystery of Godliness*, p. 502.

We take it for granted, that the whole World is divided into the *Elect* and *Reprobate*, and that no Reprobate, and none but the *Elect*, can be saved : But may not it be a Question ask’d, where either of these are expressly said in Scripture ? *Examine your selves, prove your own selves, know you not Christ is in you, unless ye be Reprobates ?* May not a Man examine himself, and find not Christ in him, but be reprobate and unapproved, at present, and yet have Grace given hereafter, so as to repent, believe, and be saved ; I say only, may not this be ask’d ?

Of the Opinion therefore of *Catharinus* and Dr. *More*, my Genius, which leads me still into the middle-way of disputed Points, would make me a ready and thankful Follower ; but yet it is the Scripture alone that won’t let me. Scripture is the Rule of my Faith, and the very Truth of the Scripture, as I believe it, is as I have said, and I must but unsay and unbelieve to say any more:



## O F T H E

# Salvability of the Heathen.

**T**HIS is the next Head I speak of after *Redemption*, because it follows from the *Universality* of it. It is common with those that are of the *Latin Church*, as *Cyprian* and *Austine*, to say that none out of the *Ark* or out of *Rahab's House*; that is, none but Christians can be saved: But I am enclining to *Justin Martin*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Eusebius*, and such of the *Greek Church*, who have other Sayings. For though I hold Communion with the Church, I cannot really and truly, and in good earnest I cannot approve, or assent (as Truth) to her eighth Article, in a literal and grammatical Construction of the Word *Thoroughly* in the *English*, and *Omnino* in the *Latin*; seeing the Beginning, the Middle, and the End of the *Athanasian Creed* does sentence every one that is not a Christian, to be inevitably damn'd. But God forbid this should be so, for the Truth of Natural Religion, and the Goodness of God, is that I am more assur'd of, than of the Creed of *Athanasius*, or the Composure of any other.

I have been long sensible of my own Inclinations, and of other Friends, whom I think like-minded with me, and to have the same Opinion of our dear and blessed Lord Jesus Christ, that he is so good, as to be one that hath done, and does Kindness, and hath shewn even saving Favour, to many whom yet he never told of it.

I have more particularly taken heed to the Bishop of *Salisbury*, because I see in his Exposition of the eighteenth Article he does candidly declare for this Opinion, but with Caution, which he hath taken up on Trust from such as say, a Heathen indeed is salvable, but only by uncovenanted Mercy. Those Authors that have said thus, may be wise Men, and made great by his Approbation: But  
if



if they have spoken dangerously, not distinguishing between the Peculiarity of the Covenant as belonging to the *Jews*, and the Covenant of Grace it self which belongs to *Mankind*, and thereupon they be out; I hope this truly great and extraordinary Bishop will be so humble, as not to refuse other Information from an infinitely inferior, and less learned Person.

Believe it, good Reader, the Redemption of Christ, and the Covenant obtain'd by it are of equal Extent: and for a Man to say that any may be sav'd by uncovenanted Mercy, is to say they may be sav'd without Christ, and without Redemption; which to say, is to bring the Curse of that eighteenth Article upon him, and no avoiding it.

All Mankind as in *Adam's* Loins are under the Law of our Creation, the Law of Innocency, the Law of Works; and since *Adam's* Fall there is no Flesh living by that Law can be justify'd. There is a Necessity therefore of that Deliverance from the Law which Christ hath wrought: But how are we redeem'd and freed from it? We are all still under it as a Rule of Life, *quoad Obedientiam*; but are freed from it as a Rule of Judgment, *quoad Justificationem*. That is, we shall not (Thanks to our Lord) be judg'd by this, but by another Law which Christ hath obtain'd for us, the Covenant of Grace, according to the Condition whereof every mortal Man shall be justify'd or condemn'd.

The Covenant in short is this, *Believe and thou shalt be sav'd*; and the Question thence arises, which to us, who maintain a Heathen's Salvability, is indeed a hard Question, and one of as great Concernment as any can be in the World, to wit, What is that Faith which is the Condition of this Covenant? For answer, It is to be premis'd, There must be the Knowledge of God, and that he is merciful and good. This being known, it must be believ'd, I mean assented to; and being believ'd, we must trust to it, and have Affiance in God. Now then, that Faith which is the Condition of the Covenant, is this very Trust in the infinite Mercy and Goodness of God for partaking the Benefits of it; His Mercy for pardoning all our Sins, and particularly the Failings of our Duty; and his Goodness then for accepting that Duty, however imperfect, so long as it is sincere in his Sight; which tho' we Christians are to believe to be for Christ's sake, it is enough the Heathen does believe to be for his Name's sake, that is, his own sake, his Mercy's sake. *There is Mercy with thee that thou mayst be fear'd.*



Here then is the Covenant and the Condition of it, whereof the whole World is capable, so that the Fault shall lie upon every Man endu'd with Reason, himself, and not on his Maker, that he is not sav'd. A Trust in God's Mercy for the Pardon of their Faults, and Acceptance of their Duty, that prevalently induces them to Repentance, and to obey him in Sincerity, according to the Light they have, is the Condition. The Apostle suitably cites this Text from one of the Prophets, more than once; *The Just shall live by Faith*. The just Man, tho' just, must live but on God's Indulgence, and he must trust to it. *Aristides*, tho' *Aristides*, one that *feareth God and worketh Righteousness*, must find Mercy for Pardon of his Sins (which is thro' Christ's Satisfaction, tho' he knows it not) and Grace for the Acceptance thereof unto Life, or he could not be sav'd.

This Condition, it is true, no Man *ex viribus naturæ* can perform: But by the special Grace of God, even a Heathen may, and so be sav'd. And why may not such a Man, by the Light of Nature (*God shewing what may be known of him*) be converted, as the Christian by the Light of the Gospel; and the one be elect, and internally called (not *ex faciente ipso quod in se est*, but *ex Deo misereunte cujus vult*) as well as the other, if God please? Here is Free Grace advanced, and no Pelagianism or Arminianism induc'd by it. No, but hereby verily is that Text made good, *Who will have all Men to be sav'd, and come unto the Knowledge of the Truth*, seeing he affords to them so much Light (according as they become capable) that if they sincerely live up to it (he giving Grace also for some so to do) they shall escape Damnation.

Having mentioned the more than ordinary valuable Judgment of Bishop *Burnet*, I think fit to transcribe a fuller Account which I took of it.

That excellent Person, when the eighteenth Article of the Church pronounces an Anathema to all them who hold that any Man may be sav'd by the Law or Sect he professeth, unless he be a Christian, which seems to be the Sense of the Article, distinguishes between the word *By* and *In*; and he says, *To be sav'd by a Law or Sect, signifies, that by the Virtue of that Law or Sect such Men as follow it may be sav'd: Whereas to be sav'd in a Law or Sect, imports only, that God may extend his Compassion to Men that are engag'd in a false Religion.* And this he appears to own, as not condemn'd by the Article. If the Bishop or



I should affirm, that a Man may be sav'd by, or in, any false Religion without Christ, the Article indeed does curse us: But to say only that a Man may be of a false Religion, and yet pardon'd and sav'd thro' Jesus Christ, acknowledging (with the Article) that *there is no Name under Heaven whereby he can be sav'd, but by him*; we are to be satisfied as to the Intent of the Article, that it curses us not. Besides that, a Curse mistaken, and the Curse causeless shall not come. The ingenious Bishop proceeds: And seeing Faith in Christ is in the Gospel requir'd as necessary to Salvation, there is no Question to be made (he says) but that those that have the Gospel preach'd to them, and believe not in him, must be damn'd: The Difficulty only is concerning those that never heard of the Christian Religion. Here then the Bishop distinguishes again of Men *in the Law*, and *without the Law*, according to the Apostle, that is, between the *Jew* and the *Gentile*, Christian and Heathen: And for the last, tho' they have not the Law written, they have it in their Hearts, and shall be judg'd according to their Consciences. This is fair, but seeing that Pardon of Sin is limited (as he speaks) to believing in Christ, and Salvation is only thro' Christ's Name according to the Scripture, he distinguishes again thus: *It is on account of the Death and Sacrifice of Christ that Men are pardon'd and sav'd; but it is not so plainly said that no Man can be sav'd unless he hath an express Knowledge of this, together with a Belief of it.* That is in effect the same I say in my Discourse concerning the Quakers, that the Redemption we have by Christ, and the Knowledge of him, is not to be reckon'd commensurate: And yet it is but unwarily said of him (or too warily, as one in the Water who feels not a Bottom for his Feet) that Pardon of Sin is positively limited to believing in Christ. For hereupon he is forc'd to mince his Speech thus, *It is not so plainly said*: Whereas Pardon of Sin is limited to a Believer in Christ only as to such as have had a Preacher, as is before understood by himself. It is true that the Gospel says, *He that believes not shall be damn'd*; but I reply, as the Apostle says, *What the Law speaks, it speaks to those that are under the Law*: So the Gospel speaks this to those that are under the Gospel, not to the Heathen. For the explicit Knowledge of Christ as the Gospel reveals him, is not at all requir'd of an Heathen Man (nor of Infants) no, not of any Man as necessary to Salvation, before Christ came. Upon this Supposition then, that *this is not so clearly said in Scripture* as the other, the Bishop comes to another Distinction, which he says is to be made, as that which will clear the matter and all Difficulties in it.



*A great Difference (says he, I will cite all his Words) is to be made between a Federal Certainty of Salvation secur'd by the Promises of God, and of this New Covenant of Jesus Christ, and the Extent to which the Goodness and Mercy of God may go. None are in a Federal State of Salvation but Christians : To them is given the Covenant of Grace, and to them the Promises of God are made and offer'd, so that they have a Certainty of it, upon t'eir performing the Conditions that are put in the Promises ; all others are out of the Promise, to whom the Tidings of it was never brought*

In this now which is said by this worthy Bishop, there is thus much of Truth to be acknowledged and noted, That no Heathen or Jew under their Dispensations had, or could have such Certainty on their turning to God (so as to *draw near to him in full Assurance of Faith*, Heb. 10. 22.) that they should be accepted and saved, as Christians have, or may have, upon the Revelation of Jesus Christ ; and for that reason, if there were no other, the Dispensation the Christian is under is exceeding better than that of the Jews and Heathen. But for this so able a Divine to take up this Distinction of Salvation by *Covenant*, or by *Uncovenanted Mercy*, as some are pleased with ; and then affirming that there is no Covenant of Grace, or Promise of Salvation upon Performance of the Conditions of it to any but Christians, is too much upon Trust, for he is not one to forget or forsake the common Doctrine of the Covenants ; to wit, one of *Works* belonging to the State of Innocency which Mankind brake, and the other of *Grace* made with *Adam* fallen, in the Promise of the Woman's Seed, that is, of a Redeemer : From whence arises a Government of God by right of Redemption ; and all Government being by a Law, it is this that he and all his Posterity are and must be under for Life or Damnation. As for those then that hold or are ~~willing~~ willing to hold a Salvability for the Heathen, and yet deny zheir Salvation by Covenant, but talk of uncovenanted Mercy, they do trip in plain Ground, upholding a Doctrine that is miraculously good and generous, but without a Foundation. For there is no way, nor ever was but one way, which is this, by the Covenant of Grace (procured for us by Christ) of Salvation to any Man under Heaven.

*As for them whom God hath left in Darknes* (says the Bishop farther, intending all the Heathen) *they are certainly out of Covenant, out of these Promises and Declarations that are made in it, so that they have no federal Right to be saved, neither can we affirm that they shall be sav'd ; This I must needs say, I take to be spoken without*  
 second



second Thoughts; and something does pass sometimes unconsidered from the most studied Person. There is no Man *coming into the World* left so in Darkeness, but he hath a *Light within*, which if he live up to, he is one of God's People, says the Quaker. There is no Man upon Earth that loves God sincerely can perish. The Quakers Doctrine in this Point is more ordinaible to Proof of the two. I will say more, there is no Man in the Earth, Heathen or Christian, but he is a Subject of the Covenant, the Covenant of Grace; and God is certainly his Governour by this Law, and so is he under a Government of Grace; and so far I will say too, that if he obeys his Governour, answers that Law, or lives up to that Revelation of God's Will which he hath, he is upon performing the Condition under the Promise thereof accordingly, to be sav'd, and we may affirm that he shall. I must yet say farther (if it be farther) that there is no Man on Earth that is sav'd but it must be by the Covenant, the Covenant of Grace, and Promise of it.

