

## ARTICLE VII.

Of the Old Testament.

The Old Testament is not contrary to the New: for both in the Old and New Testament Everlasting Life is offered to Mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and Man, being both God and Man. Wherefore they are not to be heard which feign that the Old Fathers did look only for Transitory Promises.

Although the Law given from God by Moses, as touching Ceremonies and Rites, do not bind Christian Men, nor the Civil Precepts thereof ought to be received in any Commonwealth, yet notwithstanding no Christian Man whatsoever is free from the Obedience of the Commandments which are called Moral.

THIS Article is made up of the sixth and the nineteenth of king Edward's Articles laid together: only the nineteenth of king Edward's has these words after *moral*: *Wherefore they are not to be heard, which teach that the holy scriptures were given to none but to the weak; and brag continually of the Spirit, by which they do pretend that all whatsoever they preach is suggested to them; though manifestly contrary to the holy scriptures.* This whole Article relates to the Antinomians, as these last words were added by reason of the extravagance of some enthusiasts at that time; but that madness having ceased in queen Elizabeth's time, it seems it was thought that there was no more occasion for those words.

There are four heads that do belong to this Article: First, that the Old Testament is not contrary to the New. Secondly, that Christ was the Mediator in both dispensations, so that salvation was offered in both by him. Thirdly, that the ceremonial and the judiciary precepts in the law of Moses do not bind Christians. Fourthly, that the moral law does still bind all Christians.

To the first of these the Manichees of old, who fancied that there was a bad as well as a good God, thought that these two great principles were in a perpetual struggle; and they believed the old dispensation was under the bad one, which was taken away by the new, that is the work of the good God. But they who held such monstrous tenets must needs reject the whole New Testament, or very much corrupt it: since there is nothing plainer, than that the prophets of the Old foretold the New with approbation; and the writers of the New prove both their commission and their doctrine from passages of the Old Testament. This therefore could not be

affirmed without rejecting many of the books that we own, and corrupting the rest. So this deserves no more to be considered.

Upon this occasion it will be no improper digression, to consider what revelation those under the Mosaical law, or that lived before it, had of the Messias: this is an important matter: it is a great confirmation of the truth of the Christian religion, as it will furnish us with proper arguments against the Jews. It is certain they have long had, and still have, an expectation of a Messias. Now the characters and predictions concerning this person must have been fulfilled long ago: or the prophecies will be found to be false: and if they do meet and were accomplished in our Saviour's person, and if no other person could ever pretend to this, then that which is undertaken to be proved will be fully performed. The first promise to Adam after his sin, speaks of an enmity between the seed of the serpent and the seed of the woman: 'It shall Gen. iii. 15. bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.' The one might hurt the other in some lesser instances, but the other was to have an entire victory at last; which is plainly signified by the figures of bruising the heel, and bruising the head, which was to be performed by one who was to bear this character of being the woman's seed. The next promise was made to Abraham, 'In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed:' this was lodged in his seed or posterity, Gen. xii. 3. upon his being ready to offer up his son Isaac: that promise Gen. xxii. 18. was renewed to Isaac, and after him to Jacob: when he was Gen. xxvi. 24. dying, it was lodged by him in the tribe of Judah, when he Gen. xxviii. 14. prophesied, that 'the sceptre should not depart from Judah, nor the lawgiver from between his feet, till Shiloh should Gen. xlix. 10. come; and the gathering of the people,' that is, of the Gentiles, 'was to be to him.' It is certain the ten tribes were lost in their captivity, whereas the tribe of Judah was brought back, and continued to be a political body under their own laws, till a breach was made upon that by the Romans first reducing them to the form of a province, and soon after that destroying them utterly: so that either that prediction was not accomplished: or the *Shiloh*, the *Sent*, to whom the Gentiles were to be gathered, came before they lost their sceptre and laws.

Moses told the people of Israel, that God 'was to raise up Deut. xviii. 15. among them a prophet like unto him, to whom they ought to hearken,' otherwise God would 'require it of them.' The character of Moses was, that he was a lawgiver, and the author of an entire body of instituted religion; so they were to look for such a one. Balaam prophesied darkly of one whom he saw as at a great distance from his own time; and he spoke of a 'Star that should come out of Jacob, and a sceptre out Num. xxiv. 17. of Israel:' some memorial of which was probably preserved among the Arabians. In the book of Psalms there are many

A R T.  
VII.

things said of David, which seem capable of a much auguster sense than can be pretended to be answered by any thing that befell himself. What is said in the 2d, the 16th, the 22d, the 45th, the 102d, and the 110th Psalms, affords us copious instances of this. Passages in these Psalms must be stretched by figures that go very high, to think they were all fulfilled in David or Solomon: but in their literal and largest sense they were accomplished in Christ, to whom God said, 'Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee.' In him that was verified, 'Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thy Holy One to see corruption. His hands and his feet were pierced, and lots were cast upon his vesture.' Of him it may be strictly said, 'Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever.' To him that belonged, 'The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool.' And, 'The Lord sware and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedeck.'

The prophets gave yet more express predictions concerning the *Messias*. Isaiah did quiet the fears of Ahaz, and of the

Isa. vii. 14. house of David, by saying, 'The Lord himself shall give you a sign, Behold, a virgin shall conceive and bear a son.' It was certainly no sign for one that was a *virgin*, to conceive afterwards and bear a son; therefore the *sign* or extraordinary thing here promised as a signal pledge of God's care of the house of David, must lie in this, that one still remaining a *virgin* should conceive and bear a son; not to insist upon the strict signification of the word in the original. The same

Isa. xi. 1, 2. prophet did also foretell, that as this *Messias*, or the *Branch*, should spring from the stem of Jesse, so also he was to be full of the Spirit of the Lord; and 'that the Gentiles should seek to him.' In another place he enumerates many of the miracles that should be done by him: he was to give sight to the blind, make the deaf to hear, the lame to walk. He does

Isa. xxxv. 5, 6. further set forth his character; not that of a warrior or conqueror; on the contrary, 'He was not to cry nor strive, nor break the bruised reed, or quench the smoking flax; he was to bring forth judgment to the Gentiles, and the isles were to wait for his law.' There is a whole chapter in the same prophet, setting forth the mean appearance that the *Messias* was to make, the contempt he was to fall under, and the sufferings he was to bear; and that for the sins of others, which were to be laid on him; so that his soul or life was to be made an

Isa. liii. offering for sin, in reward of which he was to be highly exalted. In another place his mission is set forth, not in the strains of war, or of conquest, but of preaching to the poor, setting the prisoners free as in a year of jubilee, and comforting the afflicted and such as mourned. In the two last chapters of that prophet mention is made more particularly of the *Gentiles* that were to be called by him, and the *isles that were afar off*, out of whom God was to take some for *priests and Levites*:

Isa. lxi.

which shewed plainly, that a new dispensation was to be opened by him, in which the *Gentiles* were to be *priests and Levites*, which could not be done while the Mosaical law stood, that had tied these functions to the tribe of Levi, and to the house of Aaron. Jeremy renewed the promise to the house of David, of 'a king that should reign and prosper; in whose days Judah and Israel were to dwell safely, whose name was to be, The Lord our Righteousness.' It is certain this promise was never literally accomplished; and therefore recourse must be had to a mystical sense. The same prophet gives a large account of a 'new covenant that God was to make with the house of Israel, not according to the covenant that he made with their fathers, when he brought them out of Egypt.' We have also two characters given of that covenant: one is, that God 'would put his law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts;' that he would be their God, and that they should all be taught of him: the other is, 'that he would forgive their iniquities, and remember their sin no more.' One of these is in opposition to their law, that consisted chiefly in rituals, and had no promises of inward assistances; and the other is in opposition to the limited pardon that was offered, in that dispensation, on the condition of the many sacrifices that they were required to offer. There is a prediction to the same purpose in Ezekiel. Joel prophesied of an extraordinary effusion of the Spirit of God on great numbers of persons, old and young, that was to happen before the great and terrible day of the Lord, that is, before the final destruction of Jerusalem. Micah, after he had foretold several things of the dispensation of the *Messias*, says that he was to come out of Bethlehem Ephratah. Haggai encouraged those who were troubled at the meanness of the temple, which they had raised after their return out of the captivity. It had neither the outward glory in its fabric that Solomon's temple had, nor the more real glory of the ark, with the *tables of the Law*; of *fire from heaven on the altar*; of a *succession of prophets*; of the *Urim and Thummim*, and the *cloud* between the cherubims; which last, strictly speaking, was the glory; all which had been in Solomon's temple, but were wanting in that. In opposition to this, the prophet, in the name of God, promised that he would in a 'little while shake the heavens and the earth,' and 'shake all nations;' words that import some surprising and great change; upon which the 'desire of all nations should come, and God would fill the house with his glory;' and 'the glory of this latter house should exceed the glory of the former, for in that place God would give peace.' Here is a plain prophecy, that this temple was to have a glory, not only equal but superior to the glory of Solomon's temple: these words are too august to be believed to have been accomplished, when Herod rebuilt the temple with much magnificence; for that was nothing in comparison of the real glory, of the symbols

A R T.  
VII.Jer. xxiii.  
5.Jer. xxxi.  
31—34Ezek.  
xxxvi. 25,  
&c.  
Joel ii. 28,  
&c.

Micah v. 2.

Hag. ii. 6  
--9.

A. R. T.  
VII.

of the presence of God, that were wanting in it. This cannot answer the words, that the *desire of all nations* was to come, and that God would *give peace* in that place. So that either this prophecy was never fulfilled: or somewhat must be assigned during the second temple, that will answer those solemn expressions, which are plainly applicable to our Saviour, who was the expectation of the *Gentiles*, by whom peace was made, and in whom the eternal Word dwelt in a manner infinitely more august than in the cloud of glory.\* Zechary prophesied that *their King*, by which they understood the Messiah, was to be *meek and lowly*, and that he was to make his entrance in a very mean appearance, *riding on an ass*: but yet under that, he was to *bring salvation to them*, and they were to *rejoice greatly in him*. Malachi told them, that 'the Lord whom they sought, even the messenger of the covenant in whom they delighted, should suddenly come into his temple;' and that the day of his coming was to be dreadful; that he was to *refine and purify*, in particular, *the sons of Levi*; and a terrible destruction is denounced after that. One character

Zech. ix. 9.

Mal. iii. 1.  
3.

\* 'It cannot be conceived how the glory of the second temple should be greater than the glory of the first, without the coming of the Messiah to it. For the Jews themselves have observed that five signs of the divine glory were in the first temple, which were wanting in the second: as the Urim and Thummim, by which the high-priest was miraculously instructed of the will of God; the ark of the covenant, from whence God gave his answers by a clear and audible voice; the fire upon the altar, which came down from heaven, and immediately consumed the sacrifice; the divine presence or habitation with them, represented by a visible appearance, or given, as it were, to the king and high-priest by anointing with the oil of unction; and, lastly, the spirit of prophecy, with which those especially who were called to the prophetic office were endued. And there was no comparison between the beauty and glory of the structure and building of it, as appeared by the tears dropped from those eyes which had beheld the former, ("For many of the priests and Levites and chief of the fathers, who were ancient men, that had seen the first house, when the foundation of this house was laid before their eyes, wept with a loud voice;" Ezra iii. 12.) and by those words which God commanded Haggai to speak to the people for the introducing of this prophecy, "Who is left among you that saw this house in her first glory? And how do you see it now? Is it not in your eyes in comparison of it as nothing?" (Hag. ii. 3.) Being then the structure of the second temple was so far inferior to the first, being all those signs of the divine glory were wanting in it with which the former was adorned; the glory of it can no other way be imagined greater, than by the coming of Him into it, in whom all the signs of the divine glory were far more eminently contained; and this person alone is the *Messias*. For he was to be the glory of the people Israel, yea, even of the God of Israel; he the Urim and Thummim, by whom the will of God, as by a greater oracle, was revealed; he the true ark of the covenant, the only propitiatory by his blood; he which was to baptize with the Holy Ghost and with fire, the true fire which came down from heaven; he which was to take up his habitation in our flesh, and to dwell among us that we might behold his glory; he who received the Spirit without measure, and from whose fulness we do all receive. In him were all those signs of the Divine Glory united, which were thus divided in the first temple; in him they were all more eminently contained than in those; therefore his coming to the second temple was, as the sufficient, so the only means by which the glory of it could be greater than the glory of the first. If then the *Messias* was to come while the second temple stood, as appeared by God's prediction and promise; if that temple many ages since hath ceased to be, there being not one stone left upon a stone; if it certainly were before the destruction of it in greater glory than ever the former was; if no such glory could accrue unto it but by the coming of the *Messias*: then is that *Messias* already come.' *Pearson on the Creed*, pp. 127, 128. *Dobson's edition*.—[Ed.]

A. R. T.  
VII.

of his coming was, that *Elijah the prophet* was to come before that great and dreadful day, who should convert many, old and young. Now it is certain that no other person came, during the second temple, to whom these words can be applied: so that they were not accomplished, unless it was in the person of our Saviour, to whom all these characters do well agree.

Mal. iv. 5.  
6.