Of this Covenant then, by which alone all Men have been, and must be saved, and no otherwise but by it, tho' it be one and the same in *Substance*, according to our Divines, yet it is diverse, and hath been threefold in the *Administration*. One before the Law, a second under the Law, and a third under the Gospel. It is objected now, A Heathen hath not Faith, which is the Condition of the Covenant, and therefore he cannot be in Covenant, nor be saved. *He that believes not shall be damned.* I answer, A Heathen hath not the Faith which is required under the third Administration, a Belief that Christ died for our Sins, and rose again for our Justification, which is more than was required of the Jew under the Second: Nor hath the Heathen the Faith of the Jew: but he may have such a Faith as these had before the Law, under the first Administration (which indeed he is only under) that is, he has the *Law of Entire Nature writ in his Heart*, as they had, to believe there is a God, and that he will reward them that diligently seek him; and also of *Lapsed Nature* to believe him merciful, to forgive his Sin upon Repentance, so that supposing God vouchsafing his Grace for him to do it, he is in a Capacity of Salvation. And from hence may we take a true Understanding of the Apostle in these Words; *But now is the Righteousness of God revealed from Faith to Faith.* The Righteousness of God is the Righteousness of this Covenant, which Righteousness is *Faith*, and which Faith was ever on foot for Mens Salvation, in opposition to *Works*: And from *Faith to Faith*, is, from the Faith which



was sufficient under the first and second, to that which is now required further under the third and latter Administration of it.

That God is so good to all Men, Heathen or Christian, and his Grace so Universal, that no Man shall be able to say at the Day of Judgment that the Fault was in *Him*, but in *Themselves* only, that they are not sav'd, is that Doctrine of the Quaker, which is never to be gain'd by any considerate Divine, but to be own'd for a generous Truth, allowing them this candid and fair Construction.

There is one Distinction therefore more, which the Bishop wants, and the Want hath put him out. It is this, That beside the two Covenants of Works and Grace, which are generally acknowledged, there is another Covenant (or rather another Consideration of the latter) which some call a Middle, some a Political, some a Peculiar, some a Subservient Covenant, belonging to the Jews, and now to us Christians also, who by the Partition-Wall being broken down are made one, and are therefore, as the Jews were, called by *Peter*, a *Chosen Generation*, a *Royal Priesthood*, a *Holy Nation*, a *Peculiar People*; and are said by *Paul*, to be *grafted into their Olive*, that is, into the same Covenant-Relation. When the Scripture then speaks of the Gentiles, that they were *without God in the World, without the Covenant, Aliens* to it, and the like, we are to understand it all in regard to the Church-state of the Jews, and Covenant whereby they had God for their God, and they were his People in a peculiar manner, as the Posterity of *Abraham*, and distinguished from all other Nations.

They were without God, that is, as he was to the Jews a Peculiar Governor, but not without God as Universal Sovereign of Heaven and Earth, and as Lord of Man thro' his Redemption by Jesus Christ. *Is he the God of the Jews only, is he not of the Gentiles? Yea of the Gentiles also.* And how, without the Covenant? That is, without the Covenant of *Peculiarity*. They were not in the Covenant in that peculiar manner as the Jews were; but as for the Covenant it self, the Covenant of Grace, of Life, of Salvation, or of the Gospel, it is Universal; and however revealed to any, whether Jew or Gentile, Christian or Heathen, there are none can be out of it, nor any Difference is to be made, but all are and were for ever since the Fall of *Adam*, and must be under it. And tho' the Gentile came not to the Jew to be *circumcised*, or the Heathen come not to us to be *baptised*, that is, to the Profession of this Covenant, they are all under the Verge of it in regard to Obligation, and Promise upon  
the



the Condition ; so that if any of them be wrought on by the Spirit of God, and do inwardly enter into and keep it (tho' they understand it not) they are made Partakers of the Benefit, the Privilege, the Promise of it, as well as we Christians. *Tribulation and Anguish upon every Soul that doth Evil ; but Glory, Honour, and Peace to every Man that worketh Good, to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile : For there is no respect of Persons with God.* Rom. 2. 10, 11. with Act. 10. 34, 35. *After this I beheld, and lo a great Multitude, which no Man could number, of all Nations, and Kindreds, and People, and Tongues, stood before the Throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white Robes, and Palms in their Hands : And cried with a loud Voice, saying, Salvation to our God, which sitteth upon the Throne, and unto the Lamb,* Rev. 7. 9, 10.

---



O F

## The Judaical Covenant.

**T**HIS Head is proper to come next, for there (as I have said on the Head preceding) is the Covenant of *Works*, and the Covenant of *Grace*. The Covenant of Works God made with *Adam* in his Integrity, being that Law which is written in all Mens Hearts, and so requires Perfection, and for the least Transgression threatens Death. The Covenant of Grace was made with Man in his Fallen Estate, and requires our Faith, Repentance, and Sincerity only unto Life; which being held forth under the Title of the *Promise to Adam, Abraham, David*, and all during the *Law*, was ratified by the Death and Blood of Christ the Redeemer under the *Gospel*, and so promulgated to the World, to continue still of Force (and in that, as in one regard, called New) as long as that lasts; *Behold the Days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new Covenant, not according to the Covenant I made with their Fathers in the day I took them by the Hand to lead them out of Egypt.* Here we have an Old Covenant and a New, and what are they? The Old is that which God made with the Jews (which is plain) even when *Moses* lead them in the Wilderness. The New is that which we have under the Gospel, tho' it may have happily another Administration, when the Jews are called.

The Old Covenant then is not the Covenant of Works, for that Covenant being all one with the Law of Nature, was made with all Mankind in *Adam*, and as written in our Hearts, must be eternally obligatory; when the Old Covenant was made with the Jews in opposition to other Nations, and as peculiar to them, is vanished, and binds not: Neither is it the Covenant of Grace for the same Reason, to wit, because this concerns all People, and never vanishes; as also  
because



because the Covenant of Grace is the New Covenant, but the New is not the Old. *In that he saith a new Covenant he hath made the first Old: Now that which decayeth and waxeth old, is ready to vanish away,* Heb. 8. 13.

The Old and New Covenant indeed, say our Divines ordinarily, are both Covenants of *Grace*, in Opposition to that of *Works*, the same in *Substance*, but differing in the *Administration*. Two, I say, as Old and New, in the Administration, but one and the same Covenant of *Grace*; which yet is not easy to be received, without the Distinction of an *A* and *The* in the Case. The Old Covenant may be a Covenant of *Grace*, or a Covenant of *Works*, or both; but not the Covenant of *Works*, or the Covenant of *Grace*. There are some plead it is a *Subservient* Covenant, as *Camero*: Some, that it is a *Mixed* Covenant, as *Ball*: Some that it is a Covenant of *Works*, as the *Leyden* Divines: The most of our ownlate Divines do make it a Covenant of *Grace*, whereof one voluminous Author, denying the other three Opinions, does yet say, it was so dispensed, as to tender Life both upon the Condition of Faith and Works. But if it proposed Life on Condition of perfect Doing, it was a Covenant of Works; if on Believing too, a Covenant mix'd, both of Works and Grace; and as perfect Doing was urged only in Tendency to Believing, a Covenant Subservient. And so all say true as to the main, and yet none so distinctly true, as to leave any enquiring Man without some Confusion in what they say. There is one thing then I apprehend will serve much for the Enodation of many Difficulties, in this Matter, and that is, to conceive aright what the Old Covenant is: And there is another like it, to the same purpose; to know what Kind of Covenant that was.

For the former, what the Old Covenant is: We have hitherto been seeing what it is not; but to understand what it is, let me tell you, that you must learn to separate what *Moses* did deliver to the *Israelites*, from that which was in Promise to the Patriarchs, as single by it self; and this is the Old Covenant. Or, Take that, and all that whatsoever, and in what manner so ever, that was added to the Covenant of *Grace*, which *Abraham* and the Patriarchs were under, and that abstracted therefrom, is I count the Old Covenant. Let me yet speak more fully. Take *Abraham*, before he was Ninety Years old, when he at first believed and that Faith was imputed to him for Righteousness, upon which he became the Father of the Faithful, while as yet he was in Uncircumcision (for the Law of



Circumcision, which was after given in peculiar Reference to his Natural Seed, the *Jews*, in pursuance of the Temporal Benediction, is to be reckon'd as pre-ambulatory to the Law, and belonging to it) and when you have paired away Circumcision, and all that which *Moses* commanded the *Jews* afterwards, from *walk before me only, and be perfect* : All this rest, this paired away from that, whatsoever it be, is, I say, the Old Covenant, or the Law, strictly taken.

From hence, in the first place, we have Light to distinguish between the Law taken *Strictly* and *Largely* ; in regard whereof we shall find the Apostle sometimes proving the Righteousness of Faith from the Law, being *witnessed by the Law and the Prophets* : and another time, setting the Law and the Gospel at the widest Distance and Opposition. As the Law is taken comprehensively for the Promise to *Abraham*, (which is fundamentally the same made to Mankind in fallen *Adam*) as well as the Covenant made with the *Jews* (that is, for the whole State they stood in who were under the Law, both by virtue of the Covenant confirmed to their Fore-fathers, and by virtue of that given by *Moses*) the Law and Gospel are confounded : As the Law is taken strictly or precisely for the Old Covenant, or the Law of *Moses* with Circumcision its Appurtenance, that is, for all that apart that was *added* to the Promise before-going, and abstracted there-from, as I have said, so are they distinguish'd, and their Differences to be owned and maintained.

From this, in the next place, we may understand how the *Jews* were under both Conditions of believing and doing. Of *doing this and live*, and of *believing also, that we may be saved*. To wit, as the Covenant of Grace was delivered to their Fore-fathers, and so on root beise, it must needs hold forth Life to them on their Faith, as well as to *Abraham*, their Progenitor, who received Circumcision as a Seal of Righteousness thereby (or to come thereby) and not by the Law, which as yet was not given. And as the Law was added (as the Apostle speaks) to this Covenant or Promise, it did tie the *Jews* to a Performance of it, as a Condition of living by it, in some Sense, as neither the Patriarchs before, nor we since, are under.

From whence yet, in the third place, we may enlarge our Light farther, to see how this our Freedom or Deliverance from the Law, does bring us Christians under the Gospel, into such a State and Condition, as the Patriarchs and those holy Men before *Abraham* were in, to live according to the Law of Nature, but yet so as this Law Natural or Moral is in the Hands of Christ, and administred with Grace



Grace and the Spirit; to wit, with Grace, in God's Acceptance of our Sincerity instead of perfect Obedience, for the Redeemer's sake; and with his Spirit, in his Assistance of us for the Performance.

From hence moreover we may see in the way, how the Covenant of Grace which *Abraham* had, and all these holy Men that went before him, or that ever were, as well as we, (or else they could not have been saved) is yet called a New Covenant; and that is, as the Lump is called a new Lump by the Apostle, 1 Cor. 5. 1. Because, I say, that that which was *added* to it by *Moses*, to wit, all which is properly the Old Covenant, is removed and purged away, as the Leaven in the *Jews* Feast, by Christ our Passover, who hath been sacrificed, and made for us that Expurgation.

For the latter thing to be conceived a-right, what kind of Covenant I take this to be, I am now in order to tell you, but without any Pretence of Singularity. The Old Covenant, as to me it still seems, was a kind of Political Covenant, made with the Nation of the *Jews*, as Princes Compacts are with their People, when they first set up Government. God promises them his Protection, that he would lead them to a fruitful Land, overcome all their Enemies, and then bless them there with suitable Blessings, and they promise him they will be ruled by him. *This Day the Lord thy God hath commanded thee to keep his Statutes. And this Day thou hast avouched the Lord to be thy God, and to walk in his Ways, and to hear his Voice: And the Lord hath avouch'd thee this Day, to be his peculiar People, and to make thee high above all Nations, as he hath promis'd thee, and that thou shouldst keep all his Commandments.* So you have it in more Words, Deut. 26. 16, 17, 18, 19.

To this end did God in sundry ways appear to *Moses*, to their Elders, to them all in the Cloud and Fire, and then causes a Tabernacle to be made for him, which was a keeping House among them, where the Sacrifices and Offerings was his Provision, and the Priests his Servants, that lived on him; and unto that Tabernacle and Ark they might repair for Counsel and Judgment. This People then being peculiarly under a *Theocracy*, which *Samuel* in two Places does expressly signify (at least until the time of *Saul*) so that the Church and Commonwealth of the *Jews* were but one, according to the Apostle, it is no wonder if Religion be made their Law, and so required of them, together with other Political Ordinances and Statutes, for their Happiness or publick Peace, as a Nation.



From hence is it, that tho' their Law is not to be peculiarly judg'd the Covenant of Works, or the Covenant of Grace, either of the two themselves, yet may we expect, that it should represent both the one and the other to them, because in the Knowledge of both, does the Business of Religion, and the whole of it, virtually consist. In the Delivery of the Moral Law, and that with Thunder and Lightning, and such Terrour as we read of it, they had a Representation of the Covenant of Nature or perfect Works; which *qua Fœdus* is doubtless, in our fallen Estate, a Ministration of Wrath, or Law of Sin and Death. In their Ceremonial Offerings, and Priestly Appointments, tho' there was a Remembrance still of Sin, and so matter of Bondage and Fear, yet had they Types of Christ, of remedying Mercy, and the Glory to come. These Sacrifices were brought directly as Mulcts to their King, to deliver them from the Danger of present Punishment, being Redemptions of their Lives, which else they should have forfeited by his Laws, and served, as I have said, to the Maintenance of his House, the Tabernacle, and Temple, which he was pleas'd to keep up amongst them. Nevertheless, that does not hinder but God Almighty might make these of farther Use, for Representations of other Things, *that is to say*, spiritual, and so the Law be a Pedagogy, under a Temporal Dispensation, leading many to Heaven.

This is certain, That the Covenants of Nature and Grace being made with Mankind, are not Matters of Concernment only to the Jews, but to the whole World as well as to them, for Everlasting Life and Death; and it is not to be conceived therefore, that either of them should receive any Detriment by the Covenant made with that particular Nation. *This I say* (says Paul in regard to the last) *that the Covenant confirm'd before of God in Christ, the Law which was four hundred and thirty Years after cannot disannul, that it should make the Promise of no effect*, Gal. 3. 17. The Covenant of God in Christ is doubtless the Covenant of Grace; and that we see a-foot in the World before the Law, and before *Abraham*; for seeing it was confirmed to *Abraham*, it must be in Being before on Necessity; and if it be not disannul'd by the Law, then cannot that, whatsoever it be, which is given by this Covenant, come to the Jews by the Law. *If there had been a Law given, that could have given Life, verily Righteousness should have been by the Law.* But forasmuch as Eternal Life and Justification does come only by the Covenant of Grace, it follows, that the Covenant made with the Jews must needs be a Covenant



nant which concern'd their outward State, or political Welfare, as I have said, and that neither Salvation, nor Condemnation, as to the Life to come, was the primary Intention, or the direct and proper Effect of it.

You may object, *To what end then served the Law?* I answer with the Apostle, *It was added because of Transgressions. The Law entred that the Offence might abound.* Again, *By the Law comes the Knowledge of Sin*, which tho' it was in the World before, Men were not apt to impute it to themselves without a Law. The Law then was for bridling the Jew from Sin, and tho' the Sadducean Jew that had the Sense of no Law but the external Commands of *Moses*, and so was deterr'd from Sinning, and driven to Sacrificing only for avoiding temporal Punishment, yet that Jew who was *one inwardly*, believing the Immortality of his Soul, and that he was under the Law of Nature, as well as the Polity of *Moses*, and so liable for every Sin to Eternal Death and Judgment, was through Conviction of Sin upon his Conscience, and that temporal Death he saw due to him in the Beast that was sacrific'd for him, excited in the Sense of his spiritual Estate, to fly to the remedying Law of Mercy upon Repentance, and Righteousness upon Believing, which is the Substance of the Promise which God had given to *Abraham* and his Forefathers, and has established in the Blood of Christ (whether the ordinary Jew understood it or not) according to the Gospel. For *Christ is the End of the Law for Righteousness*; and *the Law a School-master to drive us to Christ*.

I will conclude, The Law taken at large, as I have said already, that is, for all that which is contained in the Books of the Old Testament, may be supposed to hold forth whatsoever is in the Covenants both of Works and Grace: but the Law taken separately from either, as a third Covenant, cannot hold forth any other than the external Government of God with Propriety over the Jews, and that consisting in these two things, to wit, a hard Task of burdensome Duties, under the Danger of temporal Judgments; and a Redress from them by Sacrifice: The one typified our Estate according to the Law of Works; and the other, the Grace that comes to us by Christ Jesus,



O F

# Justification.

**U**Pon this great Article, notwithstanding I have wrote so much, and so often, I have yet to determine these two or three Questions, and the first is, Whether Christ obeyed for us, as well as suffered for us?

Before I go to answer to it, I must premise, that when we speak of Christ's obeying or suffering for us, we understand it against the Socinian, to be *loco nostro*, or *in our stead*. Now to obey or suffer in our stead, may be taken either, *In our stead*, that we may be look'd upon as having obeyed and suffered in him; or, *In our stead*, that we may not suffer or obey as he. In the first Sense we must not say he obeyed and suffered for us, for it is repugnant to Truth: We have not indeed obeyed and suffered in him; and if we had obeyed in him, so as his perfect Obedience were *in se* imputed to us, there would be no need of his Suffering, and none of our own Obedience: Which two things are alledged in most Books, and the more trite and obvious, the more clear and irrefragable. In the second Sense, the Question is to be ask'd, and I move it the rather, because Mr. Baxter has said it as currant with others, that *tho' Christ suffered that we might not suffer, yet he obeyed not that we might not obey*: We must add, *as he*, and I argue against it.

. If the Satisfaction God required of our Mediator, and which he made him, did consist both of his Active and Passive Obedience too, which Mr. Baxter holds as well as I, and no Satisfaction could be made by Christ, but in our behalf, then must he obey for us, as well as suffer for us on that account. I will speak it over more fully. If he obeyed not for us, that we might not obey as he, then he obeyed



ed not in our stead; and his Obedience was no part of his Satisfaction: But seeing *Obedience* was due to him from *Adam*, and *Suffering* from *Us*, God in Justice to his Law did require both from our Mediator to satisfy him; for he could not, or would not, and it was fit he should not, be content and well-pleased, but by a perfect fulfilling of it.

And now for making out this Obedience of his to free us from our obeying as he (which is all one but to make out that he obeyed *in our stead*;) it does appear by all the most fair and impartial Reason that can be, from what Mr. *Baxter* never denied, that Christ having perform'd the Obedience which the Law required of us, as the Condition of Life, he hath by that Obedience, as part of his Satisfaction made to God, procured for us a Freedom from that Obligation by a *new* Law, which Mr. *Baxter* judiciously does call a *Remedying* Law, which hath other Conditions, according to the Performance thereof we shall be judged, and so justified and saved. From hence it is manifest, that tho' we are not exempted by Christ's Obedience from all obeying, we are delivered from being bound to obey as he; which Obligation, had it remain'd in Force, must have excluded all of us from Salvation.

As there are none therefore ever doubted to say, that because Christ hath born the Curse of the Law, (the Law of *Works*) or the conditioned Penalty thereof in our stead, it is a righteous thing, as well as merciful with God, not to require the same of us: So is it in regard that Christ hath performed the conditioned Obedience thereof also, that we should be freed from that likewise. God must have his Law fulfilled, or he will not be satisfied: This he might require of us; but seeing Christ hath done it for us, he is content as to us, with what we are able to do, according to the Law of *Grace*. And to put this Indulgence, or piece of Satisfaction on the account of his Obedience, is more congruous and reasonable, than on his Death or Suffering.

A second Question is this: How is the Believer justified by Christ's Righteousness? I answer; As the *meritorious* Cause of our Justification. There is no body will gainsay this.

The third then is, Whether the Righteousness of Christ be not made ours by believing, and so the *Formal* Cause also? I answer, No, because it is not (it cannot be) made ours *in se*, but *quoad fructus aut effectus*. There are none say or can say it is ours but by Imputation, and when it is imputed to us so far as to be ours in the



Effects or Benefits (as the Captive hath the *Money* gather'd for him in his *Freedom*) it can be imputed no farther, or no otherwise, but it must be ours in it self: And if Imputation will serve, to be ours in it self, is more than needs.

That thing which is one Man's cannot be imputed to another, to make it his *in se*, or cannot be made by Imputation another's, so as to be his in the thing it self, tho' it can be made his *quoad effectus*, as to the partaking the Benefit. The Debt of *Onesimus* could not be made *Paul's* by *Philemon's* Imputing it to him, so as to make *Paul* to have taken, or be accounted to have taken from *Philemon* what *Onesimus* did, but it could make him Debtor so as to be engag'd to make him Recompense, if he would not forgive it. Seeing then that Imputation can do so much and no more, the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness to us can make it ours no otherwise than thus. He hath procured for us by what he hath done a Pardon and Life upon our Believing: This Pardon and Life is *really* the Believers *in se*, he is pardon'd and saved, and the Righteousness of Christ is imputed to him as the meritorious Cause thereof; and upon that account it may be said to be, and is the Believers *relatively* (and no otherwise) in regard to these Effects.

As Christ's Righteousness now is ours, so must *Adam's* Sin be ours: *As by one Man's Disobedience many were made Sinners; so by the Obedience of one shall many be made righteous.* But how by that Disobedience and Obedience? Why, by the *Imputation* of them to us. This all say, and how then made Sinners, and made righteous? Why, *quoad effectus*. We are made righteous by the Obedience of Christ imputed to us, not *in se*, but in the Effects already declared, and we are made Sinners by the Disobedience of *Adam* imputed to us in regard to this effect, that we are become mortal, and must die for it. *By one Man Sin entred into the World, and Death by Sin.* We are not made Sinners so as that the Imputation of *Adam's* Sin makes us to have committed his Sin; *Adiones sunt suppositorum*: We actually committed it not. As for those that say, We did actually sin in *Adam*, because we were in his Loins, they do make Imputation, as to his Sin, to be another thing than Imputation as to Christ's Righteousness, for none can say we obey'd in him actually, as being in his Loins.

Again, if all Men sinned by eating the forbidden Fruit with *Adam*, then was it the Sin of Human Nature; and seeing Christ took our Nature from the Virgin, who was in *Adam's* Lines as well as we,



we, it follows, that he also sinned in *Adam*: But no Sin can be imputed to Christ, and *Adam's* Sin therefore must be his own, not his, nor ours but in the Effect. And seeing it is God imputes the Sin to us, if the Sin it self be made ours by the Imputation, then is God the Author, he is made the Cause of Sin, and sole Cause of all the Original Sin which is in the World. And is not this an horrid thing for any to maintain?

To proceed farther, there is nothing I think said in Scripture, or can be said, to be imputed to a Man which he has, unless for another thing than what it is, as *Faith* is imputed to him for *Righteousness*: Or for another End than that he should have it, as *Sin* is imputed to him, to be *punished*. *Shimei* cursed *David*, and desires him not to *impute* it. What is that? Not that *David* should account he *had* not offended, but to pardon it. It follows, that for a thing to be a Man's, is one thing, and to be *imputed* to him, is another. To be *in se* is one thing, and to be his only, to an End, to an Use, to a Benefit, or an Effect, good or bad, is another. An Imputation *in se* consequently is not to be maintained, because a thing which is divers from another, cannot be the same with that from which it is divers. I think I need say no more.