But to conclude with that prophecy which of all others is the most particular: when Daniel at the end of the seventy years' captivity was interceding for that nation, an angel was sent to him to tell him, that they were to have a new period of seventy weeks, that is, seven times seventy years, 490 years; and that after sixty-two weeks, *Messiah the Prince was to come, and to be cut off*; and that then the *people of a prince should destroy the city and the sanctuary*; and the *end of these was to be as with a flood* or inundation, and *desolations were determined to the end of the war*. They were to be destroyed by abominable armies, that is, by idolatrous armies; they were to be made desolate, till an utter end or consummation should be made of them. The pomp, with which this destruction is set forth, plainly shews, that the final ruin of the Jews by the Roman armies is meant by it. From which it is justly inferred, not only that, if that vision was really sent from God by an angel to Daniel, and in consequence to that was fulfilled, then the Messiah did come, and was cut off during the continuance of Jerusalem and the temple; but that it happened within a period of time designed in that vision. Time was then computed more certainly than it had been for many ages before. Two great measures were fixed; one at Babylon by Nabonasser, and another in Greece in the Olympiads. Here a prediction is given almost five hundred years before the accomplishment, with many very nice reckonings in it. I will not now enter upon the chronology of this matter, on which some great men have bestowed their labours very happily. Archbishop Usher has stated this matter so, that the interval of time is clearly four hundred eighty-six years. The covenant was to be confirmed with many for one week, in the midst of which God was to cause the sacrifice and oblation for sin to cease; which seems to be a mystical way of describing the death of Christ, that was to put an end to the virtue of the Judaical sacrifices; so sixty-nine weeks and a half make just four hundred eighty-six years and a half. But without going farther into this calculation, it is evident, that during the second temple, the Messiah was to come, and to be cut off, and that soon after that a prince was to send an army to destroy both city and sanctuary. The Jews do not so much as pretend that during that temple the Messiah thus set forth did come, or was cut off; so either the prediction failed in the event: or the Messiah did come within that period.

Dan. ix. 24  
—27.

And thus, a thread of the prophecies of the Messiah being

ART.  
VII.

carried down through the whole Old Testament, it seems to be fully made out, that he was to be of the seed of Abraham, and of the posterity of David: that the tribe of Judah was to be a distinct policy, till he should come: that he should work many miracles: that he was to be meek and lowly: that his function was to consist in preaching to the afflicted, and in comforting them: that he was to call the Gentiles, and even the remote islands, to the knowledge of God: that he was to be born of a virgin, and at Bethlehem: that he was to be a new lawgiver, as Moses had been: that he was to settle his followers upon a new covenant, different from that made by Moses: that he was to come during the second temple: that he was to make a mean, but a joyful entrance to Jerusalem: that he was to be cut off: that the iniquities of us all were to be laid on him; and that his life was to be made an offering for sin; but that God was to give him a glorious reward for these his sufferings; and that his doctrine was to be internal, accompanied with a free offer of pardon, and of inward assistances; and that after his death the Jews were to fall under a terrible curse, and an utter extirpation. When this is all summed up together; when it appears, that there was never any other person to whom those characters did agree, but that they did all meet in our Saviour, we see what light the Old Testament has given us in this matter. Here a nation that hates us and our religion, who are scattered up and down the world, who have been for many ages without their temple, and without their sacrifices, without priests, and without their genealogies, who yet hold these books among them in a due veneration, which furnish us with so full a proof, that the Messiah whom they still look for, is the Lord Jesus whom we worship. We do now proceed to other matters.

The Jews pretend, that it is a great argument against the authority of the New Testament, because it acknowledges the Old to be from God, and yet repeals the far greater part of the laws enacted in it; though those laws are often said to be 'laws for ever,' and 'throughout all generations.' Now they seem to argue with some advantage, who say, that what God does declare to be a law that shall be perpetual by any one prophet, cannot be abrogated or reversed by another, since that other can have no more authority than the former prophet had: and if both are of God, it seems the one cannot make void that which was formerly declared by the other in the name of God. But it is to be considered, that by the phrases of 'a statute for ever,' or 'throughout all generations,' can only be meant, that such laws were not transient laws, such as were only to be observed whilst they marched through the wilderness, or upon particular occasions; whereas such laws, which were constantly and generally to be observed, were to them perpetual. But that does not import that the lawgiver himself had parted with all the authority, that naturally be-

ART.  
VII.

longs to him, over his own laws. It only says, that the people had no power over such laws to repeal or change them: they were to bind them always; but that puts no limitation on the lawgiver himself, so that he might not alter his own constitutions. Positive precepts, which have no real value in themselves, are of their own nature alterable: and as in human laws the words of enacting a law for all future times do only make that to be a perpetual law for the subjects, but do not at all limit the legislative power, which is as much at liberty to abrogate or alter it, as if no such words had been in the law; there are also many hints in the Old Testament, which shew that the precepts of the Mosaical law were to be altered: many plain intimations are given of a time and state, in which the knowledge of God was to be spread over all the earth: and that God was every where to be worshipped. Now this was impossible to be done without a change in their law and rituals: it being impossible that all the world should go up thrice a year to worship at Jerusalem, or could be served by priests of the Aaronical family. Circumcision was a distinction of one particular race, which needed not to be continued after all were brought under one denomination, and within the same common privileges.

These things hitherto mentioned belong naturally to this part of the Article: yet, in the intention of those who framed it, these words relate to an extravagant sort of enthusiasts that lived in those days; who, abusing some ill-understood phrases concerning justification by Christ without the works of the law, came to set up very wild notions, which were bad in themselves, but much more pernicious in their consequences. They therefore fancied that a Christian was tied by no law, as a rule or yoke; all these being taken away by Christ: they said indeed, that a Christian by his renovation became a law to himself; he obeyed not any written rule or law, but a new inward nature: and thus as it is said that Sadoocus mistook his master Antigonus, who taught his disciples to serve God, not for the hope of a reward, but without any expectations, as if he by that affectation of sublimity had denied that there was any reward; and from thence sprung the sect of the Sadducees: so these men, perhaps at first mistaking the meaning of the New Testament, went wrong only in their notions; and still meant to press the necessity of true holiness, though in another set of phrases, and upon other motives; yet from thence many wild and uncontrolled notions arose then, and were not long ago revived among us: all which flowed from their not understanding the importance of the word *law* in the New Testament, in which it stands most commonly for the complex of the whole Jewish religion, in opposition to the Christian; as the word *law*, when it stands for a book, is meant of the five books of Moses.

The maintaining the whole frame of that dispensation, in

opposition to that liberty which the apostles granted to the Gentiles, as to the ritual parts of it, was the controversy then in debate between the apostles and the Judaizing Christians. The stating that matter aright is a key that will open all those difficulties, which with it will appear easy, and without it insuperable. In opposition to these, who thought then that the Old Testament, having brought the world on to the knowledge of the Messias, was now of no more use, this Article was framed.

The second part of the Article relates to a more intricate matter; and that is, whether in the Old Testament there were any promises made, other than transitory or temporal ones, and whether they might look for eternal salvation in that dispensation, and upon what account? Whether Christ was the Mediator in that dispensation, or if they were saved by virtue of their obedience to the laws that were then given them? Those who deny that Christ was truly God, think that in order to the raising him to those great characters in which he is proposed in the New Testament, it is necessary to assert that he gave the first assurances of eternal happiness, and of a free and full pardon of all sins in his gospel: and that in the Old Testament neither the one nor the other were certainly and distinctly understood.

It is true, that if we take the words of the covenant that Moses made between God and the people of Israel strictly and as they stand, they import only temporal blessings: that was a covenant with a body of men and with their posterity, as they were a people engaged to the obedience of that law. Now a national covenant could only be established in temporal promises of public and visible blessings, and of a long continuance of them upon their obedience, and in threatenings of as signal judgments upon the violation of them: but under those general promises of what was to happen to them collectively, as they made up one nation, every single person among them might, and the good men among them did, gather the hopes of a future state. It is clear that Moses did all along suppose the being of God, the creation of the world, and the promise of the Messias, as things fully known and carried down by tradition to his days: so it seems he did also suppose the knowledge of a future state, which was then generally believed by the Gentiles as well as the Jews; though they had only dark and confused notions about it. But when God was establishing a covenant with the Jewish nation, a main part of which was his giving them the land of Canaan for an inheritance, it was not necessary that eternal rewards or punishments should be then proposed to them; but from the tenor of the promises made to their forefathers, and from the general principles of natural religion, not yet quite extinguished among them, they might gather this, that under those carnal promises, blessings of a higher nature were to be un-

derstood. And so we see that David had the hope of arriving 'at the presence of God,' and 'at his right hand,' where he believed there was 'a fulness of joy, and pleasures for evermore:' and he puts himself in this opposition to the wicked, that whereas 'their portion was in this life, and they left their substance to their children;' he says, that as for him, he should 'behold God's face in righteousness,' and should 'be satisfied when he awaked with his likeness;' which seems plainly to relate to a state after this life, and to the resurrection. He carries this opposition farther in another Psalm, where after he had said, that 'men in honour did not continue, but were like the beasts that perished: that none of them could purchase immortality for his brother; that he should still live for ever, and not see corruption: they all died and left their wealth to others, and like sheep they were laid in the grave, where death should feed on them:' in opposition to which he says, that 'the upright should have dominion over them in the morning:' which is clearly a poetical expression for another day that comes after the night of death. As for himself in particular, he says, that 'God shall redeem my soul (that is, his life, or his body, for in those senses the word *soul* is used in the Old Testament) from the power of the grave:' that is, from continuing in that state of death; for 'he shall receive me.' This does very clearly set forth David's belief both of future happiness, and of the resurrection of his body. To which might be added some other passages in the Psalms, Ecclesiastes, Isaiah, and Daniel: in all which it appears, that the holy men in that dispensation did understand, that under those promises in the books of Moses that seemed literally to belong to the land of Canaan, and other temporal blessings, there was a spiritual meaning hid, which it seems was conveyed down by that succession of prophets, that was among them, as the mystical sense of them.

It is to this that our Saviour seems to appeal, when the Sadducees came to puzzle him with that question of the seven brethren, who had all married one wife: he first tells them, 'they erred, not knowing the Scriptures;' which plainly imports, that the doctrine, which they denied, was contained in the scriptures: and then he goes to prove it, not from those more express passages that are in the prophets and holy writers, which as some think the Sadducees rejected; but from the law, which being the source of their religion, it might seem a just prejudice against any doctrine, especially if it was of great consequence, that it was not contained in the law. Therefore he cites these words that are so often repeated, and that were so much considered by the Jews, as containing in them the foundation of God's love to them; that God said upon many occasions, particularly at his first appearance to Moses, 'I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.' Which words imported not only that

Ps. xvi. 11.  
Ps. xvii.  
14, 15.Ps. xlix.  
14, 15.Ps. lxxxiv.  
11.  
lxxxvii. 6.  
xc. 17.  
xcvi. 13.  
Ecc. xi. 9.  
xii. 14.  
Is. xxv. 8.  
xxvi. 19.  
Dan. xii. 2.Matt. xxii.  
29.Ver. 31, 32.  
Exod. iii.  
6.

A R T.  
VII.

God had been their God, but still was their God: now when God is said to be a God to any, by that is meant, that he is their benefactor, or *exceeding rich reward*, as was promised to Abraham. And that therefore Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob *lived unto God*, that is, were not dead; but were then in a happy state of life, in which God did reward them, and so was their God. Whether this argument rests here, our Saviour designing only to prove, against the main error of the Sadducees, that we have souls distinct from our bodies, that shall outlive their separation from them; or if it goes further to prove the rising of the body itself, I shall not determine. On the one hand our Saviour seems to apply himself particularly to prove the resurrection of the body; so we must see how to find here an argument for that, to answer the scope of the whole discourse: yet on the other hand it may be said, that he having proved the main point of the soul's subsisting after death, which is the foundation of all religion; the other point which was chiefly denied, because that was thought false, would be more easily both acknowledged and believed.

As for the resurrection of the body, all that can be brought from hence as an argument to prove it is, that since God was the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and by consequence their benefactor and rewarder, and yet they were pilgrims on this earth, and suffered many tossings and troubles, that therefore they must be rewarded in another state: or because God promised that to them he would give the land of Canaan, as well as to their seed after them, and since they never had any portion of it in their own possession, that therefore they shall rise again, and with the other saints reign on earth, and have that promise fulfilled in themselves.

From all this the assertion of the Article is as to one main point made good, that the old fathers looked for more than transitory promises: it is also clear, that they looked for a further pardon of sin, than that which their law held forth to them in the expiation made by sacrifices. Sins of ignorance, or sins of a lower sort, were those only for which *sin* or *trespass-offerings* were appointed. The sins of a higher order were punished by death, by the hand of Heaven, or by cutting off; so that such as sinned in that kind were to die without mercy: yet when David had fallen into the most heinous of those sins, he prays to God for a pardon, according to God's loving-kindness, and the multitude of his tender mercies: for he knew that they were beyond the expiation by sacrifice. The prophets do often call the Jews to repent of their idolatry and other crying sins, such as oppression, injustice, and murder; with the promise of the pardon of them; even though they were of the deepest dye, as crimson and scarlet. Since then for lesser sins an expiation was appointed by sacrifice, besides their confessing and repenting

Heb. x. 28.

Psal. li. 1,  
2, 16, 17.

Isa. i. 18.