I know indeed how *Davenant* is here an Antagonist, and he for want of that Distinction, they had not then, of an Imputation *in se*, and *quo ad effectus*, is put hard to it, when he is driven to make the Believer and Christ to be one *Person*, and Christ's Righteousness therefore personally his, and so consequently the *formal* Cause (which he would maintain) of our Justification. But I could wish that excellent Dr. alive, for Re-consideration; and I leave it to the Answer above-given, only taking notice of these special Words I find in him; *Inchoata obedientia, accedente peccatorum condonatione, perinde valet atque perfecta Legis impletio, juxta illud Augustini, omnia facta deputantur, quando quicquid non fit ignoscitur*. Now if this judicious Saying of his be Truth, that upon the account of Christ's Merits, our imperfect Faith, or inchoate Obedience, *perinde valet*, does stand us in the same stead as perfect Obedience would (which is truly, I think, and remarkably said) then is there no need of Christ's Righteousness to be made ours, or imputed to us, but only as to this very Effect granted, that our inchoate Obedience shall *perinde valere*, as a perfect Righteousness would to the Believer's Justification.

If Christ's Righteousness were formally ours, there were no need of rewarding our imperfect one, for then it would be of *Debt*, when



now it is but of *Grace* : And if God does reward our imperfect one (which is undeniable in Scripture) there is no need of Christ's, but for this meriting the Acceptance, that it may be so rewarded. I will say the same more at large ; If God accepts our Faith, our Repentance, and sincere tho' imperfect Obedience, and for Christ's sake, or through his Merits, rewards it, so as to pardon and save us, which is that we obtain by Christ's Righteousness, what need of making it ours *in se*, for the same end, unless you will have the same thing twice done.

As for the saying Christ and the Believer are one, it is true, that Christ and his Church is one *Body*, but not one *Person*. And what Body? Not a *Natural* Body, which having all its Members with the Soul in them, makes a Person ; but a *Mystical* Body, which consists of such Members as are all Persons themselves, divers and distinct from the Head, and one another. And tho' the Allusion be to the Body Natural, the Qualities yet that are in the *Head*, are not in the *Members*. Christ is said to be made unto us *Wisdom and Righteousness*, yet his *Wisdom* is not ours, he *knows all things*, not we : Nor his *Righteousness* ours, he *knew no Sin*, we do. He, may be said, *made that to us*, as he hath procured for us. The Understanding of a Man is in his Head, not in his Feet or Hands ; but yet are they govern'd by it, and it is *theirs*, for their Benefit : So is the Righteousness of Christ ours, and so to be held ours, and no otherwise ours, in this great Controversy of Justification.

Mr. *Calvin*, in his *Institutions*, tells us, Christ must be ours first, and he being ours, that which is his, must be ours ; and so his Righteousness is ours. But I must say, on the contrary, that what is his, cannot be ours, because it is his ; as he cannot be *us*, because *he*. For how is Christ himself ours ? He is not ours as our Land, our Houses, our Money is ours, which one only can possess ; but he is ours, in the Relation we have to him. He is our Saviour, our Head, our King, Priest, Prophet, and so he is others Saviour, Lord, as *ours*. He is not neither ours, as now said (which were more) so as that his Qualities should be ours, his *Wisdom*, his *Holiness* ours ; for then we should be *Christed* with *Christ*, as the *Antinomian* speaks, and be indeed Christ's very Person. It is strange, that things spoken *Mystically* in Scripture, should be taken as *Naturally* spoken, and so understood. But it is not so, that Christ is ours, but ours indeed only (as I have said already) in the Relations we have to him, and our Interest in the Benefits procured for us (or arising to us)



us) by them. In short, As Christ himself is ours, in our Interest, in his Benefits: So is his Righteousness ours, and no otherwise, but in the Benefit we partake by it.

Not that I shall be offended at any Brother, Minister, or other godly Christian, who hath other Sentiments. I know that *Conterenus*, Cardinal, and our *Fisher*, Bishop, who was a Martyr for Popery, acknowledge a double Righteousness, which we attain by Faith (*efficienter*, as they say): The one is an inherent Righteousness; for when our Faith is found, it will produce Repentance, sincere Obedience, and a holy Life, which is *Justitia inherens*. The other is a Righteousness of *Free Gift*, and imputed *Justitia donata & imputata*, which is Christ's Righteousness apprehended by Faith, (as they both hold, according to the Protestants) so as to make it ours. And as to the Question then, which of the two we must trust to for Justification (that is, with them, to make us righteous, and to be accounted so of God) it is the *imputed* Righteousness (say they) because the *Inherent* is imperfect, and we cannot trust to it. Now when two such Persons as these were convinced by the *Protestants*, so as to receive this Doctrine from them, the Protestants themselves have reason to consider more thoroughly of it, which I honestly say, in regard to Mr. *Baxter* and my self, who have our different Conceptions from them.

For my part, I must confess I am not so bold as to think, or believe, that the very Righteousness of Christ is mine (and much less do I think that a Man's believing it to be his makes it his) for if I did believe it mine, I should go to God as having a perfect Righteousness to justify me by the Law (the Law of Works) so as to have a Right to it, and the Reward to be of Debt: but I dare not do so; no, I cast my Self on God's Mercy altogether, to pardon all my Sins, through the Satisfaction of Christ, and to accept of that Faith, and inchoate Obedience (the Failings done away by that Pardon) through his Merits, for Righteousness, when otherwise I have none to justify me.

I believe, that by Faith we are inserted in, or united to Christ, so as to have an Interest in him for the Communication of his Spirit, and all Benefits we have by him. But I believe not, that his Righteousness does thereby become personally ours, so as *formally* to justify us. If I am in an Error, I beseech God's Pardon, and also his Mercy, that I may have his Righteousness as mine, if others have it, who do humbly expect only the Fruit, the Effects, or Benefit of it.



I believe there is a free Gift of Righteousness (*donata & imputata*) in the fifth of the *Romans*, call'd, *the Gift by Grace*, (ver. 15.) and *Gift of Righteousness*, (ver. 17.) and *free Gift* often; but I think not, with the most of Protestants, that it means Christ's Righteousness, for *by that* it is said (ver. 18.) to *come to us*, and therefore not the Gift it self; but I think indeed it means *the Righteousness of God* (which *Paul's* Mind is so much upon) revealed in the Gospel, in Opposition to Works of the Law (or perfect Works) and is nothing else but this Faith and inchoate Obedience even now mention'd, accepted for Righteousness through the Merits of Christ; and so are we said to be *Righteous* (v. 19.) *by his Obedience*. To be justify'd without a Righteousness, is to be cloathed without a Garment: And seeing there is no other Righteousness we have but this, if we be justified at all, we must be justify'd by it.

The Law of Works is look'd upon as the Rule of Judgment by these great mention'd *Papists*, and our *Protestants* also, when they dispute with them: And if so, there were no Righteousness but Christ's, made legally ours, could justify us: But it is the Law of Grace, or of the Gospel, is, I account, the Rule whereby we shall be judged. This Law or Rule requires of us to believe and repent, in order to Remission and Salvation; and when a Man believes and repents; he performs this Law; and in that Performance he hath a Righteousness according to it, and God's accounting, judging, or declaring a Man righteous, according to that Law whereby he is to be judg'd, is his Justification. This is so plain and clear, that I cannot but give notice, that it is the want of the Knowledge, or receiving hereof, is the Ground of all the Controversy there hath been on the Point, and that the receiving only the Rule must put an End to it.

Justification by Faith and Repentance, through the Righteousness of Christ, as the meritorious Cause of the Acceptance thereof, for Pardon and Life: And Justification by Christ's Righteousness, through Faith and Repentance, as the Condition of having it imputed, are like to make so little Difference as to the Practice of a truly godly Christian, that I am not much concern'd who is for the one, and who is for the other. They both alike trust to the Satisfaction and Merits of Christ alone, as I do for Pardon and Salvation; and when *St. Paul* says, it is *by Faith*, and *St. James* *by Works* also that we are justify'd, this Faith and these Works both together (to reconcile the Apostles themselves) make a Righteousness but imperfect,



fect, which is indeed none but Acceptation, and that through Christ's Merits; which Righteousness therefore, tho' inherent, seeing the Acceptation is from without, is of Grace nevertheless for being of such Works; and what shall hinder our Reconciliation?

I am really very tender of depriving any good Christian Friend of the Comfort they have in *imputed* Righteousness, provided they are not deficient in *inherent*: But if their Trust in Christ's Righteousness makes them negligent of their own, the Doctrine is dangerous; which, for preventing Antinomianism, made Mr. *Baxter* write against it.



## OF THE

## Judge of Faith and the Scripture.

**I**T is one chief *Stumbling Stone* of the *Roman* Catholick, that the *Pope* and his *Church* is *Judge* of the *Scripture*; that is, of all *Scripture* Controversy, concerning Faith and Worship, and Religious Duty. They distinguish between a *Rule* and *Judge*, and they do well. The *Scripture* is the *Rule*, not the *Judge*, of Faith and Manners. This is true, and when the *Protestants* call it a *Judge*, they mean no more than the *Rule*, (they call it so *Metonymically*, as containing the Mind of God, the Supreme Autocratorical *Judge*) by which we are to be governed in our *Determinations*. If we would know what we are to *believe*, that is, what *Doctrine* is true, and what we are to *do*, that is, what is our *Duty*, we go to the *Rule*, the *Word of God*, and if we understand that, we are determined. Now for the understanding that, though we do own a Subordinate, Authoritative Judgment in the Ministers, yet because fallible in their Interpretation, every Man must read himself, and consider and enquire of Books and Teachers with Care, Study, and Prayer; and when he comes to be satisfied in the Meaning, he is to *believe* and *practise* accordingly. Here is a *Judgment of private Discretion* after all Information from Fathers, Doctors, Church or Ministers, that must be *followed*. And as there are some that take the *Scripture* for the *Judge*, when it is but the *Rule*: So there are others that take their *Conscience* for the *Rule*, when it is but the *Discerner of the Rule*; that is, the *Judge*, which may be *Erroneous*, when the *Rule* is *Infallible*.

*Conscience* is an *Act of the Understanding*, discerning what God requires us to *believe* or *do*: And that which it judges to be true, or our *Duty*, is to be held so by us, so far as that we may not act contrary, for any Advantage, or Loss, whatsoever. Indeed, if my Judgment err, I am bound to lay down my *Error*, but till I am convinced,



vinced, I must not act against my Conscience. It is one thing to do *according to my Conscience*, and another to *go against it*, when it is erroneous: I say not that I am bound to act *according to my Conscience*, when I *err*, because I am bound to find my *Error*, and leave it, but I am bound never to go *against it*. The Reason at bottom here lies in that School-Axiom, that *Affirmative* Precepts binds *Semper* only, but *Negatives ad Semper*. I will use no Words to explain it; but say with our *Protestants*, that it is *Conscience*, for certain, that is the final *Judge* of what we are to *believe*, and what to do, according to the *Rule*: and that whatsoever we verily believe the *Word of God*, (which is the *Rule*) does requires of us, it must be obligatory to every Body. The *Church* or *Ministers* are Helps to inform us, but that which obliges is *Conscience*; that is, the *Word* or *Will of God*, as we understand it, not as any *others* understand it, lays the Obligation on us.

As for the *Roman* Opinion of God's appointing an *External Judge* to deliver the Sense of *Scripture*, and that we must follow that Sense, though against our own Judgment (which their Opinion must come to;) it does destroy Humane Nature, it unmans us of our Reason, it must make all of them wicked; that is, not to act by *Conscience*, when *what is not of Faith is Sin*. Besides, that it is an Inconsiderate, Captivated, Presumptuous Opinion, because it must imply, that there is some *One Body*, either *Single* or *Collective*, that is infallible. They must make their *Pope* or their *Church* infallible, or else their Judgment will do no more to end Controversies than every one's own Judgment. And that the *Roman Church* may be *Judge*, she hath the Face to declare her *self* to be infallible, that is, indeed to take on her an Attribute of the alone Omniscient God, which is open Blasphemy, even one of the Characters which the *Beast*, and the *Whore*, do bear in the *Revelations*.

There is one Text here fit to be mentioned, *No Scripture is of any private Interpretation*. From whence I suppose they may be apt to say to me, We must therefore go to the *Fathers* for the Interpretation of the *Scriptures*; and if they vary, and there be any Controversy, then the *Pope* and *Councils* must decide it, but no private Man may interpret any of them. This, let me tell them, is a Fundamental Mistake of the Place. In the *Acts* we read, That those of *Berea* were more noble than them of *Thessalonica*, for they searched the *Scriptures* daily whether those Things were so. How could these good Men now examine what was deliver'd by *Paul*, in comparing  
Scripture



Scripture with Scripture, unless they had the Use of a *private Judgment of Discretion*, inseparable from every Body? And how shall any of the *Pope's Doctrines* be unquestionable, when that which *Peter* himself, or *Paul*, did deliver, was subject to Examination by the *Scriptures*? I will therefore say one thing here, what, perhaps, may seem strange, it is this. Let a Text of Scripture have the Interpretation of a *Father*, of a *Pope*, and many *Popes*, and of a *Council*, and let the Doctrine be Orthodox, and consonant to the Analogy of Faith, yet if that Interpretation be not the very Sense of the Place, that is, the very Meaning of the *Writer*, and the *Holy Ghost* that inspired it; that Sense, whatsoever, and whose-soever it be, is but a *private Interpretation*.

When St. *Peter* tells us, That all Scripture is by *Divine Inspiration*, and the Men of God spake as they were moved by the *Holy Ghost*, therefore no Scripture is of *private Interpretation*, what think we he does intend? Doth he here set up an *Infallible Successor*? No such Matter, but this he intends, that the true Interpretation of Scripture is that Sense, which is the Meaning of the *Spirit*, the Sense of the *Holy Ghost*, and consequently the very *Mind* of the *Apostle*, or *Prophet*, that wrote. That is, the *Authentick Sense* is the only Sense, and all other Senses but this are *private Interpretation*, which we must not follow. I will collect from hence, that when *Popes* and *Councils* ordinarily do take up the Interpretation of Scriptures from *Fathers*, or those before them, without questioning it, one single judicious Man, who by long Study and Prayer beats out the Sense of some Text, is more to be regarded (as to that Text) than any *Council*, *Pope* or *Fathers*. And as such a one himself, so long as he believes that to be the very Meaning of the *Holy Ghost*, is bound to follow it, and no other; so is every one that is convinced by him bound likewise to the same, whatsoever any *Pope*, *Father*, or *Council*, shall say to the contrary.

I know the Papists do brag, and tell of what Advantage their Church hath above ours, in that if any *Varieties of Opinion* arise, they may be agreed, by referring them to *One Judge*. But I must tell again, there is no such Judge, God hath appointed no such *One Judge*. In the Matter of *Religion* I am at God's Bar; and whatsoever my *Conscience* tells me is *God's Will*, or *God's Meaning*, I can't depart from it. In Matters of my *Estate* I can refer them to a *Judge*; I may part with my *Estate*, but in the Matter of *Religion* it is not so, I can't part with my *Soul*, I can't put my *Salvation*, into any Man's Hands



Hands to dispose of according to his Discretion ; I am at *God's Bar* ; and I cannot appeal from him ; my *Conscience* to me is instead of *God* ; it is under him, the *Discerner* of the Sense, and there is none but he is *Lord* over it ; none, whose Controul it is, or can be subject to, but *His*. As for *Variety of Opinions* among *Christians*, I will yet say this, so long as the *Creed* of the *Apostles*, and all Things necessary to Salvation, are plain, I do not think the Danger of them so great, and so necessary to be prevented, as others do. Some *Varieties in Opinion* will not hurt *God's Church*, any more than a *Variety of Flowers* will hurt the *Garden* of a *Man*.

Having no more then to say on the Point, I will, by way of Surplusage, give some Reasons which do move *me*, that I can never come into their Church, though I believe nothing like to be sufficient to prevail with them to bring them out of it.

The first is; the *Universal Headship* which their Church challenges to the *Pope* over all Christians in the World. An Office so impossible to be executed, that it is an astonishing Thing that ever the Imagination of those Two wrested Texts, *Thou art Peter, and feed my Sheep*, should bring so many to the Belief, that so monstrous a Charge should be of Christ's Appointment. Alas ! What Man, unbiaised by Education, does not see how Worldly Greatness, Wealth, Honour, and Domination, is the Bottom of this ? I will suppose you one come from *Rome*, and had seen the Triple Crown, the Red Hats, the Grandeur and Glory of that Court ; I would ask what think you of these Things ? What think you of them in Relation to *God* ? Is this, think you, his *Son's Coat* ? What think you of them in Relation to *Peter* ? Is this the Successor, and these the Emoluments of a Fisherman ? Of one that went about Preaching the Gospel in Self-denial, and laying down his Life for it, without seeking any Advantage but of his own and his Hearers Salvation ? *The Princes of the Gentiles exercise Dominion over them, and they that are great exercise Authority upon them. It shall not be so among you ; but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your Minister. And whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your Servant. Even as the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and give his Life a Ransom for many.*

The second is, the Doctrine of *Infallibility*, before named. If the *Pope* be *Universal Pastor*, then must the *Law* be sought at his *Mouth*, and he be infallible. But if this indeed be so, what means the *Bleating of the Sheep*, and the *Lowings of the Oxen*, which I hear



within their *Camp*. What a wretched Piece of Sloth must here be in their *Church*, that all *Controversies* in their *Schools*, as of the *Scotists* and *Thomists*, and in their *Cloysters*, as of the *Franciscans* and *Dominicans*, with the like, are not determined, and all Parties set at Peace?

The third is the *Schism*, the notorious Schism of their Church. They have defined the *Church Catholick* by a Number of those that are united under the *Pope*, as *Christ's Vicar*; and whosoever are not within that *Communion*, they must be out of the *Church*, which is with them out of the *Ark*, where there is no *Salvation*. By this Definition they have damned, and do damn all other *Churches*, and all other Men and Women besides themselves throughout the whole World. I pray now what was the *Schism* of the *Donatists*, but their confining the *Church* to themselves in *Africa*? And if the *Venom* of *Schism* lies mainly in *Uncharitableness*, what a Petty Evil was there in that fading *Schism*, in Comparison of theirs that lasts so many Generations?

The fourth is their Churches Cruelty, for these Four Things do hang one upon another. If the *Pope* will be the *Universal Head*, and *Infallible*, and the *Single, Roman, Church* be the *Catholick*, then let any *Doctrine* be determined by a *Council* and *Pope*, it must be made thereby a *Point De Fide*; and if any Man do not receive it, he must be accounted to be one out of the *Faith*, and a *Heretick*; and if he be so, their *Casuits* determine him to have no longer Right to *Esteem*, *Goods* or *Life*, but all must be confiscated, and he deliver'd over to the *Secular Power* to be destroyed and burnt. Alas! now what Man can number the cruel Slaughter of *Thousands*, if not *Millions*, of Men and Women, otherwise innocent (such as the *Waldenses*, and their Fellows) that have been executed by the *Decrees of Popes*? Who can look into their *Inquisition-Houses*, and see what relentless Severities, what Invention of Tortures, Racks, Immurings, and such Proceedings they use there, but his Heart will bleed, and rise in Indignation against such a Religion, as the very worst Religion, the most cursed Religion in the World was never found to do the like? While their demure Fathers of *St. Dominick*, who pretend, under *Christian Rome*, to be Followers of the *Lamb*, do prove indeed no less fell, savage, barbarous, and no less Leaches of Blood, than were the *Worshippers* of the *Dragon*, or the *Dragon* himself, while *Rome* was *Pagan* under the Ten Persecutions. Alas! how many of their *Refugees* of *France* go about our Streets every Day as Witnesses of what I am speaking, having fled from that Religion



Religion there, whose *Mercies* are but *Extremity* ; whose *Deliverance*, *Banishment* ; and whose *Zeal* is a *consuming Fire*.

There are Two Things more I will not insist long upon, because they depend not on the former, and are exagitated sufficiently by others. The one is the *Idolatry* of the *Church of Rome*, particularly in her Doctrine of *Daimons*, or Worship of dead Men and Women, as the Heathen did : And in the Adoration of the *Host*, making *God* of a Piece of *Bread*, which no Man but by going out of his Senses can believe ; and if his Sense be deceived in such a Case, he can be sure of nothing else in the Earth. The other is the *Fooleries* of their *Church* ; particularly in the numberless *Ceremonies*, and the *Significations* thereof, which she hath in her Worship, especially at *Baptism*, and at the *Mass* : In her strange, fond, and babyish Doing with her *Images* ; the cloathing and uncloathing them ; the going a Pilgrimage to them ; praying before them, and many times to them : In their *Saints Relicks*, and Abuse of such Things ; in the *Pope's* divers sorts of *Blessings* impressed upon *Trinkets*, which they carry about them against evil Accidents ; their *Holy Water*, and *Indulgencies*, which signifies as little ; in their *Legends* and *Fables* of counterfeit *Miracles* ; with a Multitude of such *Trumpery*, as cannot be reckoned up, without making our ordinary *Protestants* to smile, if not laugh downright, when they ought rather to fetch Tears out of the Eyes of the more Serious, to see how the Ancient, Plain, Primitive, Service of *Jesus Christ*, and that Spiritual Worship that is due to *God*, is corrupted with so much *Superstition*, and simple People abused with so many Tricks, to delude them, and get their Money. *This their Way is their Folly, yet their Posterity approve their Sayings.*



O F

# Venial Sin.

**I** Have here but one Question to be ask'd, Whether a Protestant may allow the Distinction of *Mortal* and *Venial Sin* ? And how ? I thus determine it.

Seeing all Venial Sin is Venial, not in its Nature, but through Mercy ; and Mortal Sin through God's Mercy is pardoned, the Question is, What Difference here may be found between the one Sin and the other, as will serve for the Allowance of such a Distinction ? For doing which, the Mercy of God (we must reflect) in pardoning Sin is dispensed by way of Covenant, which requires Repentance in order to Pardon ; and we must distinguish therefore of Repentance, and of Sins requiring it.

There is a *General* and *Particular* Repentance, and there are some Sins accordingly requiring the one only, and some requiring both. There are Sins pass us often without our Notice, Sins of Infirmity and of daily Incurfion, which are pardonable on our general Repentance ; when there are other Sins, known, wilful Sins, which are not pardoned without particular Sorrow for them, and Amendment.

And now hereby may the Distinction of *Venial* and *Mortal* Sin be made out and allowed : A Venial Sin being such, for which a general Repentance thro' God's Goodness may suffice ; but a Mortal, such, for which a particular Repentance, even by the Covenant of Grace, is necessary, as the Condition, to the Forgiveness of it. The one is, the other is not, (*secundum Legem ordinariam*) pardoned without it.



---



---

# O F P R A Y E R,

## With Reference to Liturgical and Ex- temporary Devotion.

**C**ONCERNING Prayer, there are four things to be distinguished, and presented: The Spirit of Prayer; the Gift of Prayer; Praying in the Spirit; Praying by it, or with it.