A R T.  
VII.

of it; and since it seems, by St. Paul's way of arguing, that they held it for a maxim, that 'without shedding of blood there was no remission of sins;' this might naturally lead them to think that there was some other consideration that was interposed in order to the pardoning of those more heinous sins: for a greater degree of guilt seems by a natural proportion to demand a higher degree of sacrifice and expiation. But after all, whatsoever Isaiah, Daniel, or any other prophet, might have understood or meant by those sacrificatory phrases that they use in speaking of the Messiah, yet it cannot be said from the Old Testament, that in that dispensation it was clearly revealed that the Messiah was to die, and to become a sacrifice for sin: the Messiah was indeed promised under general terms; but there was not then a full and explicit revelation of his being to die for the redemption of mankind; yet since the most heinous sins were then pardoned, though not by virtue of the sacrifices of that covenant, nor by the other means prescribed in it, we have good reason to affirm, that, according to this Article, life was offered to mankind in the old dispensation by Christ, who was, with relation to obtaining the favour of God, and everlasting life, the Mediator of that as well as of the new dispensation. In the New Testament he is set in opposition to the old Adam, 'that as in the one all died, so in the other all were made alive:' nor is it any way incongruous to say, that the merit of his death should by an anticipation have saved those who died before he was born: for that being in the view of God as certain before, as after it was done, it might be in the divine intention the sacrifice for the old, as well as it is expressly declared to be the sacrifice for the new dispensation. And this being so, God might have pardoned sins in consideration of it, even to those who had no distinct apprehensions concerning it. For as God applies the death of Christ, by the secret methods of his grace, to many persons whose circumstances do render them incapable of the express acts of laying hold on it, the want of those (for instance, in infants and idiots) being supplied by the goodness of God: so though the revelation that was made of the Messiah to the fathers under the old dispensation, was only in general and prophetic terms, of which they could not have a clear and distinct knowledge; yet his death might be applied to them, and their sins pardoned through him, upon their performing such acts as were proportioned to that dispensation, and to the revelation that was then made; and so they were reconciled to God even after sins, for which no sacrifices were appointed by their dispensation, upon their repentance and obedience to the federal acts and conditions then required, which supplied the want of more express acts with relation to the death of Christ, not then distinctly revealed to them. But though the old fathers had a conveyance of the hope of

Heb. ix.  
22.Isa. liii.  
Dan. ix.1 Cor. xv  
22.

A R T. VII. eternal life made to them, with a resurrection of their bodies, and a confidence in the mercy of God, for pardoning the most heinous sins; yet it cannot be denied, but that it was as 'a light that shined in a dark place, till the day-star did arise,' and that Christ 'brought life and immortality to light by his gospel;' giving us fuller and clearer discoveries of it, both with relation to our souls and bodies; and that by him also God 'has declared his righteousness for the remission of sins, through the forbearance of God, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, and through faith in his blood.'

2 Pet. i. 19.

Rom. iii. 24, 25.

The third branch of this Article will not need much explanation, as it will bear no dispute, except with Jews, who do not acknowledge the New Testament. The ceremonial parts of the Mosaical law, which comprehends all both the negative and the positive precepts, were enjoined the Jews either with relation to the worship of God and service at the temple, or to their persons and course of life.

That which is not moral of its own nature, or that had no relation to civil society, was commanded them, to separate them not only from the idolatrous and magical practices of other nations, but to distinguish them so entirely as to all their customs, even in the rules of eating and of cleanness, that they might have no familiar commerce with other nations, but live within and among themselves; since that was very likely to corrupt them, of which they had very large experience. Some of those rituals were perhaps given them as punishments for their frequent revolts, and were as a yoke upon them, who were so prone to idolatry. They were as rudiments and remembrances to them: they were as it were subdued by a great variety of precepts, which were matter both of much charge and great trouble to them: by these they were also amused; for it seems they did naturally love a pompous exterior in religion; they were also, by all that train of performances which were laid on them, kept in mind both of the great blessings of God to them, and of the obligations that lay on them towards God; and many of those, particularly their sacrifices and washings, were typical. All this was proper and necessary to restrain and govern them, while they were the only people in the world that renounced idolatry, and worshipped the true God: and therefore so soon as that of which they had an emblem in the structure of their temple (of a court of the Gentiles separated with a middle wall of partition, from the place in which the Israelites worshipped) was to be removed, and that the house of God was to become 'a house of prayer to all nations,' then all those distinctions were to be laid aside, and all that service was to determine and come to an end. The apostles did declare, that the Gentiles were not to be brought under that heavy yoke, which their fathers were not able to bear; yet the apostles themselves, as born Jews, and while they lived among the Jews,

Acts xv.

A R T. VII. did continue in the observance of their rites, as long as God seemed to be waiting for the remnant of that nation that was to be saved, before his wrath came upon the rest to the uttermost. They went to the temple, they purified themselves; and, in a word, 'to the Jews they became Jews;' and in this compliance, the first converts of the Jewish nation continued till the destruction of Jerusalem; after which, it became impossible to observe the greatest part of their most important rituals, even all those that were tied to the temple. But that nation losing its genealogies, and all the other characters that they formerly had of a nation under the favour and protection of God, could no more know after a few ages, whether they were the seed of Abraham or not, or whether there were any left among them of the tribe of Levi, or of the family of Aaron. So that now all those ceremonies are at an end; many of them are become impossible, and the rest useless; as the whole was abrogated by the authority of the apostles, who being sent of God, and proving their mission by miracles, as well as Moses had done his, they might well have *loosed* and dissolved those precepts upon earth, upon which, according to our Saviour's words, they are to be esteemed as *loosed in heaven*.

Heb. x.

The judiciary parts of the law were those that related to them as they were a society of men, to whom God by a special command gave authority to drive out and destroy a wicked race of people, and to possess their land; which God appointed to be divided equally among them, and that every portion should be as a perpetuity to a family; so that though it might be mortgaged out for a number of years, yet it was afterwards to revert to the family. Upon this bottom they were at first set; and they were still to be preserved upon it; so that many laws were given them as they were a civil society, which cannot belong to any other society: and therefore their whole judiciary law, except when any parts of it are founded on moral equity, was a complicated thing, and can belong to no other nation, that is not in its first and essential constitution made and framed as they were. For instance; the prohibition of taking use for money, being a mean to preserve that equality which was among them, and to keep any of them from becoming excessively rich, or others from becoming miserably poor, this is by no means to be applied to other constitutions, where men are left to their industry, and neither have their inheritance by a grant from heaven, nor are put by any special appointment of God all upon a level. So that it is certain, and can bear no debate, that the Mosaical dispensation, as to all the parts of it that are not of their own nature moral, is determined and abrogated by the gospel. The decisions which the apostles made in this matter are so clear, and for the proof of them, the whole tenor of the Epistles to the Galatians and the Hebrews is so full, that no doubt can rest concerning this with any man who reads them.

The last branch of this Article that remains to be considered, is concerning the moral law, by which the Ten Commandments are meant, together with all such precepts as do belong to them, or are corollaries arising out of them. By *moral law* is to be understood, in opposition to *positive*, a law which has an antecedent foundation in the nature of things, that arises from eternal reason, is suitable to the frame and powers of our souls, and is necessary for maintaining human society. All such laws are commanded, because they are in themselves good, and suitable to the state in which God has put us here. The two sources, out of which all the notions of morality flow, are, first, the consideration of ourselves as we are single individuals, and that with relation both to soul and body; and next, the consideration of human society, what is necessary for the peace and order, the safety and happiness, of mankind. There are two orders of moral precepts; some relate to things that of their own nature are inflexibly good or evil, such as truth and falsehood; whereas other things by a variety of circumstances may so change their nature, that they may be either morally good or evil: a merciful or generous temper is always a good moral quality, and yet it may run to excesses: there may be many things that are not unalterably moral in themselves, which yet may be fit subjects of perpetual laws about them. For instance; in the degrees of kindred with relation to marriage, there are no degrees but direct ascendants or descendants, that is, parents and children, that by an eternal reason can never marry; for where there is a natural subordination, there can never be such an equality as that state of life requires: but collateral degrees, even the nearest, brothers and sisters, are not by any natural law barred marriage, and therefore in a case of necessity they might marry: yet since their intermarrying must be attended with vast inconveniences, and would tend to the defilement of all families, and hinder the conjunction of mankind by the intermixture of different families; it becomes therefore a fit subject for a perpetual law, to strike a horror at the thought of such commixtures, and so to keep the world pure; which, considering the freedoms in which those of the same family do live, could not be preserved without such a law. It is also the interest of mankind, and necessary for the careful education of the rising generation, that marriages should be for life; for if it were free for married persons to separate at pleasure, the issue of marriages so broken would be certainly much neglected: and since a power to break a marriage would naturally inflame such little quarrellings as may happen among all persons that live together, which will on the contrary be certainly repressed, when they know that the marriage cannot be dissolved, and when, by such a dissolution of marriages, the one half of the human species, I mean womankind, is exposed to great miseries, and subject to much tyranny, it is a fit subject for a per-

petual law; so that it is moral in a secondary order. It were easy to give instances of this in many more particulars, and to shew, that a precept may be said to be moral, when there is a natural suitableness in it to advance that which is moral in the first order, and that it cannot be well preserved without such a support. It will appear what occasion there is for this distinction, when we consider the Ten Commandments, which are so many heads of morality, that are instanced in the highest act of a kind; and to which are to be reduced all such acts as by the just proportions of morality belong to that order and series of actions.

The foundation of morality is religion. The sense of God, that he is, and that he is both a rewarder and a punisher, is the foundation of religion. Now this must be supposed as antecedent to his laws, for we regard and obey them from the persuasion that is formed in us concerning the being and the justice of God: the two first commandments are against the two different sorts of idolatry; which are, the worshipping of false gods, or the worshipping the true God in a corporeal figure: the one is the giving the honour of the true God to an idol, and the other is the depressing the true God to the resemblance of an idol. These were the two great branches of idolatry, by which the true ideas of God were corrupted. Religion was by them corrupted in its source. Nobody can question but that it is immoral to worship a false god; it is a transferring the honour, which belongs immediately and singly to the great God, to a creature, or to some imaginary thing which never had a real existence. This is the robbing God of what is due to him, and the exalting another thing to a degree and rank that cannot belong to it. Nor is it less immoral to propose the great and true God to be worshipped under appearances that are derogatory to his nature, that tend to give us low thoughts of him, and that make us think him like, if not below, ourselves. This way of worshipping him is both unsuitable to his nature, and unbecoming ours; while we pay our adorations to that which is the work of an artificer. This is confirmed by those many express prohibitions in scripture, to which reasons are added, which shew that the thing is immoral in its own nature: it being often repeated, that no similitude of God was ever seen: and 'to whom will ye liken me?' All things in heaven and earth are often called the 'work of his hands:' which are plain indications of a moral precept, when arguments are framed from the nature of things to enforce obedience to it. The reason given in the very command itself, is taken from the nature of God, who is jealous; that is, so tender of his glory, that he will not suffer a diminution of it to go unpunished; and if this precept is clearly founded upon natural justice, and the proportion that ought to be kept between all human acts and their objects, then it must be perpetual; and that



A R T.  
VII.

the rather, because we do plainly see that the gospel is a refining upon the law of Moses, and does exalt it to a higher pitch of sublimity and purity; and by consequence the ideas of God, which are the first seeds and principles of religion, are to be kept yet more pure and undefiled in it, than they were in a lower dispensation.

Ex. iii. 1.  
Lev. xix.  
12.  
Matt. v.  
33.

The third precept is against false swearing: for the word *vain* is often used in the scripture in that sense: and since in all the other commandments, the sin which is named is not one of the lowest, but of the chief sins that relate to that head; there is no reason therefore to think, that *vain* or idle swearing, which is a sin of a lower order, should be here meant, and not rather false swearing, which is the highest sin of the kind. The morality of this command is very apparent; for since God is the God of truth, and every oath is an appeal to him, therefore it must be a gross wickedness to appeal to God, or to call him to vouch for our lies.

The fourth commandment cannot be called moral in the first and highest sense; for from the nature of things no reason can be assigned, why the seventh day, rather than the sixth, or the eighth, or any other day, should be separated from the common business of life, and applied to the service of God. But it is moral that a man should pay homage to his Maker, and acknowledge him in all his works and ways: and since our senses and sensible objects are apt to wear better things out of our thoughts, it is necessary that some solemn times should be set apart for full and copious meditations on these subjects; this should be universal, lest, if the time were not the same every where, the business of some men might interfere with the devotions of others. It ought to have such an eminent character on it, like a cessation from business: which may both awaken a curiosity to inquire into the reason of that stop, and also may give opportunity for meditations and discourses on those subjects. It is also clear, that such days of rest must not return so oft, that the necessary affairs of life should be stopped by them, nor so seldom, that the impressions of religion should wear out, if they were too seldom awakened: but what is the proper proportion of time, that can best agree both with men's bodies and minds, is only known to the great Author of nature. Howsoever, from what has been said, it appears that this is a very fit matter to be fixed by some sacred and perpetual law, and that from the first creation; because there being then no other method for conveying down knowledge, besides oral tradition, it seems as highly congruous to that state of mankind, as it is agreeable to the words in Genesis, to believe that God should then have appointed one day in seven for commemorating the creation, and for acknowledging the great Creator of all things. But though it seems very clear, that here a perpetual law was given the world for the separating the seventh day; yet it was

A R T.  
VII.

a mere circumstance, and does not at all belong to the standing use of the law, in what end of the week this day was to be reckoned, whether the first or the last: so that even a less authority than the apostles, and a less occasion than the resurrection of Christ, might have served to have transferred the day. There being in this no breach made on the good and moral design of this law, which is all in it that we ought to reckon sacred and unalterable: the degree of the rest might be also more severely urged under the Mosaical law, than either before it or after it. Our Saviour having given plain intimations of an abatement of that rigour, by this general rule, that 'the sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath.' We, who are called to a state of freedom, are not under such a strictness as the Jews were. Still the law stands for separating a seventh day from the common business of life, and applying it to a religious rest, for acknowledging at first the Creator, and now, by a higher relation, the Redeemer, of the world.

Mark ii. 27.