*The Spirit of Prayer* I apprehend to be no other than the Spirit of Grace and Regeneration, with the Connotation of its Operation on the Soul, in regard to this Duty. There is no Christian, born of God, without this, whereby he cries, *Abba, Father*; as no Man born after the Flesh, without his Breathing. There is no holy Thought, Meditation, Desire after God, or Request that is acceptable to him in Christ, but it is from this Spirit of Adoption or Prayer. It follows then, that for as much as any gracious or regenerate Man may use a Form if he please, and some such have and do use a *Form*, and some *conceived Prayer*, that it is a Conceit exceedingly extravagant, and no wise to be approved, to think that a Liturgy, or Use of a Form is inconsistent with the Spirit of Prayer. What godly Man could think so, when they saw those holy Men and Martyrs, *Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, Bradford, Rogers, Philpot*, saying their Prayers out of the Psalter, and Blessing God for the Book of King *Edward*; *I will pour upon the House of Judah and Jerusalem the Spirit of Prayer and Supplication.*

*The Gift of Prayer*, I account a natural or acquir'd, not infused Ability or Faculty of expressing the Thoughts and Affections with Fluency or Readiness in Prayer. It does depend chiefly, I think, upon an Aptness of Memory, retaining the Sentences and very  
Words



Words of Scripture, when others can retain the Sense only, together with a warm Fancy, and Tongue that is voluble. In short, it is a ready Utterance, which must be distinguished from the former mentioned. I my self knew, and remember a godly Person, a Scholar, and fill'd always with present Matter for Discourse in Religion, who in praying sometimes alone with me, did hum and huck so in his Prayer, as I never heard any; when yet, in the mean while, I have been so assured of the Grace of God, and Eminency of that Grace in the Person, of that Sincerity in his Duty, such an humbling under Sin, Fervency in his Petitions, melting under the Sense of God's Mercy and Pardon; and, in a word, a Heart ~~it~~ self no less broken than those Words, that I cannot but be satisfy'd, beyond doubt, for ever since, that the *Gift* of Prayer is one thing, and the *Spirit* of Prayer another.

Now so far as the Gifts which God gives to any Ministers, are bestowed for Use, and the Edification of their People, if you could say, that a Liturgy, or Form of Prayer, does stand in Opposition to that Provision he hath made, and appointed for the Good of his Church; that is, *Gifts unto Men for the Work of the Ministry*: so as that Text of Paul, *The Manifestation of the Spirit is given to every Man to profit withall*; and that of Peter, *As every one hath received the Gift, even so minister the same one to another*, were applicable in our Case, I know no Argument any have against a Liturgy, like to turn religious Christians from it, as this: But we must consider, first, That the *Gifts* here spoken of, were extraordinary, that is, objectively and immediately inspir'd; so that it were to oppose the holy Ghost, to forbid, hinder, or stint that Operation of his then, tho' it was to be orderly exercised. Whereas the Gifts that any have now, are ordinary, the Assistance, Help, or Operation of the holy Spirit, being subjective and mediate only, in the Use of our own Reason and Wit; that is, of our own Parts, which are liable to Defect, and may admit of Rule. And yet seeing the Spirit helping our Infirmities in our Prayers is denied of none, but to be sought, whether we pray by Heart or Book, the Church's imposing a Liturgy, and set Form on the Minister, is to be reverently look'd upon as cumulative, not destructive to his Gifts. There is the Gift of Prayer to Ministers as *single*, and as in *Conjunction*: And when the Common-Prayer, which is a Composition of their Gifts conjoined, is performed in the *Pew*, the Minister is left to the Use of his single Gift in the *Pulpit*, without any Prejudice of the one by the other.

In-



Indeed, if the Common Prayer be made a Napkin, to wrap up the Talents of any, I will not justify the Abuse of that which hath its Use and Commendation, upon other Reasons. *There are Diversity of Gifts, but the same Spirit.*

*Praying in the Spirit*, I apprehend to be, Praying with the Qualifications which are wrought in us by the Spirit, and prescribed by him in the Word, to make our Prayers acceptable to God. Praying in the Spirit, say Practical Divines, consists not in a Copiousness of Words, but Extent of Affection. The actuating of all does lie in the Operation of the Spirit on our Hearts in this Duty. We must pray also *according to God's Will*, which is another Qualification in Prayer; and when a Man does pray according to what the Spirit hath directed in the Word, he may be said, very appositely, to pray in the Spirit. The several Qualifications requir'd in Prayer, as praying in Faith, with Perseverance, in the Name of Christ, and the like, which are in all practical Books, belongs to Common Places, and is not my intended Business.

Two Things there are then more particularly, wherein I will place this Operation: the one is, The Spirit doth many times pitch the Heart upon those Objects or Things which are most fit for us to ask. The other is, He then excites and enlarges our Affections about the same: *The Spirit also helpeth our Infirmities, for we know not what we should pray for as we ought, but the Spirit it self maketh Intercession for the Saints according to the Will of God.* It is said, that Satan entred Judas, when he went to betray his Lord; and Satan moved David to number the People: It appears from hence, that Satan puts evil Thoughts into the Heart, and pitches them on Objects he tempts them with. The Spirit of God doubtless does no less in the good Actions which he stirs up in God's Saints. *He puts good Thoughts in the Mind* (says a learned Church-man, as I remember) *and represents Things to us.* Or it were not else to be imagined, the Apostle should speak expressly what I have but now cited. And seeing therefore, that the Spirit doth not only move the Affections, in relation to the Things the Heart is upon, in those *Groans*, which are said to be *unutterable*, but pitches the Heart (objectively I will suppose) upon those Things, those very Things or Objects themselves (sometimes at least) that are most suitable to our Wants, which he knows better than we, and most agreeable to God's Will, whether we regard his Promises and *Word*, or the Will of his *Providence*, and what he is minded to effect, which he alone does



know, and not we: It does seem, that the prescribing a set Form to our Prayers, does put some stint upon God's Spirit, in one part of this Operation, which is the suggesting good Thoughts, or the good Things themselves into our Minds, or pitching ours Hearts upon the things he knows best for every one, which the Minister knows not; and yet I dare not say this is evil, seeing it is but for the while, and puts no stint to him in his Operation on the Affections, exciting or enlarging them upon the Petitions the Church hath prescribed.

There are many Reasons *in regard to the Minister*, if he have no Gift, or if he have, and have not Grace, lest he be lifted up in the Ostentation of it: And *in regard of the People*, under some Considerations, why a set Form is more eligible, when in regard of the humbly Godly, who are endued with the *Gift and Spirit* both, I do not see any reason, why a fluent Expression, a raised Voice, a Zeal in the Delivery, a melting Soul-touching Phrase out of Scripture, with Newness and Variety of the same, and the like Circumstances, which many times pierce the Heart, that is flat otherwise, and hath need of all we can to quicken it, should any way be derogatory (as one would make it) to the sound and wholsome Requests otherwise which a Man puts up to God in his Prayers.

And why indeed (let me ask) should not the Church be as ready to use those Gifts which God hath given unto any, to excite the People the more to their Devotion, as well as they are to make use of *Organs*, and Diversity of *Voices*, in their choosing singing Men and singing Boys, to that purpose? The same Psalm in an Anthem, hath another Operation on the Heart of a devout Conformist out of the Mouth of a Quire, than it hath in a private Parlour. And if a Nonconformist does find the like Experience as to an Extempore Prayer, above any Composure, why should a religious Person say any thing against it? The Use of a Man's Gifts in Prayer is but an Organ of God's making, a warbling and holy Descant upon the plain Requests of the Heart, to affect it the more with them; and an Organ is the Use of those Gifts, as I may say, which are of Man's making, or which Man hath given to the Church for the same end, to wit, the enlivening our dull Affections, while we are meditating, praying, and praising the Almighty.

This I must say with Faithfulness, yet not without two or three Cautions: The one is, That in Prayers the Church hath composed, we may humbly conceive, that the Spirit of God did pitch the  
Hearts



Hearts of those that were to join in their Gifts for the Composure, upon those Objects or Matter which is most generally agreeable to our publick Congregations, as it does the Heart of any single Minister, upon those things as is most agreeable to his Will for the present Occasion. Another Caution is, that if a Minister hath not the Gift to express himself without Study, and does therefore take Pains for his Prayer, as for his Preaching, having a Gift upon his Pains and Study (tho' none else) that does equal, if not excel his that hath the best without it, he may expect the same Assistance on his Study, that the Spirit should help his Infirmary, as to the putting in his Mind those things which are most conducive for his People to receive, and most agreeable to his Will to give, as any other may, who hath the readiest Gift to follow his present Motions. The last Caution is, That tho' a Minister should therefore take heed of drying up his Gifts, by one constant Form in the Pulpit, where he hath Liberty, yet if any do, and his Ministry be less grateful to many, that's no ground sufficient for Separation from him; because all know, that he who prays with the largest Gifts of Prayer, does but offer a stinted Form as to the Hearer's particular State, and the stinting the Object does not yet stint the Spirit in his Operation on the Affections; *Praying always with all manner of Prayer, and Supplication in the Spirit.*

Praying with the Spirit, or by it, in the last place, is that we find in the Days of the Apostles, when they had extraordinary Administrations of the Spirit, in Gifts that were miraculous, in so much that they who spake with Tongues, and so preached and prayed (some of them, at least, I apprehend) understood not themselves what they deliver'd, but every Man in whose Tongue they spake were edify'd; and therefore we read of some that did *interpret*. Those were such, it is like, as had Skill in more Tongues than their own; or else, in case there were none such, the same miraculous Power might enable some for the Interpretation, as others to speak. Thus praying with the *Spirit* is opposed to praying with the *Understanding*, and the Apostle prefers praying with the *Understanding* before it; so as no Person therefore need to brag of this if he had it; and there is none but the mistaken Enthusiast now to pretend to it. *I will pray with the Spirit, and I will pray with the Understanding also.*



O F

# Preaching,

With Reference to St. *Paul's* Example.

Q U E S T.

**W** *Hat is it, to preach in the Demonstration of the Spirit, and of Power? And are we Ministers bound to preach as he did?*

A N S W.

Unless it were an Apostle that preached, who might preach from present Revelation, or with the Miracle of the Holy Ghost falling on the Hearers. To speak or preach in the Demonstration of the Spirit, by the ordinary Minister, is to deliver the very Truth of the Scripture, or the plain Sense of the Spirit in Scripture, in Opposition to humane Conceit or Invention; so long as it be but *sound Speech, not to be reproved*, according to the Talent God has given him: And to speak so, is to speak in *Power*; because a Man may expect that Assistance of the Holy Ghost, to accompany such preaching in Humility; which he cannot, upon his seeking Praise, from his presumed Excellency, or enticing Words of Man's Wisdom.

O F



---



---

# O F T H E AUTHORITY O F T H E Laws of M E N.

**T**His is a Point concerns the Conscience, and is therefore of great Moment ; I will be plain and short in my Endeavour to determine it. To say, that the Laws of Men do not bind the Conscience at all, is too loose ; and to say, that the Breach of every Law is a deadly Sin, is too rigorous. *A Mean there is between these Extremities* (says Mr. Hooker) *if so be we could find it out.* I must confess, I cannot say I have read and observ'd any who have ventured to chalk out this Mean, so as I should gather any other Satisfaction from it, but to make me content my self the better with my own Sentiments.

The Magistrate, I account with the Apostle, is the *Minister of God* for the People's Good. If he command in order to that End, I think his Commands ought to be obey'd, not only for fear of his Sword, but for *Conscience sake*. But if he commands any thing for the People's hurt, or that which is evidently not for their Good, I think his Command (if the Matter be not Sin) is yet to be obeyed for *Wrath sake*, and so not to be contemned ; but I think not any Obligation lies on the Conscience (if it can be avoided without Contempt and Scandal) that it should be done. We must distin-



guish here between the Authority that resides in the *Person*, and the Authority of this or that his *particular Command*. I apprehend, that when any Command or Law does require *that* which is *Morally* or *Civilly* evil, every such Command or Law is really divested of Authority, and so may be left undone, without Breach on a Man's Conscience; yet if a Man be brought to question about it, he must suffer, because the Authority which resides still in the *Person* must be submitted to, as to the Ordinance of *God*. He must not *resist*, that is express; and rather than resist, he must suffer; whereas if he could avoid it without Resistance, he was not bound in good earnest either to do or suffer. Where we are not obliged *ad agendum, ad patiendum*, (says *Grotius*) *tum denum ubi pœna evitari, nisi vi opposita non potest*. De Imp. Sum. Pot. circa Sacr. p. 98.