These four commandments make the first table, and were generally reckoned as four distinct commandments, till the Roman church having a mind to make the second disappear, threw it in as an appendix to the first, and then left it quite out in her catechisms: though it is plain that these commandments relate to two very different matters, the one being in no sort included in the other. Certainly they are much more different than the coveting the neighbour's wife is from the coveting any of his other concerns; which are plainly two different acts of the same species; and the *house* being set before the *wife* in Exodus (though it comes after it in Deuteronomy, which, being a repetition, is to be governed by Exodus, and not Exodus by it) stands for the whole substance, which is afterwards branched out in the particulars; and so it is clear that there is no colour for dividing this in two; but the first two commandments relating to things of such a different sort, as is the worshipping of more gods than one, and the worshipping the true God in an image, ought still to be reckoned as different: and though the reason given from the jealousy and justice of God may relate equally to both, yet that does not make them otherwise one, than as both might be reduced to one common head of idolatry, so that both were to be equally punished.

Ex. xx. 17  
Deut. v.  
21.

In the second table this order is to be observed. There are four branches of a man's property, to which every thing that he can call his own may be reduced: his person, his wife and children, his goods, and his reputation: so there is a negative precept given to secure him in every one of these, against killing, committing adultery, stealing, and bearing false witness: to which, as the chief acts of their kind, are to be reduced all those acts that may belong to those heads: such as injuries to a man in his person, though not carried on nor designed to kill him; every temptation to uncleanness, and all those ex-

cesses that lead to it; every act of injustice, and every lie or defamation. To these four are added two fences; the one exterior, the other interior. The exterior is the settling the obedience and order that ought to be observed in families, according to the law of nature: and, by a parity of reason, if families are under a constitution, where the government is made as a common parent, the establishing the obedience to the civil powers, or to such orders of men who may be made as parents, with relation to matters of religion: this is the foundation of peace and justice, of the security and happiness of mankind. And therefore it was very proper to begin the second table, and those laws that relate to human society, with this; without which the world would be like a forest, and mankind, like so many savages, running wildly through it.

The last commandment is an inward fence to the law: it checks desires, and restrains the thoughts. If free scope should be given to these, as they would very often carry men to unlawful actions, for a man is very apt to do that which he desires, so they must give great disturbance to those that are haunted or overcome by them. And therefore as a mean both to secure the quiet of men's minds, and to preserve the world from the ill effects which such desires might naturally have, this special law is given; 'Thou shalt not covet.' It will not be easy to prove it *moral* in the strictest sense, yet in a secondary order it may be well called *moral*: the matter of it being such both with relation to ourselves and others, that it is a very proper subject for a perpetual law to be made about it. And yet, as St. Paul says, he had not known it to be a sin, if it had not been for the law that forbids it; for, after all that can be said, it will not be easy to prove it to be of its own nature moral. Thus, by the help of that distinction of what is moral in a primary and in a secondary order, the morality of the Ten Commandments is demonstrated.

That this law obliges Christians as well as Jews, is evident from the whole scope of the New Testament. Instead of derogating from the obligation of any part of that law, our Saviour after he had affirmed, that 'he came not to dissolve the law, but to fulfil it,' and 'that heaven and earth might pass away, but that one tittle of the law should not pass away;' he went through a great many of those laws, and shewed how far he extended the commentary he put upon them, and the obligations that he laid upon his disciples, beyond what was done by the Jewish rabbies: all the rest of his gospel, and the writings of his apostles, agree with this, in which there is not a tittle that looks like a slackening of it, but a great deal to the contrary: a strictness that reaches to idle words, to passionate thoughts, and to all impure desires, being enjoined as indispensably necessary; for 'without holiness no man can see the Lord.'

And thus every thing relating to this Article is considered, and I hope both explained and proved.

Rom. vii.  
7.Matt. v.  
17, 18.

## ARTICLE VIII.

## Of the Three Creeds.

*The Three Creeds, Nice Creed, Athanasius Creed, and that which is commonly called the Apostles' Creed, ought thoroughly to be received and believed; for they may be proved by most certain Warrants of Holy Scripture.*

ALTHOUGH no doubt seems to be here made of the names or designations given to those creeds, except of that which is ascribed to the apostles, yet none of them are named with any exactness: since the article of the procession of the Holy Ghost, and all that follows it, is not in the Nicene creed, but <sup>In Ancho-  
reto.</sup> was used in the church as a part of it; for so it is in Epiphanius, before the second general council at Constantinople; and it was confirmed and established in that council: only the article of the Holy Ghost's *proceeding from the Son*, was afterwards added first in Spain, anno 447, which spread itself over all the west: so that the creed here called the Nice creed is indeed the Constantinopolitan creed, together with the addition of *filioque* made by the western church. That which is called Athanasius's creed is not his neither; for as it is not among his works, so that great article of the Christian religion having been settled at Nice, and he and all the rest of the orthodox referring themselves always to the creed made by that council, there is no reason to imagine that he would have made a creed of his own; besides, that not only the Macedonian,\* but both the Nesto-

\* The Macedonian heresy, so called from Macedonius, its founder. Upon the death of Eusebius, bishop of Constantinople, Paulus, who had been before displaced by the Emperor, was again chosen to that see. The Arians at the same time chose Macedonius. When the Emperor Constantius became acquainted with this matter, he sent instructions to the president, to remove Paulus, and to establish Macedonius in that see. The installation of Macedonius was accompanied with an awful event—the slaughter of (according to Socrates) about 3150 persons. Such, says that historian, were the means that Macedonius and the Arians used to climb by slaughter and murder to be magistrates in the church. Afterwards, Macedonius gave place to Paulus, who, however, was not long after banished through the influence of the Arians, and in his exile murdered. Macedonius again took possession of the see of Constantinople, and grievously persecuted the orthodox, who adhered to the article of 'one substance,' or the essential deity of Christ; not only cutting them off from the churches, but banishing them from the city. He continued for a time to make war with and wear out those who held the truth as in Jesus, but was at length deposed. He was first an Arian, and then fell into another heresy. His opinion was, that although the Son of God was like unto the Father, as well in substance as in all other things, yet the Holy Ghost had not these titles of honour, but 'was only the servant or drudge of the Father and the Son.' His followers were called Macedonians, or Pneumatomachians. His heresy was condemned at the second general council at Constantinople, A. D. 381, at which 150 bishops were present, and 'the finishing touch' was there given to the decrees of Nice respecting the three persons in the Godhead.—[Ed.]

rian\* and the Eutychian† heresies are expressly condemned by this creed; and yet those authorities never being urged in those disputes, it is clear from thence, that no such creed was then known in the world; as indeed it was never heard of before the eighth century; and then it was given out as the creed of Athanasius, or as a representation of his doctrine, and so it grew to be received by the western church; perhaps the more early, because it went under so great a name, in ages that were not critical enough to judge of what was genuine and what was spurious.

There is one great difficulty that arises out of several expressions in this creed, in which it is said, that *whosoever will be saved, must believe it*; that the belief of it is *necessary to salvation*; and that such as do not *hold it pure and undefiled* shall without doubt *perish everlastingly*: where many explanations of a mystery hard to be understood are made indispensably necessary to salvation; and it is affirmed, that all such as do not so believe must perish everlastingly. To this two answers are made: 1. That it is only the Christian faith in general that is hereby meant, and not every period and article of this creed; so that all those severe expressions are thought to import only the necessity of believing the Christian religion: but this seems forced; for the words that follow, *and the catholic faith is*, do so plainly determine the signification of that word to the explanation that comes after, that the word *catholic faith*, in the first verse, can be no other than the same word, as it is defined in the third and following verses; so that this answer seems not natural. 2. The common answer in which the most eminent men of this church, as far as the memory of all such as I have known could go up, have agreed, is this, that these condemnatory expressions are only to be understood to relate to those who, having the means of instruction offered to them, have rejected them,

\* For an account of Nestorius, see page 63.

† The Eutychian heresy, so called from Eutyches, its founder. Eutyches was abbot of a convent of monks at Constantinople. His opposition to the doctrines of Nestorius (see pp. 63, 64) led him into an error of the opposite extreme, equally prejudicial to the interests of the Christian church. The 'poisonous heresy' of Eutyches caused a provincial council to be summoned, which was accordingly held at Constantinople. At that council Eutyches thus delivered his doctrine: 'I confess that our Lord consisted of two natures before the divinity was coupled with the humanity, but after the uniting of them I affirm that he had but one nature. He said, moreover, 'that the body of the Lord was not of the same substance with ours.' Wherefore he was degraded. Upon his application to the Emperor Theodosius, another council was called, which met at Ephesus. At this council Flavianus, bishop of Constantinople, who procured the condemnation of Eutyches, was, owing to the influence of Dioscorus, bishop of Alexandria, who was the declared enemy of the Bishop of Constantinople, condemned to be publicly scourged, and afterwards banished. He died of his wounds in Epipas, a city of Lydia, the place of his banishment. This council was called *conventus latronum*. Another, known as the fourth general council, was however summoned, and held at Chalcedon in the year 451, where Eutyches, who had been already sent into banishment, was condemned, and the following decreed—'That in Christ two distinct natures were united in one person, and that without any change, mixture, or confusion.' *Ex-grius Scholasticus and Mosheim.*—[Ed.]

and have stifled their own convictions, holding the truth in unrighteousness, and choosing darkness rather than light: upon such as do thus reject this great article of the Christian doctrine, concerning one God and three Persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and that other concerning the incarnation of Christ, by which God and man were so united as to make one person, together with the other doctrines that follow these, are those anathemas denounced: not so as if it were hereby meant, that every man who does not believe this in every tittle must certainly perish, unless he has been furnished with sufficient means of conviction, and that he has rejected them, and hardened himself against them. The wrath of God 'is revealed against all sin,' and 'the wages of sin is death:' so that every sinner has the wrath of God abiding on him, and is in a state of damnation: yet a sincere repentance delivers him out of it, even though he lives and dies in some sins of ignorance; which though they may make him liable to damnation, so that nothing but true repentance can deliver him from it; yet a general repentance, when it is also special for all known sins, does certainly deliver a man from the guilt of unknown sins, and from the wrath of God due to them. God only knows our hearts, the degrees of our knowledge, and the measure of our obstinacy, and how far our ignorance is affected or invincible; and therefore he will deal with every man according to what he has received. So that we may believe that some doctrines are necessary to salvation, as well as that there are some commandments necessary for practice; and we may also believe that some errors as well as some sins are exclusive of salvation; all which imports no more than that we believe such things are sufficiently revealed, and that they are necessary conditions of salvation; but by this we do not limit the mercies of God towards those who are under such darkness as not to be able to see through it, and to discern and acknowledge these truths. It were indeed to be wished, that some express declaration to this purpose were made by those who have authority to do it: but in the mean while, this being the sense in which the words of this creed are universally taken, and it agreeing with the phraseology of the scripture upon the like occasions, this is that which may be rested upon. And allowing this large explanation of these severe words, the rest of this creed imports no more than the belief of the doctrine of the Trinity, which has been already proved, in treating of the former Articles.

As for the creed called the Apostles' creed, there is good reason for speaking so doubtfully of it as the Article does, since it does not appear that any determinate creed was made by them: none of the first writers agree in delivering their faith in a certain form of words; every one of them gives an abstract of his faith, in words that differ both from one

another, and from this form. From thence it is clear that there was no common form delivered to all the churches; and if there had been any tradition, after the times of the council of Nice, of such a creed composed by the apostles, the Arians had certainly put the chief strength of their cause on this, that they adhered to the Apostles' creed, in opposition to the innovations of the Nicene fathers; there is therefore no reason to believe that this creed was prepared by the apostles, or that it was of any great antiquity, since Ruffin\* was the first that published it: it is true, he published it as the creed of the church of Aquileia; but that was so late, that neither this nor the other creeds have any authority upon their own account. Great respect is indeed due to things of such antiquity, and that have been so long in the church; but, after all, we receive those creeds, not for their own sakes, nor for the sake of those who prepared them, but for the sake of the doctrine that is contained in them; because we believe that the doctrine which they declare is contained in the scriptures, and chiefly that which is the main intent of them, which is to assert and profess the Trinity, therefore we do receive them; though we must acknowledge that the creed ascribed to Athanasius, as it was none of his, so it was never established by any general council.

\* For an account of Ruffin, see page 69.

## ARTICLE IX.

## Of the Original or Birth-Sin.

Original Sin standeth not in the following of Adam (as the \* Pelagians do vainly talk), but it is the fault or corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the Offspring of Adam, whereby man is very far gone from Original Righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil, so that the Flesh lusteth always contrary to the Spirit, and therefore in every Person born into the World it deserbeth God's Wrath and Damnation: And this Infection of Nature doth remain, yea in them that are regenerated, whereby the Lust of the Flesh, called in Greek *φρόνημα σαρκός*, which some do expound the Wisdom, some Sensuality, some the Affection, some the Desire of the Flesh, is not subject to the Law of God. And though there is no Condemnation for them that believe and are baptized, yet the Apostle doth confess, That Concupiscence and Lust hath of itself the nature of Sin.

AFTER the first principles of the Christian religion are stated, and the rule of faith and life was settled, the next thing that was to be done, was to declare the special doctrines of this religion; and that first with relation to all Christians, as they

\* 'A new controversy arose in the church during the fifth century, and its pestilential effects extended themselves through the following ages. The authors of it were Pelagius and Cælestius, both monks; the former a Briton, the latter a native of Ireland: they lived at Rome in the greatest reputation, and were universally esteemed on account of their extraordinary piety and virtue. These monks looked upon the doctrines which were commonly received, 'concerning the original corruption of human nature, and the necessity of divine grace to enlighten the understanding, and purify the heart, as prejudicial to the progress of holiness and virtue, and tending to lull mankind in a presumptuous and fatal security. They maintained that these doctrines were as false as they were pernicious; that the sins of our first parents were imputed to them alone, and not to their posterity; that we derive no corruption from their fall, but are born as pure and unspotted as Adam came out of the forming hand of his Creator: that mankind, therefore, are capable of repentance and amendment, and of arriving to the highest degrees of piety and virtue by the use of their natural faculties and powers; that, indeed, external grace is necessary to excite their endeavours, but that they have no need of the internal succours of the Divine Spirit.' These notions, and some others intimately connected with them, were propagated at Rome, though in a private manner, by the two monks already mentioned, who, retiring from that city, A. D. 410, upon the approach of the Goths, went first into Sicily, and afterwards into Africa, where they published their doctrine with more freedom. From Africa, Pelagius passed into Palestine, while Cælestius remained at Carthage, with a view to preferment, desiring to be admitted among the presbyters of that city. But the discovery of his opinions having blasted his hopes, and his errors being condemned in a council held at Carthage, A. D. 412, he departed from that city, and went into the east. *Mosheim*. In the east Pelagius met a friend and supporter in John, bishop of Jerusalem, whose attachment to the sentiments of Origen led him to favour those of Pelagius.

are single individuals, for the directing every one of them in order to the working out his own salvation; which is done from this to the nineteenth Article: and then with relation to them as they compose a society called the church; which is carried on from the nineteenth to the end.

In all that has been hitherto explained, the whole church of England has been all along of one mind. In this and in some that follow there has been a greater diversity of opinion; but both sides have studied to prove their tenets to be at least not contrary to the Articles of the Church. These different parties have disputed concerning the decrees of God, and those assistances which, pursuant to his decrees, are afforded to us. But because the foundation of those decrees, and the necessity of those assistances, are laid in the sin of Adam, and in the effects it had on mankind, therefore these controversies begin on this head. The Pelagians and the Socinians agree in saying, that Adam's sin was personal: that by it, as

Rom.v.12.

being the first sin, it is said that sin *entered into the world*: but that as Adam was made mortal, and had died whether he had sinned or not; so they think the liberty of human nature is still entire; and that every man is punished for his own sins, and not for the sin of another; to do otherwise, they say, seems contrary to justice, not to say, goodness.

Ver. 15.

In opposition to this, *judgment* is said to have *come upon many to condemnation through one* (either man or sin). *Death* is said to have *reigned by one*, and *by one man's offence*; and *many* are said to be *dead through the offence of one*. All these passages do intimate that death is the consequence of Adam's sin; and that in him, as well as in all others, *death* was the wages of *sin*, so also that we die upon the account of his sin.

Under the patronage of John, Pelagius assumed more boldness in the propagation of his heresy. Augustin sent into Palestine a Spanish presbyter named Orosius, who accused Pelagius before a council of bishops at Jerusalem. He was, however, dismissed without the least censure; and was shortly afterwards acquitted of all errors by the council of Diospolis (a city of Palestine known in scripture as Lydda), at which Eulogius of Caesarea, metropolitan of Palestine, presided. The African bishops, nothing dismayed by the apostacy of the eastern church, assembled at Carthage, A. D. 416, while the Numidian bishops met at Milevum, and condemned anew the antisciptural doctrines of Pelagius and his companion. Upon this Pelagius and Cælestius appealed to Zosimus, bishop of Rome, whom, by a confession of faith drawn up in a sufficiently artful manner to impose on the *infallibility* of the papal see, they induced to pronounce in their favour, and declare them sound in the faith and unjustly persecuted by their adversaries. The African bishops, however, with Augustin at their head, continued their war against this heresy, until at last Zosimus changed his mind, and condemned Pelagius and Cælestius, the very persons whom a little before he had pronounced orthodox, and to whom he had extended his protecting influence. Sometime afterwards this heresy was condemned by the third general council at Ephesus, and by the Gauls, Britons, and Africans, in their councils. Thus was this heresy crushed; and to the great Head of the church thanks are due, for having, at that time, raised up such a bold and uncompromising champion of the faith in Augustin, bishop of Hippo; by whose unwearied exertions it was that this sect was suppressed in its very birth.—[Ed.]

We are said to bear the *image of the first Adam*, as true Christians bear the *image of the second*: now we are sure that there is both a derivation of righteousness, and a communication of inward holiness, transferred to us through Christ: so it seems to follow from thence, that there is somewhat both transferred to us, and conveyed down through mankind, by the first Adam; and particularly that by it we are all made subject to death; from which we should have been freed, if Adam had continued in his first state, and that by virtue of the *tree of life*: in which some think there was a natural virtue to cure all diseases, and relieve against all accidents, while others do ascribe it to a divine blessing, of which that tree was only the symbol or *sacrament*; though the words said after Adam's sin, as the reason of driving him out of paradise, lest he put forth his hand, and 'take of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever,' seem to import that there was a physical virtue in the tree, that could so fortify and restore life, as to give immortality. These do also think that the threatening made to Adam, that upon his eating the forbidden fruit he should surely die, is to be taken literally, and is to be carried no further than to a natural death. This subjection to death, and to the fear of it, brings men under a slavish bondage, many terrors, and other passions and miseries that arise out of it, which they think is a great punishment; and that it is a condemnation and sentence of death passed upon the whole race; and by this they are *made sinners*, that is, treated as guilty persons, and severely punished.

Gen.iii.22.

1 Cor. xv.  
49.

This they think is easily enough reconciled with the notions of justice and goodness in God, since this is only a temporary punishment relating to men's persons: and we see in the common methods of Providence, that children are in this sort often punished for the sins of their fathers; most men that come under a very ill habit of body, transmit the seeds of diseases and pains to their children. They do also think that the communication of this liability to death is easily accounted for; and they imagine, that as the tree of life might be a plant that furnished men with an universal medicine, so the forbidden fruit might derive a slow poison into Adam's body, that might have exalted and inflamed his blood very much, and might, though by a slower operation, certainly have brought on death at the last. Our being thus adjudged to death, and to all the miseries that accompany mortality, they think may be well called the *wrath of God, and damnation*: so temporary judgments are often expressed in scripture. And to this they add, that Christ has entirely redeemed us from this, by the promise he has given us of raising us up at the last day: and that therefore when St. Paul is so copiously discoursing of the resurrection, he brings this in, that as we have borne the 'image of the first Adam, who was earthly,' so we shall also 'bear the image of the heavenly:' and 'since

ART.  
IX.1 Cor. xv.  
21, 22.  
In Ep. ad  
Rom. pas-  
sim.

by man came death, by man came also the resurrection from the dead; and that 'as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive;' and that this is the universal redemption and reparation that all mankind shall have in Christ Jesus. All these these divines apprehend is conceivable, and no more; therefore they put original sin in this only, for which they pretend they have all the fathers with them before St. Austin, and particularly St. Chrysostom and Theodoret, from whom all the later Greeks have done little more than copied out their words. This they do also pretend comes up to the words of the Article; for as this general adjudging of all men to die may be called, according to the style of the scriptures, *God's wrath and damnation*; so the fear of death, which arises out of it, corrupts men's natures, and inclines them to evil.

Others do so far approve of all this, as to think that it is a part of original sin, yet they believe it goes much further: and that there is a corruption spread through the whole race of mankind, which is born with every man. This the experience of all ages teaches us but too evidently; every man feels it in himself, and sees it in others. The philosophers, who were sensible of it, thought to avoid the difficulty that arises from it, when it might be urged, that a good God could not make men to be originally depraved and wicked; they therefore fancied that all our souls pre-existed in a former and a purer state, from which they fell, by descending too much into corporeal pleasure, and so both by a lapse and for a punishment they sunk into grosser bodies, and fell differently according to the different degrees of the sins they had committed in that state: and they thought that a virtuous life did raise them up to their former pitch, as a vicious one would sink them lower into more depraved and more miserable bodies. All this may seem plausible: but the best that can be said for it is, that it is an hypothesis that saves some difficulties; but there is no sort of proofs to make it appear to be true. We neither perceive in ourselves any remembrances of such a state, nor have we any warning given us either of our fall, or of the means of recovering out of it: so since there is no reason to affirm this to be true, we must seek for some other source of the corruption of human nature. The Manichees imputed it to the evil god, and thought it was his work, which some say might have set on St. Austin the more earnestly to look for another hypothesis to reconcile all.

But before we go to that, it is certain, that in scripture this general corruption of our nature is often mentioned. 'The imaginations of man's thoughts are only evil continually: What man is he that liveth and sinneth not? The just man falleth seven times a day: The heart of man is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked; who can know it? All that are in Christ must become new creatures: old things must be done away, and every thing must become new. God made

Gen. vi. 5.  
viii. 21.  
1 Kings  
viii. 46.  
Prov. xxiv.  
16.  
Jer. xvii. 9.  
2 Cor. v. 17.  
Eccl. vii.  
29.ART.  
IX.Gal. v. 17.  
Rom. viii.  
7, 8.  
John iii. 6.

man upright, but he sought out to himself many inventions. The flesh is weak; The flesh lusteth against the spirit; The carnal mind is enmity to the law of God, and is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be: and 'they that are in the flesh cannot please God:' where by *flesh* is to be meant the natural state of mankind, according to those words, 'That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.' These, with many other places of scripture to the same purpose, when they are joined to the universal experience of all mankind concerning the corruption of our whole race, lead us to settle this point, that in fact it has overrun our whole kind, the contagion is spread over all. Now this being settled, we are next to inquire, how this could happen: we cannot think that God made men so: for it is expressly said, that 'God made man after his own image.'

Gen. i. 27.

The surest way to find out what this *image* was at first, is to consider, what the New Testament says of it, when we come to be restored to it. 'We must put on the new man, after the image of him that created him;' or as elsewhere, the 'new man in righteousness and true holiness.' This then was the *image of God*, in which man was at first made. Nor ought the image of God to be considered only as an expression that imports only our representing him here on earth, and having dominion over the creatures: for in Genesis the creation of man in the image of God is expressed as a thing different from his dominion over the creatures, which seems to be given to him as a consequent of it. The image of God seems to be this, that the soul of man was a being of another sort and order than all those material beings till then made, which were neither capable of thought nor liberty, in which respect the soul was made after the *image of God*. But Adam's soul being put in his body, his brain was a *tabula rasa*, as white paper, had no impressions in it, but such as either God put in it, or such as came to him by his senses. A man born deaf and blind, newly come to hear and see, is not a more ignorant and amazed-like creature than Adam must have been, if God had not conveyed some great impressions into him; such as first the acknowledging and obeying him as his Maker, and then the managing his body so as to make it an instrument, by which he could make use of and observe the creation. There is no reason to think that his body was at first inclined to appetite, and that his mind was apt to serve his body, but that both were restrained by supernatural assistances. It is much more natural and more agreeable to the words of the *wise man*, to think that *God made man upright*, that his body craved modestly, and that his mind was both judge and master of those cravings; and if a natural hypothesis may be offered but only as an hypothesis, it may be supposed, that a man's blood was naturally low and cool, but that it was capable of a vast inflammation and elevation, by which a man's powers

Eph. iv.  
22, 24.Gen. i. 27.  
28.

might be exalted to much higher degrees of knowledge and capacity: the animal spirits receiving their quality from that of the blood, a new and a strong fermentation in the blood might raise them, and by consequence exalt a man to a much greater sublimity of thought: but with that it might dispose him to be easily inflamed by appetites and passions; it might put him under the power of his body, and make his body much more apt to be fired at outward objects, which might sink all spiritual and pure ideas in him, and raise gross ones with much fury and rapidity. Hereby his whole frame might be much corrupted, and that might go so deep in him, that all those who descended from him might be defiled by it, as we see madness and some chonical diseases pass from parents to their children.

All this might have been natural, and as much the physical effect of eating the forbidden fruit, as it seems immortality would have been that of eating the fruit of the tree of life: this might have been in its nature a slow poison, which must end in death at last. It may be very easy to make all this appear probable from physical causes. A very small accident may so alter the whole mass of the blood, that in a very few minutes it may be totally changed: so the eating the forbidden fruit might have, by a natural change of things, produced all this. But this is only an hypothesis, and so is left as such. All the assistance that revealed religion can receive from philosophy, is to shew, that a reasonable hypothesis can be offered upon physical principles, to shew the possibility, or rather probability, of any particulars that are contained in the scriptures. This is enough to stop the mouths of Deists, which is all the use that can be made of such schemes.