The Reason of this at bottom lies here, and is firm. Power in the Magistrate, or *Civil Power*, which is the ground of Subjection, does lie not in *Might*, Strength, or Force, but in *Right*. *Potestas* (say Political Writers) is *jus imperandi*. This Right, in the Nature of the Thing, must arise from the *Grant* or *Will* of the supreme Lord, which is *God's*, without whose *Will* (or that Grant or Charter, which is an Act of his *Will*) no Power can be derived to any. Now that Grant or Will of *God*, which constitutes any to rule, or to be his *Minister*, being for the People's Weal, (He is the *Minister of God for our Good*, says the Text) it follows, that whatsoever is not indeed for the People's *Good*, the Magistrate is not to command, because it is *God's Will* he should command only for their *Good*. And if he command any Matter that is otherwise, that Command hath no Authority, as to the Conscience, at all, as being without the Warrant of *God's Will*. This is such Doctrine, which is plain, and stands on its own Bottom. *He is the Minister of God for thy Good*, saith *St. Paul*, otherwise he is not *God's Minister*, and hath to other Purposes none of *God's Power*. *Dr. Taylor* in his Cases, l. 3. p. 35. *Quod necessariam non habet Conjunctionem cum fine publici commodi, non potest præcepi lege humana*, saith *Suarez*, from the Schools.

One Difficulty only there is, which is this; Who shall judge, whether a Law be for the People's *Weal* or not? I answer, the Magistrate must judge as to the *Making* the Law, and we must judge as to our *Obedience* to it. My reason is plain, because *God* hath made every Man the Judge of his own Actions, and consequently of all Circumstances, whether they are agreeable or not agreeable to his

*Will*,



*Will*, for his Forbearance or doing of them; so that it is not according to the Resolution of another's Conscience, but of his own, or the Judgment of *private Discretion*, he shall be justify'd, or not justify'd in his walking before him. Let a Law then be promulgated, wherein a Man is concerned, I thus determine; If he deal uprightly, and in his Conscience does judge that the Law is *good*, I mean good for the general (whether their temporal or spiritual Good) I do apprehend he is obliged in Conscience to obeying that Law (at least so far as his particular Obedience is conducive to that Good) tho' the keeping it otherwise be to his own Disadvantage or private Loss. If he judges it not *good*, I do suppose he may do well in Prudence to be wary, and do perhaps as others do, and not run himself into Harm's way. But really if he observe it not, he is to make no Conscience of it, as if the Thing offended God, whether he does it, or leaves it undone. And this is the very *Mean*, I think, which is to be sought, and hath been to seek, to wit, That the Laws or Commands of the higher Powers does no less than bind the *Conscience* (even in political and indifferent things) when he is the Executioner of *God's Will*: But tho' the *outward Man* (out of the Case of Sin) may be bound, the *Conscience* cannot be obliged, and ought to be kept free still, when he is Executioner only of his own. *Human Laws* (says the forenam'd Doctor and Bishop) *bind the Conscience of the Subject, but yet give place to just and charitable Causes: Which are competent and sufficient, is not expressly and minutely declared; but it is to be defined by the Moderation and Prudence of a good Man.*

To conclude, As God, our Sovereign Lord, hath given us the Scriptures for a Rule of Religion, that when any thing is required of us to believe or practice, as necessary to God's Worship, or our Salvation, we may, and are to try it by this Rule, and can be obliged thereby no farther than we do judge it agreeable to this Rule, the Word of God. And as in *Morals* he hath given us the Law of Nature (which is God's Will, as the Scripture is) to be our Rule to judge of Vertue or Vice, that we may avoid the one, and pursue the other: So hath he given to Man his Rule in *Politics*, (which is written in our fleshy Tables, as the Law of Nature is) whereby the Laws of every Commonwealth are to be made, try'd and judg'd, the Law-giver being accountable to God, according as he acts by it, and the People oblig'd in Conscience so far to obey his Will, as he commands agreeable to it, and this Rule or Law is the *Common Good*. Things are religiously good or evil, as they agree



gree or agree not with the Scriptures: Things are morally good or evil as they agree or not with the Law of Nature; And things are politically good or evil as they agree and agree not to the publick Benefit. If the Subject now, in such Matters that are Commonwealth Matters, must not judge, and be Judge himself of what is commanded by Man, whether it be agreeable or no to this Rule, that is, whether as to his Practice it be conducive or no to the common Good, he is not only made a *Slave*, but a *Brute* to his Prince, which divests him of Reason; and to argue for it, is absurd. *Salus Populi suprema Lex.*

*An APPENDIX to this Head.*

**F**ROM the Determination upon this Head concerning Human Laws, and our conscientious Obligation by them, there is a ground tacitely laid to promote the publick Good, in a Matter of greatest Concernment to the Nation. The Government of our Land we know does lie in Parliaments, which are called and convened to consult *de arduis Regni*, and so to make or repeal Laws, as in other Regards, so in an especial Regard for the Redress of Grievances.

There is now hardly ever any publick Grievance, but when it comes to be complained of, there is the Interest of some private Person or Persons, which they call *Property*, stands in the way of the Redress; and here is then a Principle to be laid down, upon which all Polity or Government hath its Foundation, to wit, that there is a *Universale eminens Dominum*, in the supreme Power of every Nation, for the publick Interest, that must take place, and put an End to all Contest *de jure Privatorum*. By *Dominion*, the Politick Writers do not mean Empire, but such a Power as every Man hath over his own Goods; that is all one as a Right of Possession: And they say, there is a Dominion or Right in the supreme Authority on the behalf of the Commonwealth, which is superiour to that which the private Man hath in what he possesseth; so that tho' there is a *Meum & Tuum* between one private Man and another, there is none between a private Man and the Publick. The Commonwealth hath a Right in all, and the supreme Authority, (which lies in a Parliament) over all, for the common Good.

To this purpose there is a Saying of *Antoninus*, Τὸ τῷ μὴ σμίνει σύμμερον ἔδει τι μελίω σμζέει, *What is not profitable to the Bee-hive, is not for*



*for the Profit of the Bee.* Cicero says the same in other words, The Emolument of the Publick must be sought before the private; so that whatsoever Profit or Property (if you will so call it) that the private Person enjoys, it must not be allowed, but resumed, if it be to the Detriment of the Commonwealth, or if the Good of the Publick requires it. And this is a Principle to be held, as a Rule of Conscience to every Parliament-Man, insomuch as in case any one does vote against the Redress of a publick Grievance, for saving a private Loss, he commits a Parliament Sin, and can have no good Conscience, but in his superiour Regard to the Publick. He may indeed have a Tenderness and Pity for the private Man's Damage. But if it proceed to the giving his Vote for maintaining the Grievance, such a Pity to the private Man, is to be *merciless* to his Country, and untrue to his Trust.

If any conscientious Man now shall scruple in the Case, there is one Instance may satisfy him; and that is of the *Israelites*, who when they went out of *Egypt*, did, by the Command of God, borrow of the *Egyptians* their Jewels and Treasure, and carried it away with them. No doubt but these things were the *Egyptian's* Property; but so long as God's Dominion was superiour over theirs, and he disposed thereof, the Egyptian Property was vacated, and the *Israelites* went away with their own. The Case is the same here; a publick Grievance is to be taken away, but the Property of some private Persons is pleaded for it. The Answer is the same; there is a super-eminent Dominion in the Commonwealth over what the private Person has. The Parliament does but do the Commonwealth Right, and the private Interest is at an End. If this Principle be taken in as it ought, it will be as Seed sown in good Ground, to bring forth Fruit for the Generation to come.



## O F T H E

## Power of the Magistrate about Religion.

**T**Here is a Book I wrote on this Subject against Mr. *Parker*, (before he was a Bishop) the young *Leviathan* that follow'd *Hobs*, in giving to Kings a Power over the Conscience. A dangerous Position, which having rebuked there, I will offer here as to the Divinity Case, this Contraction.

There is a Difference to be held in the first place between the Magistrate's taking *Care of Religion*, and his compelling People to it. No body can force another to believe any thing which he doth not, and consequently not to practise any thing which is not be done but upon that Faith. There is a Difference again next, between the compelling Men to their Duty, even in Religion, which is according to their Consciences, and the compelling them to any thing *against* their Consciences, whatsoever it be in the World, especially in Matters of supernatural Revelation. To act against a Man's Conscience is Sin; but the Magistrate cannot command a Man to sin, *Non datur potestas ad malum*. There is a Difference, lastly, between the not *forcing* any to a Thing against their Consciences, which the Magistrate must take heed to do; and the *restraining* 'em from doing things according to their Consciences, when they are erroneous, and when if he let them alone, they may bring *themselves*, the *Church* or *State*, to Detriment or Ruin. There is no Toleration to be desir'd, or is desired of the sober Nonconformist, but one stated, and so far agreed to in the general, that the *Articles of our Christian Faith*, a good *Life*, and the *Government of the Nation* be secured.



## O F

# Subjection to our present QUEEN.

**W**Hereas there were many that could not submit to take the Oath of Fidelity to *K. William*, and join in the Association; and there are some that swear Allegiance to *Anne*, as *Queen de facto*, yet cannot come to an Acknowledgment of *William's* or her Right; and all such Doubts depend upon the sole Question about King *James's* conscionable Exclusion, whether it be justifiable or no, upon the account of that Scripture, *Rom. 13. 1, 2.* It is necessary the Apostle's Words be taken into Consideration, which are these, *Let every Soul be subject unto the higher Powers, for there is no Power but of God: The Powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the Power, resisteth the Ordinance of God, and they that resist, shall receive to themselves Damnation.*

For examining the Case there are two Distinctions here to be known: To offer more, were to confound, not edify. One is, between *Subjection* and *Obedience*. It is *Dr. Feild's* Distinction; and those that are for Non-resistance and Passive Obedience, gainsay it not. We are not always to obey the higher Powers, neither when they command what God forbids, or forbid what he commands; unto which, by the word *Passive*, they assent. But we are always (say they) to be in *Subjection*, and never rise up to deliver our selves from them. As to this point then of *Subjection* the Case is to be argued. Distinguish we therefore, in the second place, between these two things, which certainly are different, the Powers which *Are*, and the Powers which are *Not*. Understand it right, to wit,



the Powers that are, and the Powers that are not the Powers that are; or not those which the Apostle means or intends in the Text. This Distinction is certain, clear and plain to the Intelligent, and effectual to our Purpose. The Powers, the higher Powers, in the Text, the *ἐξουσίαι*, are the Powers that Be. This is express, that the Powers that Be, are the Powers in the Text, the Powers that are of God, the Ordinance of God, and they that resist them, shall receive to themselves Damnation. Let this be granted to these devoutly loyal Men; but then must they grant to me again, what can't be deny'd by any, that as for the Powers that are not in the Text, that is, the Powers that are, not the Powers that Be: As they are not in the Text, they are not the Powers which are of God, not the Ordinance of God: And they that resist such (and not the Powers that Be) shall not receive to themselves Damnation:

Now there is one Question to be ask'd, which alone will resolve the whole Case at Stake, and that is this, What is the true Meaning of the *ἐξουσίαι*, what is really and in good earnest (so as the Conscience may rest upon it) that which is meant by the Powers that Be? I answer, the Powers that be, are the Powers according to the present Constitution. There are some higher Powers (or Kings) whose Government is absolute, and so absolute, as that the Subjects have no Liberty of Person, or Property in Goods by their Constitution. But as for others ordinarily, there is to be supposed an Original Contract, which gives the People such Liberty and Rights, and the governing Powers such a Prerogative, as extends so far, and no farther than the Compact allows. And this appears (as I have been shewn in our old chief Law-Books) by consequence, tho' no full preserved Record thereof be of it; for the Law could not maintain the People in any Rights against their Sovereign, by virtue of our Constitution, if that Constitution were not supposed to be made by such an original Agreement with him.

There is therefore two things to be considered, the *Potestas* and *Forma Regiminis*, the Power and the Form in such Governments. In regard to the one, the higher Powers are the Ordinance of God, with Paul; in the other, the Ordinance of Man, with Peter. The Form is of Men. The People between themselves, or with their Governor, agree what the Government shall be, and then the Power flows from God, to rule so, and no otherwise, but according to that Form; which is all one as the Constitution. *Potestas est a Deo*, but *Forma ab hominibus*, says the most learned Bp. Andrews. If then  
the



the higher Powers for the Administration rule not by that Form, but designedly and resolutely, and not by a Slip and Inadvertency depart from it, the Power a *Deo*, the *Potestas* fails them, and they do *cadere de Jure*, fall from their Right to our Subjection.