To return to the main point of the fall of Adam: he himself was made liable to death: but not barely to cease to live; for death and life are terms opposite to one another in scripture. In treating upon these heads, it is said, that 'the wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life.' And though the addition of the word *eternal* makes the signification of the one more express, yet where it is mentioned without that addition, no doubt is to be made, but that it is to be so meant: as where it is said, that 'to be carnally minded is death, but to be spiritually minded is life and peace;' and 'believing, we have life through his name: Ye will not come unto me, that ye may have life.' So, by the rule of opposites, *death* ought to be understood as a word of a general signification, which we, who have the comment of the New Testament to guide us in understanding the Old, are not to restrain to a natural death; and therefore when we are said to be 'the servants of sin unto death,' we understand much more by it than a natural death: so God's threatening Adam with *death*, ought not to be restrained to a *natural death*. Adam being thus defiled, all emanations from him must partake of that vitiated state to which he had brought himself. But then the

Rom. vi.  
23.Rom. viii.  
6.  
John xx.  
31.  
John v. 40.

question remains, how came the souls of his posterity to be defiled; for if they were created pure, it seems to be an unjust cruelty to them, to condemn them to such an union to a defiled body, as should certainly corrupt them? All that can be said in answer to this is,

That God has settled it as a law in the creation, that a soul should inform a body according to the texture of it, and either conquer it, or be mastered by it, as it should be differently made: and that as such a degree of purity in the texture of it might make it both pure and happy; so a contrary degree of texture might have very contrary effects. And if, with this, God made another general law, that when all things were duly prepared for the propagation of the species of mankind, a soul should be always ready to go into and animate those first threads and beginnings of life; those laws being laid down, Adam, by corrupting his own frame, corrupted the frame of his whole posterity, by the general course of things, and the great law of the creation. So that the suffering this to run through all the race, is no more (only different in degrees and extent) than the suffering the folly or madness of a man to infect his posterity. In these things God acts as the Creator of the world by general rules, and these must not be altered because of the sins and disorders of men: but they are rather to have their course, that so sin may be its own punishment. The defilement of the race being thus stated, a question remains, whether this can be properly called a sin, and such as deserves *God's wrath and damnation*? On the one hand an opposition of nature to the Divine nature must certainly be hateful to God, as it is the root of much malignity and sin. Such a nature cannot be the object of his love, and of itself it cannot be accepted of God: now since there is no mean in God, between *love* and *wrath*, *acceptation* and *damnation*, if such persons are not in the first order, they must be in the second.

Yet it seems very hard, on the other hand, to apprehend, how persons who have never actually sinned, but are only unhappily descended, should be, in consequence to that, under so great a misery. To this several answers are made: some have thought that those who die before they commit any actual sin, have indeed no share in the favour of God, but yet that they pass unto a state in the other world, in which they suffer little or nothing. The stating this more clearly, will belong to another opinion, which shall be afterwards explained.

There is a further question made, whether this vicious inclination is a sin, or not? Those of the church of Rome, as they believe that original sin is quite taken away by baptism, so finding that this corrupt disposition still remains in us, they do from thence conclude, that it is no part of original sin; but that this is the natural state in which Adam was made at first, only it is in us without the restraint or bridle of supernatural assistances, which was given to him, but lost by sin, and re-

ART  
IX.

stored to us in baptism. But, as was said formerly, Adam in his first state was made after the image of God, so that his bodily powers were perfectly under the command of his mind; this revolt, that we feel our bodies and senses are always in, cannot be supposed to be God's original workmanship. There are great disputings raised concerning the meaning of a long discourse of St. Paul's in the seventh of the Romans concerning a constant struggle that he felt within himself; which some, arguing from the scope of the whole Epistle, and the beginning of that chapter, understand only of the state that St. Paul represents himself to have been in while yet a Jew, and before his conversion: whereas others understand it of him in his converted and regenerated state. Very plausible things have been said on both sides, but without arguing any thing from words, the sense of which is under debate, there are other places which do manifestly express the struggle that is in a good man: 'The flesh is weak, though the spirit is willing: the flesh lusteth against the spirit, as the spirit lusteth against the flesh:' we ought to be still 'mortifying the deeds of the body;' and we feel many sins 'that do so easily beset us,' that from these things we have reason to conclude, that there is a corruption in our nature, which gives us a bias and propensity to sin. Now there is no reason to think that baptism takes away all the branches and effects of original sin: it is enough if we are by it delivered from the wrath of God, and brought into a state of favour and acceptance: we are freed from the curse of death, by our being entitled to a blessed resurrection: and if we are so far freed from the corruption of our nature, as to have a federal right to such assistances as will enable us to resist and repress it, though it is not quite extinct in us, so long as we live in these frail and mortal bodies, here are very great effects of our admission to Christianity by baptism; though this should not go so far as to root all inclinations to evil out of our nature. The great disposition that is in us to appetite and passion, and that great heat with which they inflame us; the aversion that we naturally have to all the exercises of religion, and the pains that must be used to work us up to a tolerable degree of knowledge, and an ordinary measure of virtue, shews that these are not natural to us: whereas sloth and vice do grow on us without any care taken about them: so that it appears, that they are the natural, and the other the forced, growth of our souls. These ill dispositions are so universally spread through all mankind, and appear so early, and in so great a diversity of ill inclinations, that from hence it seems reasonable and just to infer, that this corruption is spread through our whole nature and species, by the sin and disobedience of Adam. And beyond this a great many among ourselves think that they cannot go, in asserting of original sin.

But there is a further step made by all the disciples of St.

ART  
IX.

Austin, who believe that a covenant was made with all mankind in Adam, as their first parent: that he was a person constituted by God to represent them all; and that the covenant was made with him, so that if he had obeyed, all his posterity should have been happy, through his obedience; but by his disobedience they were all to be esteemed to have sinned in him, his act being imputed and transferred to them all. St. Austin considered all mankind as lost in Adam, and in that he made the decree of election to begin: there being no other reprobation asserted by him, than the leaving men to continue in that state of damnation, in which they were by reason of Adam's sin; so that though by baptism all men were born again and recovered out of that lost state, yet unless they were within the decree of election, they could not be saved, but would certainly fall from that state, and perish in a state of sin; but such as were not baptized were shut out from all hope. Those words of Christ's, 'Except ye be born again of water and of the Spirit, ye cannot enter into the kingdom of God,' being expounded so as to import the indispensable necessity of baptism to eternal salvation; all who were not baptized were reckoned by him among the damned: yet this damnation, as to those who had no actual sin, was so mitigated, that it seemed to be little more than an exclusion out of heaven, without any suffering or misery, like a state of sleep and inactivity. This was afterwards dressed up as a division or partition in hell, called the *Limbo of Infants*; so by bringing it thus low, they took away much of the horror that this doctrine might otherwise have given the world.

It was not easy to explain the way how this was propagated: they wished well to the notion of a soul's propagating a soul, but that seemed to come too near creation: so it was not received as certain. It was therefore thought, that the body being propagated defiled, the soul was created and infused at the time of conception: and that though God did not create it impure, yet no time was interposed between its creation and infusion: so that it could never be said to have been once pure, and then to have become impure. All this, as it afforded an easy foundation to establish the doctrine of absolute decrees upon it, no care being taken to shew how this sin came into the world, whether from an absolute decree or not, so it seemed to have a great foundation in that large discourse of St. Paul's: where, in the fifth of the Romans, he compares the blessings that we receive by the death of Christ, with the guilt and misery that was brought upon us by the sin of Adam. Now it is confessed, that by Christ we have both an imputation or communication of the merits of his death, and likewise a purity and holiness of nature conveyed to us by his doctrine and spirit. In opposition then to this, if the comparison is to be closely pursued, there must be

John iii. 3.  
5.Matt. xxvi.  
41.  
Gal. v. 17.  
Rom. viii.  
13.



A R T.  
IX.Rom. v. 12,  
to the end.

an imputation of sin, as well as a corruption of nature, transfused to us from Adam. This is the more considerable as to the point of imputation, because the chief design of St. Paul's discourse seems to be levelled at that, since it is begun upon the head of reconciliation and atonement: upon which it follows, that 'as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and death passed upon all men, for that (or, as others render it, *in whom*) all have sinned.' Now they think it is all one to their point, whether it be rendered *for that*, or *in whom*: for though the latter words seem to deliver their opinion more precisely, yet it being affirmed, that, according to the other rendering, all who die have sinned; and it being certain, that many infants die who have never actually sinned, these must have *sinned in Adam*, they could sin no other way. It is afterwards said by St. Paul, that 'by the offence of one many were dead: that the judgment was by one to condemnation: that by one man's offence death reigned by one. That by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation: and that by one man's disobedience many were made sinners.' As these words are positive, and of great importance in themselves, so all this is much the stronger, by the opposition in which every one of them is put to the effects and benefits of Christ's death; particularly to our justification through him, in which there is an imputation of the merits and effects of his death, that are thereby transferred to us; so that the whole effect of this discourse is taken away, if the imputation of Adam's sin is denied. And this explication does certainly quadrate more entirely to the words of the Article, as it is known that this was the tenet of those who prepared the Articles, it having been the generally-received opinion from St. Austin's days downward.

But to many other divines this seems a harsh and unconceivable opinion; it seems repugnant to the justice and goodness of God, to reckon men guilty of a sin which they never committed, and to punish them in their souls eternally for that which is no act of theirs: and though we easily enough conceive how God, in the riches of his grace, may transfer merit and blessing from one person to many, this being only an economy of mercy, where all is free, and such a method is taken as may best declare the goodness of God: but in the imputation of sin and guilt, which are matters of strict justice, it is quite otherwise. Upon that head God is pleased often to appeal to men for the justice of all his ways: and therefore no such doctrine ought to be admitted, that carries in it an idea of cruelty, beyond what the blackest tyrants have ever invented. Besides that in the scripture such a method as the punishing children for their fathers' sins, is often disclaimed, and it is positively affirmed, that every man that sins is punished. Now though, in articles relating to the nature of God,

Jer. xxxi.  
29, 30.  
Ezek. xviii.  
20.A R T.  
IX.

they acknowledge it is highly reasonable to believe, that there may be mysteries which exceed our capacity; yet in moral matters, in God's fœderal dealings with us, it seems unreasonable, and contrary to the nature of God, to believe that there may be a mystery contrary to the clearest notions of justice and goodness; such as the condemning mankind for the sin of one man, in which the rest had no share; and as contrary to our ideas of God, and upon that to set up another mystery that shall take away the truth and fidelity of the promises of God; justice and goodness being as inseparable from his nature, as truth and fidelity can be supposed to be. This seems to expose the Christian religion to the scoffs of its enemies, and to objections that are much sooner made than answered: and since the foundation of this is a supposed covenant with Adam as the representative head of mankind, it is strange that a thing of that great consequence should not have been more plainly reported in the history of the creation; but that men should be put to fetch out the knowledge of so great and so extraordinary a thing, only by some remote consequences. It is no small prejudice against this opinion, that it was so long before it first appeared in the Latin church; that it was never received in the Greek; and that even the western church, though perhaps for some ignorant ages it received it, as it did every thing else, very implicitly, yet has been very much divided both about this, and many other opinions related to it, or arising out of it.

As for those words of St. Paul's, that are its chief, if not its only foundation, they say many things upon them. First, it is a single proof. Now when we have not a variety of places proving any point, in which one gives light, and leads us to a sure exposition of another, we cannot be so sure of the meaning of any one place, as to raise a theory, or found a doctrine, upon it. They say further, that St. Paul seems to argue, from that opinion of our having sinned in Adam, to prove that we are justified by Christ. Now it is a piece of natural logic not to prove a thing by another, unless that other is more clear of itself, or at least more clear by its being already received and believed. This cannot be said to be more clear of itself, for it is certainly less credible or conceivable, than the reconciliation by Christ. Nor was this clear from any special revelation made of it in the Old Testament: therefore there is good reason to believe, that it was then a doctrine received among the Jews, as there are odd things of this kind to be found among the Cabbalists, as if all the souls of all mankind had been in Adam's body. Now when an argument is brought in scripture to prove another thing by, though we are bound to acknowledge the conclusion, yet we are not always sure of the premises; for they are often founded upon received opinions. So that it is not certain that St. Paul meant to offer this doctrine to our belief as true, but only

A R T. IX. that he intended by it to prove our being reconciled to God through the death of Christ; and the medium by which he proved it might be, for aught that appears from the words themselves, only an opinion held true among those to whom he writes. For he only supposes it, but says nothing to prove it: which it might be expected he would have done, if the Jews had made any doubt of it. But further they say, that when comparisons or oppositions, such as this, are made in scripture, we are not allowed to carry them on to an exact equality: we are required not only 'to be holy as God is holy, but to be perfect as he is perfect:' where by the *as* is not to be meant a true equality, but some sort of resemblance and conformity. Therefore those who believe that there is nothing imputed to Adam's posterity on the account of his sin, but this temporary punishment of their being made liable to death, and to all those miseries that the fear of it, with our other concerns about it, bring us under, say that this is enough to justify the comparison that is there stated: and that those, who will carry it on to be an exact parallel, make a stretch beyond the phraseology of the scripture, and the use of parables, and of the many comparisons that go only to one or more points, but ought not to be stretched to every thing.

1 Pet. i. 15,  
16.  
Matt. v. 48.

Ex. xxxii.  
10. and  
through  
the whole  
Old Testa-  
ment.  
Mat. iii. 7.  
1 Thess. ii.  
16.  
Luke xxiii.  
40.  
1 Cor. xi.  
29.  
1 Pet. iv. 17.  
Rom. xiii.  
2.  
2 Cor. vii.  
3.  
John viii.  
10, 11.  
Rom. xiv.  
23.

These are the things that other great divines among us have opposed to this opinion. As to its consonancy to the Article, those who oppose it do not deny, but that it comes up fully to the highest sense that the words of the Article can import: nor do they doubt, but that those who prepared the Articles, being of that opinion themselves, might perhaps have had that sense of the words in their thoughts. But they add, that we are only bound to sign the Articles in a literal and grammatical sense: since therefore the words, *God's wrath and damnation*, which are the highest in the Article, are capable of a lower sense, temporary judgments being often so expressed in the scriptures, therefore they believe the loss of the favour of God, the sentence of death, the troubles of life, and the corruption of our faculties, may be well called *God's wrath and damnation*. Besides, they observe, that the main point of the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity, and its being considered by God as their own act, not being expressly taught in the Article, here was that moderation observed, which the compilers of the Articles have shewed on many other occasions. It is plain from hence, that they did not intend to lay a burden on men's consciences, or oblige them to profess a doctrine that seems to be hard of digestion to a great many. The last prejudice that they offer against that opinion is, that the softening the terms of *God's wrath and damnation*, that was brought in by the followers of St. Austin's doctrine, to such a moderate and harmless notion, as to be only a loss of heaven, with a sort of unactive sleep, was an effect of their apprehending that the world could very ill bear

an opinion of so strange a sound, as that all mankind were to be damned for the sin of one man: and that therefore, to make this pass the better, they mitigated *damnation* far below the representation that the scriptures generally give of it, which propose it as the being adjudged to a place of torment, and a state of horror and misery.

A R T.  
IX.

Thus I have set down the different opinions in this point, with that true indifference that I intend to observe on such other occasions, and which becomes one who undertakes to explain the doctrines of the church, and not his own; and who is obliged to propose other men's opinions with all sincerity, and to shew what are the senses that the learned men, of different persuasions in these matters, have put on the words of the Article. In which one great and constant rule to be observed is, to represent men's opinions candidly, and to judge as favourably both of them and their opinions as may be: to bear with one another, and not to disturb the peace and union of the church, by insisting too much and too peremptorily upon matters of such doubtful disputation; but willingly to leave them to all that liberty, to which the church has left them, and which she still allows them.

## ARTICLE X.

## Of Free-Will.

The Condition of Man after the fall of Adam is such that he cannot turn and prepare himself by his own natural strength and good works to faith and calling upon God. Wherefore we have no power to do good works pleasant and acceptable to God, without the Grace of God by Christ preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working with us when we have that good will.

We shall find the same moderation observed in this Article, that was taken notice of in the former; where all disputes concerning the degree of that feebleness and corruption, under which we are fallen by the sin of Adam, are avoided, and only the necessity of a preventing and a co-operating grace is asserted against the Semipelagians\* and the Pelagians. But before we enter upon that, it is fitting first to state the true notion of free-will, in so far as it is necessary to all rational

\* 'A new and different modification was given to the doctrine of Augustin by the monk Cassian, who came from the east into France, and erected a monastery near Marseilles. Nor was he the only one who attempted to fix upon a certain temperature between the errors of Pelagius and the opinions of the African oracle; several persons embarked in this undertaking about the year 430, and hence arose a new sect, which were called by their adversaries, Semipelagians.

† The opinions of this sect have been misrepresented, by its enemies, upon several occasions; such is generally the fate of all parties in religious controversies. Their doctrine, as it has been generally explained by the learned, amounted to this: "That inward preventing grace was not necessary to form in the soul the first beginnings of true repentance and amendment; that every one was capable of producing these by the mere power of their natural faculties, as also of exercising faith in Christ, and forming the purposes of a holy and sincere obedience." But they acknowledged, at the same time, "That none could persevere or advance in that holy and virtuous course which they had the power of beginning, without the perpetual support and the powerful assistance of the divine grace."

‡ The disciples of Augustin, in Gaul, attacked the Semipelagians, with the utmost vehemence, without being able to extirpate or overcome them. The doctrine of this sect was so suited to the capacities of the generality of men, so conformable to the way of thinking that prevailed among the monastic orders, so well received among the gravest and most learned Grecian doctors, that neither the zeal nor industry of its adversaries could stop its rapid and extensive progress. Add to its other advantages, that neither Augustin, nor his followers, had ventured to condemn it in all its parts, nor to brand it as an impious and pernicious heresy. Mosheim.—[E. D.]

† 'The leading principles of the Semipelagians were the five following:—  
1. That God did not dispense his grace to one more than another, in consequence of predestination, i. e. an eternal and absolute decree; but was willing to save all men, if they complied with the terms of his gospel. 2. That Christ died for all men. 3. That the grace purchased by Christ, and necessary to salvation, was offered to all men. 4. That man, before he received grace, was capable of faith and holy desires. 5. That man, born free, was consequently capable of resisting the influences of grace, or complying with its suggestions.' Maclaine.

agents to make their actions morally good or bad; since it is a principle that seems to rise out of the light of nature, that no man is accountable, rewardable, or punishable, but for that in which he acts freely, without force or compulsion; and so far all are agreed.

Some imagine, that liberty must suppose a freedom to do, or not to do, and to act contrariwise at pleasure. To others it seems not necessary that such a liberty should be carried to denominate actions morally good or bad: God certainly acts in the perfectest liberty, yet he cannot sin. Christ had the most exalted liberty in his human nature, of which a creature was capable, and his merit was the highest, yet he could not sin. Angels and glorified saints, though no more capable of rewards, are perfect moral agents, and yet they cannot sin: and the devils, with the damned, though not capable of further punishment, yet are still moral agents, and cannot but sin: so this indifferency to do, or not to do, cannot be the true notion of liberty. A truer one seems to them to be this, that a rational nature is not determined as mere matter, by the impulse and motion of other bodies upon it, but is capable of thought, and, upon considering the objects set before it, makes reflection, and so chooses. Liberty therefore seems to consist in this inward capacity of thinking, and of acting and choosing upon thought. The clearer the thought is, and the more constantly that our choice is determined by it, the more does a man rise up to the highest acts, and sublimest exercises of liberty.

A question arises out of this, whether the will is not always determined by the understanding, so that a man does always choose and determine himself upon the account of some idea or other? If this is granted, then no liberty will be left to our faculties. We must apprehend things as they are proposed to our understanding; for if a thing appears true to us, we must assent to it; and if the will is as blind to the understanding, as the understanding is determined by the light in which the object appears to it, then we seem to be concluded under a fate, or necessity. It is, after all, a vain attempt to argue against every man's experience: we perceive in ourselves a liberty of turning our minds to some ideas, or from others; we can think longer or shorter of these, more exactly and steadily, or more slightly and superficially, as we please; and in this radical freedom of directing or diverting our thoughts, a main part of our freedom does consist: often objects as they appear to our thoughts do so affect or heat them, that they do seem to conquer us, and carry us after them; some thoughts seeming as it were to intoxicate and charm us. Appetites and passions, when much fired by objects apt to work upon them, do agitate us strongly; and, on the other hand, the impressions of religion come often into our minds with such a secret force, so much of terror and such secret joy mixing with them,

A R T.  
X.

that they seem to master us; yet in all this a man acts freely, because he thinks and chooses for himself; and though perhaps he does not feel himself so entirely balanced, that he is indifferent to both sides, yet he has still such a remote liberty, that he can turn himself to other objects and thoughts, so that he can divert, if not all of a sudden resist, the present impressions that seem to master him. We do also feel that in many trifles we do act with an entire liberty, and do many things upon no other account, and for no other reason, but because we will do them: and yet more important things depend on these.

Our thoughts are much governed by those impressions that are made upon our brain: when an object proportioned to us appears to us with such advantages as to affect us much, it makes such an impression on our brain, that our animal spirits move much towards it; and those thoughts that answer it arise oft and strongly upon us, till either that impression is worn out and flatted, or new and livelier ones are made on us by other objects. In this depressed state in which we now are, the ideas of what is useful or pleasant to our bodies are strong; they are ever fresh, being daily renewed; and, according to the different construction of men's blood and their brains, there arises a great variety of inclinations in them. Our animal spirits, that are the immediate organs of thought, being the subtler parts of our blood, are differently made and shaped, as our blood happens to be acid, salt, sweet, or phlegmatic: and this gives such a bias to all our inclinations, that nothing can work us off from it, but some great strength of thought that bears it down: so learning, chiefly in mathematical sciences, can so swallow up and fix one's thought, as to possess it entirely for some time; but when that amusement is over, nature will return and be where it was, being rather diverted than overcome by such speculations.

The revelation of religion is the proposing and proving many truths of great importance to our understandings, by which they are enlightened, and our wills are guided; but these truths are feeble things, languid and unable to stem a tide of nature, especially when it is much excited and heated: so that in fact we feel, that, when nature is low, these thoughts may have some force to give an inward melancholy, and to awaken in us purposes and resolutions of another kind; but when nature recovers itself, and takes fire again, these grow less powerful. The giving those truths of religion such a force that they may be able to subdue nature, and to govern us, is the design of both natural and revealed religion. So the question comes now according to the Article to be, whether a man by the powers of nature and of reason, without other inward assistances, can so far turn and dispose his own mind, as to believe and 'to do works pleasant and acceptable to God.' Pelagius thought that man was so entire in his

liberty, that there was no need of any other grace but that of *pardon*, and of proposing the truths of religion to men's knowledge, but that the use of these was in every man's power. Those who were called Semipelagians thought that an assisting inward grace was necessary to enable a man to go through all the harder steps of religion; but with that they thought that the first turn or conversion of the will to God, was the effect of a man's own free choice.

In opposition to both which, this Article asserts both an assisting and a preventing grace. That there are inward assistances given to our powers, besides those outward blessings of Providence, is first to be proved. In the Old Testament, it is true, there were not express promises made by Moses of such assistances; yet it seems both David and Solomon had a full persuasion about it. David's prayers do every where relate to somewhat that is internal: he prays God 'to open and turn his eyes; to unite and incline his heart; to quicken him; to make him to go; to guide and lead him; to create in him a clean heart, and renew a right spirit within him.' Solomon says, that 'God gives wisdom; that he directs men's paths, and giveth grace to the lowly.' In the promise that Jeremy gives of a new covenant, this is the character that is given of it; 'I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts: They shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest.' Like to that is what Ezekiel promises; 'A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you; and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh; and I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments and do them.' That these prophecies relate to the new dispensation cannot be questioned, since Jeremy's words, to which the other are equivalent, are cited and applied to it in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Now the opposition of the one dispensation to the other, as it is here stated, consists in this, that whereas the old dispensation was made up of laws and statutes that were given on tables of stone, and in writing, the new dispensation was to have somewhat in it beside that external revelation, which was to be internal, and which should dispose and enable men to observe it.

A great deal of our Saviour's discourse concerning the Spirit, which he was to pour on his disciples, did certainly belong to that extraordinary effusion at Pentecost, and to those wonderful effects that were to follow upon it; yet as he had formerly given this as an encouragement to all men to pray, that 'his heavenly Father would give the Holy Spirit to every one that asked him,' so there are many parts of that his last discourse that seem to belong to the constant necessities of all Christians. It is as unreasonable to limit all to that time, as the first words of it, 'I go to prepare a place for

A R T.  
X.Ps. cxix.  
18, 27, 32,  
35.  
Ps. li. 10.  
11.  
Prov. ii. 6.  
iii. 6, 34.Jer. xxxi.  
33, 34.Ezek.  
xxxvi. 26,  
27.Luke xi.  
13.John xiv.  
2.

ART.  
X.

you; and 'because I live, ye shall live also.' The prayer which comes after that discourse, being extended beyond them to all that should 'believe in his name through their word,' we have no reason to limit these words, 'I will manifest myself to him; My Father and I will make our abode with him; In me ye shall have peace;' to the apostles only; so that the guidance, the conviction, the comforts, of that Spirit, seem to be promises which in a lower order belong to all Christians. St. Paul speaks of 'the love of God shed abroad in Christians' hearts by the Holy Ghost:' when he was under temptation, and prayed thrice, he had this answer, 'My grace is sufficient for thee; my strength is made perfect in weakness.' He prays often for the churches in his Epistles to them, that 'God would stablish, comfort, and perfect them, enlighten and strengthen them;' and this in all that variety of words and phrases that import inward assistances. This is also meant by 'Christ's living and dwelling in us,' and by our being 'rooted and grounded in him;' our being 'the temples of God, a holy habitation to him, through his Spirit;' our being 'sealed by the Spirit of God to the day of redemption;' by all those directions to pray for 'grace to help in time of need,' and 'to ask wisdom of God that gives liberally to all men;' as also by the phrases of 'being born of God,' and 'the having his seed abiding in us.' These and many more places, which return often through the New Testament, seem to put it beyond all doubt, that there are inward communications from God, to the powers of our souls; by which we are made both to apprehend the truths of religion, to remember and reflect on them, and to consider and follow them more effectually.

How these are applied to us is a great difficulty indeed, but it is to little purpose to amuse ourselves about it. God may convey them immediately to our souls, if he will; but it is more intelligible to us to imagine that the truths of religion are by a divine direction imprinted deep upon our brain; so that naturally they must affect us much, and be oft in our thoughts: and this may be an hypothesis to explain regeneration or habitual grace by. When a deep impression is once made, there may be a direction from God, in the same way that his providence runs through the whole material world, given to the animal spirits to move towards and strike upon that impression, and so to excite such thoughts as by the law of the union of the soul and body to correspond to it: this may serve for an hypothesis to explain the conveyance of actual grace to us: but these are only proposed as hypotheses, that is, as methods, or possible ways, how such things may be done, and which may help us to apprehend more distinctly the manner of them. Now as this hypothesis has nothing in it but what is truly philosophical, so it is highly congruous to the nature and attributes of God, that if our faculties are

ART.  
X.

fallen under a decay and corruption, so that bare instruction is not like to prevail over us, he should by some secret methods rectify this in us. Our experience tells us but too often what a feeble thing knowledge and speculation is, when it engages with nature strongly assaulted; how our best thoughts fly from us and forsake us: whereas at other times the sense of these things lies with a due weight on our minds, and has another effect upon us. The way of conveying this is invisible; our Saviour compared it to the 'wind that bloweth where it listeth; no man knows whence it comes, and whither it goes.' No man can give an account of the sudden changes of the wind, and of that force with which the air is driven by it, which is otherwise the most yielding of all bodies; to which he adds, 'so is every one that is born of the Spirit.' This he brings to illustrate the meaning of what he had said, that 'except a man was born again of water and of the Spirit, he could not enter into the kingdom of God:' and to shew how real and internal this was, he adds, 'that which is born of the flesh is flesh;' that is, a man has the nature of those parents from whom he is descended, by *flesh* being understood the fabric of the human body, animated by the soul: in opposition to which he subjoins, 'that which is born of the Spirit is spirit;' that is to say, a man thus regenerated by the operation of the Spirit of God, comes to be of a spiritual nature.