I do remember therefore, that at the time when the Prince of Orange was yet in *Holland*, but preparing for his coming into *England*, I being upon occasion admitted into the Presence of King *James* alone, to speak with him, after some Words about the Danger and sad Effects of War, and my Desire of the Prevention, his Majesty was willing I should speak freely, and I said thus to him, If it please Your Majesty, I would advise you to send presently over to the Prince, to know what he would have, and to tell him, That whatsoever he would have, you will grant it him, if it be reasonable; and that you will call a Parliament immediately, to judge whether it be reasonable or no. We proceeding farther, came to speak about Liberty of Conscience, which he was for, to bring in Popery, and I, in good earnest. I used thereupon, as near as well may be remembered, these very words; If I were your Majesty, I would have Liberty of Conscience, (I would have it) but if you will have that, you must part with your dispensing Power (because we would have had that (I count) by a Law, and not by his dispensing with the Law) for if you will assume a dispensing Power (said I) you take a Power over the Laws, and you change your Government from Regal to Despotical, and they will fight with you; and they fight for the Government, and you against the Government. I spake with the best Elocution I had, and he heard me to the End. And then he stepped one Step backward, and said, *What you have spoken, you have honestly spoken, and conscientiously spoken, but you are out; I am a King, he but a Prince*, therefore he would not send to him. And then going on, he spake of the Prince fairly, as an excellent General, but as much concern'd, (says he) *He comes for my Crown; and no Man is so Despotical as he*; telling me, that he swore against being Statdholder, and yet he was; and falling to speak about Liberty of Conscience again, he express'd himself very fluently, till he dismiss'd me, which he did condescendingly, and took what I said in good part. Having said this therefore to his Person, to have saved him in his Throne, I may say the same as freely in Print. A dispensing Power, indefinitely maintain'd, is a Power over the Laws: A Power over the Laws subverts the Government: A Change of the Government absolves the Subject from his Allegiance. And is this alone my



Judgment? No, but of our Lawyers. *Rex sub Deo & sub Lege*, says *Bracton*: No, but of our Nation also, as appears by this Vote of their Representatives in the House of Commons, Jan. 28, 1683.

*Resolved*, That King James the Second having endeavoured to subvert the Constitution of the Kingdom, by breaking the Original Compact between King and People, and by Advice of Jesuits, and other wicked Persons, violated the fundamental Laws; and having withdrawn himself, hath abdicated the Government, and thereby the Throne is vacant.

The Government thus forfeited, by his breaking the Original Contract, and by his going then away, abdicated also, according to that Vote, a Convention is called, and the Supreme Power Personal ceasing, it descended into that our Politicks call *Real*, that is, it by *Escheat* (to use *Hooker's* Word) fell on the Community or People; Not for them to govern, (I must say) but to set up a Government; which is, in truth, a greater Power than that of *Parliament*: For a *Parliament* makes Laws for the *Administration* only of the Government: But a *Convention* (representing the forty Counties) might make those as they agreed for the *Constitution*. The Constitution of a Government, we are to know, is the Agreement of the People in setting it up, and there are three things go into it. The first thing they must agree in, is what *Kind* of Government it shall be; and this our *Convention* thought fit to be the same as it was, a *Monarchy*, but Mixt, Legal, Parliamentary, so as to be still a *Free State*, not to be violated by the Monarch. The second thing, is, what, or who the Persons shall be that govern; and these were soon determined, King *William* and Queen *Mary*, and after them our present Queen; and so far they went. The third thing they must agree in, is, What Extent their Government shall have, or what Qualifications shall be put on it, which, what they be, are to be read in the Act. And here may some, who love their Country, be ready hereafter to bethink the Opportunity this *Convention* hath slipt, in not declaring more fully the State hereof, and in putting no farther Limitations on it, of the like great Moment as this one is, that no Papist shall reign over us. For upon account hereof, the *Hanover* Family being of the Protestant Line, is to succeed, and their Title to the Throne stands good thereupon, but not on equal foot with the Queen's, for Her's is expressly establish'd by the *Constitution* it self; the Act of the *Convention*, so as no Prince can have a Title more manifest and uncontestable upon Earth. But this Constitution now leaving the People at Liberty after her,



to have chose what Government or Governor they pleased, an Act of Parliament is passed under *William*, to confine this Liberty, and settle the Throne in that Family ; which Act is a Law indeed of the *Administration*, not *Constitution*, yet strengthened by a Statute under *Elizabeth*, which makes such an Act to bind the Descent of the Crown ; and more by the Oath for the Succession, which being enjoin'd by the supreme Authority, does oblige those to take it that yet have not, and leaves no scruple to any, unless this in hand, in reference to the mentioned Text of the *Romans*, and King *James's* Deposition.

Having thought therefore long on the Matter, I have pitcht on this as the fundamental Exposition of the Place, that the *Powers that Be*, are the Government, or Governors, of every Country, according to its Constitution : And consequently that the Subjection or Non-resistance that is required of God, as due to the higher Powers, is a Subjection no other but according to the same. The Scripture, it is certain, does not go about to prescribe to, alter or meddle with the Governments of Nations ; but it supposes a Government in every Country, and commands Subjection and Non-resistance to the Government *that is*. We overturn all, if we preach otherwise than thus. *Evangelium non abolet Politias*.

And now then let it come to the Government of our Nation ; for we know, (and none pretend more than the Loyalist to stand by it) is *Basileia vouche*, a Government regulated by the Laws, and those no other than such as the People themselves yield to the making by their Representatives in Parliament ; that is, *Quas vulgus elegerit* ; which renders it a *Free State*, that is ever to be maintained. It is called a Legal and Regal Monarchy, because it is a Government by the Statutes of the Realm, and not according to the Will of the Lord. And such being the Constitution of our *Great Britain*, the Case, by the Precedent of King *James*, is resolved, that if any King hereafter (for of our Queen we have no fear) shall rule so, as really designing (that if he be not hindred, he will effect it) to change the Government, or *Manner of the Kingdom*, as the Scripture expresses it, from Legal to Arbitrary, from Regal to Despotical, and it shall please God to give the People, who are free Subjects, the happy Means of a Deliverance, they do not resist in this Case, or rise up against the *Powers that be*, the Powers in the Text, the Powers that are of God, the Ordinance of God ; but the Powers not in the Text, the Powers that are not of God, the Powers which



which are not the Ordinance of God, and it being indeed a rising in defence of, or *for* the Government, and not *against* the Government, and no resisting the *Powers that be*, they shall not receive to themselves Damnation. This is the Case of the Revolution.

It is objected by the conscientious Non-juror, that the Church in her Homilies ; all her chief Divines and Bishops, in their Books and Sermons, have constantly preached up Non-resistance and Passive Obedience, which is all one with *Subjection to the higher Powers* commanded by the Apostle. And this indefinitely is true, but the *Subjection* must be understood to be to the *Apostles* higher Powers, the Powers that *be*, the Powers in the Text, the Powers (I have said) according to our Constitution : And as for any Powers that are otherwise, and so not in the Text, neither they nor the Apostle ever required Subjection. This Answer is satisfactory, and I have something to say more, for *Cases may fall out* (says *Bilson*, that most judicious and excellent Prelate) *even in Christian Kingdoms, where People may plead their Right against the Prince, and not be charged with Rebellion. If a Prince shall go about to subject his Kingdom to a Foreign Realm, or change the Form of a Common-wealth from Impery to Tyranny.* This Instance has he, as I before. I will add, that *Barclay* and *Arniseus*, (those chief *French* Authors) who maintain their King's Authority to be inviolable, do themselves admit of such, and these very Exceptions, *Si Regnum alienet, si Rempublicam evertere conetur.* And yet there is no Case for all that, say they, wherein we may take Arms against the King, because in such Cases the King does *Regis Personam exuere* : And what is that, but in such Cases he is [not] the *higher Powers* in the Text (or the Powers of the Apostle) to whom Non-resistance is required. There are several other Cases *Grotius* reckons up, but this is beyond my Line ; and forasmuch as the *End* in a People's setting up a Governour is greater, (that is, of more Importance) than the *Means*, the Argument for the People against the Prince, in such Cases, is irrefragable.

For all this, to maintain Non-resistance, it is pleaded by some, that the Prince of *Orange* came, and was invited to other Ends, and not to depose King *James* ; only he went away, abdicated, and left the Government upon our Hands. Very pert, and in some measure true ; but had he done nothing, and was nothing done, to make him fear to stay ? When the Prince came with Forces, and the Nation join'd with him, to deliver themselves from Popery and Arbitrary



trary Power by his Means ; and a Convention (which represents the whole People) set up another King, and recall'd not him, which is, in Fact and Deed, all that is in Resistance and Deposition ; what an idle thing is it, to maintain it unlawful to resist, or take up Arms, in any Case, against a King (even in such a one as makes him none) and yet slabbber, and justify our Revolution.

There are two Reasons now for speaking of this Point. The one is, because there has been of late a great stir made by a Sermon preach'd on this Subject before the Queen, I suppose as innocently as loyally meant, but brought into Dispute ; and it is meet, that all scrupulous good Persons should be satisfy'd about the Government. The other is, to the end that those whom it pleases God hereafter to put over us, for to govern, may not be tempted by Love of their People, or Liberality of Parliaments, to make such use of their raised Strength as our Neighbour Kings have done, to go out of the Circle of our *British* Constitution : Especially knowing that the Spirit of the Nation, and the Conscience of it also, together with the *Form* of Government, is such, as not to bear, that under King *James* we should be *Papists*, and under any Successor, be *Slaves*.

---

There



**T**Here falling out here a blank Side to spare, I will fill it with  
 some Quotations, which I purposely omitted (to avoid swelling)  
 in the due place. *Barclaius ait amitti Regnum* (says Grotius)  
*si Rex hostili animo in totius populi exitium feratur: Quod concedo, con-*  
*sistere enim simul non possunt voluntas imperandi, & voluntas perden-*  
*di, De jure Bel. l. 1. c. 4. Quid ergo? Nulli ne casus incidere pos-*  
*sunt* (says Barclay himself) *quibus populo in Regem arma capere jure*  
*suo liceat? Nulli certe quamdiu Rex manet: Duos autem casus invenio;*  
*quibus Rex rex rege non Regem facit. Adversus Monarchomacos, l. 3.*  
*c. 16. As for our Bilson, he sets himself, de Industria, to maintain*  
 the Prince's Authority against the Pope, and yet in defending the  
 Protestants in their Stirs in Germany, France, Scotland, I will not  
 (says he) pronounce all that resist to be Rebels. Cases may fall out, as  
 I have cited two of them, and then he further says, *In these and o-*  
*ther Cases that might be named, if the Nobles and Commons join toge-*  
*ther, to defend the ancient and accustomed Liberty, Regiment, and Laws,*  
*they may not be accounted Rebels. In his Book (and excellent Book)*  
*of the true Difference between Christian Subjection, and Unchristian Re-*  
*bellion, p. 520. In fine, the Pope may not depose Princes; but*  
 the whole Realm may defend their Rights against them, according  
 to this eminent Bishop's Judgment; I deny'd (says he) *that Bishops*  
*had Authority to prescribe Conditions to Kings when they crown'd them,*  
*but I never deny'd that the People might preserve their Foundation-Free-*  
*dom, and Form of their Common-wealth, which they fore-prized when*  
*they consented to have a King, p. 521. There being yet a Line or*  
 two to fill, I will set down this Saying, because I like it, tho' it be  
 an Overplus, and not to this, but to other good Purpose: *Quæ ex*  
*jure nature dependent iis Princeps etiam tenetur, quia licet sit dominus a-*  
*liorum, subditus tamen est nature, & civis mundanus. Arniseus de*  
*Jure Majestatis Principum semper inviolabile, l. 1. c. 3.*

F I N I S.