With this I conclude all that seemed necessary to be proved, that there are inward assistances given to us in the new dispensation. I do not dispute whether these are fitly called *grace*, for perhaps that word will scarce be found in that sense in the scriptures; it signifying more largely the love and favour of God, without restraining it to this act or effect of it. The next thing to be proved is, that there is a *preventing grace*, by which the will is first moved and disposed to turn to God. It is certain that the first promulgation of the gospel to the churches that were gathered by the apostles, is ascribed wholly to the riches and freedom of the grace of God. This is fully done in the Epistle to the Ephesians, in which their former ignorance and corruption is set forth under the figures of *blindness*, of 'being without hope, and without God in the world, and dead in trespasses and sins, they following the course of this world, and the prince of the power of the air, and being by nature children of wrath;' that is, under wrath. I dispute not here concerning the meaning of the word *by nature*, whether it relates to the corruption of our nature in Adam, or to that general corruption that had overspread heathenism, and was become as it were another nature to them. In this single instance we plainly see that there was no previous disposition to the first preaching of the gospel at Ephesus: many expressions of this kind, though perhaps not of this force, are in the other Epistles. St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Romans, puts God's choosing of Abraham upon

Rom. v. 5.

2 Cor. xii.  
9.Eph. iii.  
17.2 Cor. vi.  
16.Eph. ii. 22.  
1. 13, 14.Heb. iv.  
16.Jam. i. 5.  
1 John iii.  
9.

John iii. 8.

Eph. ii. 2.  
3, 12.

ART. X. this, that it was 'of grace, not of debt, otherwise Abraham might have had whereof to glory.' And when he speaks of God's casting off the Jews, and grafting the Gentiles upon that stock from which they were cut off, he ascribes it wholly to the goodness of God towards them, and charges them 'not to be highminded, but to fear.' In his Epistle to the Corinthians he says, that 'not many wise, mighty, nor noble, were chosen, but God had chosen the foolish, the weak, and the base things of this world, so that no flesh should glory in his presence;' and he urges this further, in words that seem to be as applicable to particular persons, as to communities or churches: 'Who maketh thee to differ from another? and what has thou, that thou didst not receive? Now if thou didst receive it, why dost thou glory as if thou hadst not received it?' From these and many more passages of the like nature it is plain, that in the promulgation of the gospel, 'God was found of them that sought not to him, and heard of them that called not upon him;' that is, he prevented them by his favour, while there were no previous dispositions in them to invite it, much less to merit it. From this it may be inferred, that the like method should be used with relation to particular persons.

We do find very express instances in the New Testament of the conversion of some by a preventing grace: it is said, that 'God opened the heart of Lydia, so that she attended to the things that were spoken of Paul.' The conversion of St. Paul himself was so clearly from a preventing grace, that if it had not been miraculous in so many of its circumstances, it would have been a strong argument in behalf of it. These words of Christ seem also to assert it; 'Without me ye can do nothing; ye have not chosen me, but I you; and no man can come to me, except the Father which has sent me draw him.' Those who received Christ were 'born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of the will of God.' God is said 'to work in us both to will and to do of his own good pleasure;' the one seems to import the first beginnings, and the other the progress, of a Christian course of life. So far all among us, that I know of, are agreed, though perhaps not as to the force that is in all those places to prove this point.

There do yet remain two points in which they do not agree; the one is the efficacy of this preventing grace; some think that it is of its own nature so efficacious, that it never fails of converting those to whom it is given: others think that it only awakens and disposes, as well as it enables them to turn to God, but that they may resist it, and that the greater part of mankind do actually resist it. The examining of this point, and the stating the arguments on both sides, will belong more properly to the seventeenth Article. The other head, in which many do differ, is concerning the extent of this preventing

grace; for whereas such as do hold it to be efficacious of itself, restrain it to the number of those who are elected and converted by it; others do believe, that as Christ died for all men, so there is an universal grace which is given in Christ to all men, in some degree or other, and that it is given to all baptized Christians in a more eminent degree; and that as all are corrupted by Adam, there is also a general grace given to all men in Christ. This depends so much on the former point, that the discussing the one is indeed the discussing of both; and therefore it shall not be further entered upon in this place.

ART.  
X.

## ARTICLE XI.

## Of the Justification of Man.

We are accounted Righteous before God only for the Merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by Faith, and not for our own Works or Deservings. Wherefore that we are justified by Faith only, is a most wholesome Doctrine, and very full of Comfort, as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification.

IN order to the right understanding this Article, we must first consider the true meaning of the terms of which it is made up: which are *justification*, *faith*, *faith only*, and *good works*; and then, when these are rightly stated, we will see what judgments are to be passed upon the questions that do arise out of this Article. *Just*, or *justified*, are words capable of two senses; the one is, a man who is in the favour of God by a mere act of his grace, or upon some consideration not founded on the holiness or the merit of the person himself. The other is, a man who is truly holy, and as such is beloved of God. The use of this word in the New Testament was probably taken from the term *chasedim* among the Jews, a designation of such as observed the external parts of the law strictly, and were believed to be upon that account much in the favour of God; an opinion being generally spread among them, that a strict observance of the external parts of the law of Moses did certainly put a man in the favour of God. In opposition to which, the design of a great part of the New Testament is to shew that these things did not put men in the favour of God. Our Saviour used the word *saved* in opposition to *condemned*; and spoke of men who were *condemned already*, as well as of others who were *saved*. St. Paul enlarges more fully into many discourses; in which our being *justified* and the *righteousness of God*, or his *grace towards us*, are all terms equivalent to one another. His design in the Epistle to the Romans was to prove that the observance of the Mosaic law could not *justify*, that is, could not put a man under the *grace* or *favour* of God, or the *righteousness* of God, that is, into a state of *acceptation* with him, as that is opposite to a state of *wrath* or *condemnation*: he upon that shews that Abraham was in the favour of God before he was circumcised, upon the account of his trusting to the promises of God, and obeying his commands; and that God reckoned upon these acts of his, as much as if they had been an entire course of obedience; for that is the meaning of these words, 'And it was imputed to him for righteousness.' These promises were freely made to him by God, when by no previous works of

John iii.  
18.Gen. xv. 6.  
Rom. iv. 3.  
22.

his he had made them to be due to him of debt; therefore that covenant which was founded on those promises, was the 'justifying of Abraham freely by grace.' Upon which St. Paul, in a variety of inferences and expressions, assumes that we are in like manner 'justified freely by grace through the redemption in Christ Jesus.' That God has of his own free goodness offered a new covenant, and new and better promises to mankind in Christ Jesus, which whosoever believe as Abraham did, they are justified as he was. So that whosoever will observe the scope of St. Paul's Epistles to the Romans and Galatians, will see that he always uses *justification* in a sense that imports our being put in the favour of God. The Epistle to the Galatians was indeed writ upon the occasion of another controversy, which was, whether, supposing Christ to be the Messias, Christians were bound to observe the Mosaic law or not: whereas the scope of the first part of the Epistle to the Romans is to shew that we are not justified nor saved by the law of Moses, as a mean of its own nature capable to recommend us to the favour of God, but that even that law was a dispensation of *grace*, in which it was a true faith like Abraham's that put men in the favour of God; yet in both these Epistles, in which *justification* is fully treated of, it stands always for the receiving one into the favour of God.

Rom. iii.  
24.

In this, the consideration upon which it is done, and the condition upon which it is offered, are two very different things. The one is a dispensation of God's mercy, in which he has regard to his own attributes, to the honour of his laws, and his government of the world: the other is the method in which he applies that to us, in such a manner, that it may have such ends as are both perfective of human nature, and suitable to an infinitely holy Being to pursue. We are never to mix these two together, or to imagine that the condition, upon which justification is offered to us, is the consideration that moves God; as if our holiness, faith, or obedience, were the moving cause of our justification;\* or that God *justifies*

\* 'Faith is the only hand which putteth on Christ unto justification; and Christ the only garment, which, being so put on, covereth the shame of our defiled natures, hideth the imperfection of our works, preserveth us blameless in the sight of God, before whom, otherwise, the weakness of our faith were cause sufficient to make us culpable, yea, to shut us from the kingdom of heaven, where nothing that is not absolute can enter.'—Hooker.

Justification is the office of God only, and is not a thing which we render unto him, but which we receive of him: not which we give to him, but which we take of him, by his free mercy, and by the only merits of his most dearly beloved Son, our only Redeemer, Saviour, and Justifier, Jesus Christ: so that the true understanding of this doctrine, we be justified freely by faith without works, or that we be justified by faith in Christ only, is not, that this our own act to believe in Christ, or this our faith in Christ, which is within us, doth justify us, and deserve our justification unto us (for that were to count ourselves to be justified by some act or virtue that is within ourselves); but the true understanding and meaning thereof is, that although we hear God's word and believe it, although we have faith, hope, charity, repentance, dread, and fear of God within us, and do never so many works thereunto: yet we must renounce the merit of all our said virtues, of faith,

A R T.  
XI.

us, because he sees that we are truly *just*: for though it is not to be denied, but that in some places of the New Testament, *justification* may stand in that sense, because the word in its true signification will bear it; yet in these two Epistles, in which it is largely treated of, nothing is plainer than that the design is to shew us what it is that brings us to the favour of God, and to a state of pardon and acceptation: so that *justification* in those places stands in opposition to accusation and *condemnation*.

The next term to be explained is *faith*; which in the New Testament stands generally for the complex of Christianity, in opposition to the law, which stands as generally for the complex of the whole Mosaical dispensation. So that the *faith of Christ* is equivalent to this, the gospel of Christ; because Christianity is a fœderal religion, founded on God's part, on the promises that he has made to us, and on the rules he has set us; and on our part, on our believing that revelation, our trusting to those promises, and our setting ourselves to follow those rules: the believing this revelation, and that great article of it, of Christ's being the Son of God, and the true Messias, that came to reveal his Father's will, and to offer himself up to be the sacrifice of this new covenant, is often represented as the great and only condition of the covenant on our part; but still this *faith* must receive the whole gospel, the precepts as well as the promises of it, and receive Christ as a Prophet to teach, and a King to rule, as well as a Priest to save us.

By *faith only*, is not to be meant faith as it is separated from the other evangelical graces and virtues; but faith, as it is opposite to the rites of the Mosaical law: for that was the great question that gave occasion to St. Paul's writing so fully upon this head; since many Judaizing Christians, as they acknowledged Christ to be the true Messias, so they thought that the law of Moses was still to retain its force: in opposition to whom St. Paul says, that 'we are justified by

Rom. iii.  
28.

Gal. ii. 16.

hope, charity, and all other virtues and good deeds, which we either have done, shall do, or can do, as things that be far too weak, and insufficient, and imperfect, to deserve remission of our sins, and our justification; and therefore we must trust only in God's mercy, and that sacrifice which our High-priest and Saviour Christ Jesus, the Son of God, once offered for us upon the cross, to obtain thereby God's grace and remission, as well of our original sin in baptism, as of all actual sin committed by us after our baptism, if we truly repent and turn unfeignedly to him again. So that as St. John Baptist, although he were never so virtuous and godly a man, yet in this matter of forgiving of sin, he did put the people from him, and appointed them unto Christ, saying thus unto them, Behold, yonder is the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sins of the world: even so, as great and as godly a virtue as the lively faith is, yet it putteth us from itself, and remitteth or appointeth us into Christ, for to have only by him remission of our sins, or justification. So that our faith in Christ (as it were) saith unto us thus, It is not I that take away your sins, but it is Christ only, and to him only I send you for that purpose, forsaking therein all your good virtues, words, thoughts, and works, and only putting your trust in Christ.' *Homily of the Salvation of Mankind: Second Part.*—[Ed.]

A R T.  
XI.Rom. ii.  
12.James ii.  
24.

faith, without the works of the law.' It is plain that he means the Mosaical dispensation, for he had divided all mankind into those 'who were in the law,' and those 'who were without the law,' that is, into Jews and Gentiles. Nor had St. Paul any occasion to treat of any other matter in those Epistles, or to enter into nice abstractions, which became not one that was to instruct the world in order to their salvation: those metaphysical notions are not easily apprehended by plain men, not accustomed to such subtilties, and are of very little value, when they are more critically distinguished: yet when it seems some of those expressions were wrested to an ill sense and use, St. James treats of the same matter, but with this great difference, that though he says expressly that 'a man is justified by his works, and not by faith only;' yet he does not say, *by the works of the law*; so that he does not at all contradict St. Paul; the works that he mentions not being the circumcision or ritual observances of Abraham, but his offering up his son Isaac, which St. Paul had reckoned a part of the *faith of Abraham*: this shews that he did not intend to contradict the doctrine delivered by St. Paul, but only to give a true notion of the *faith that justifies*; that it is not a bare believing, such as devils are capable of, but such a believing as exerted itself in good works. So that the *faith* mentioned by St. Paul is the complex of all Christianity; whereas that mentioned by St. James is a bare believing, without a life suitable to it. And as it is certainly true that we are taken into the favour of God, upon our receiving the whole gospel, without observing the Mosaical precepts; so it is as certainly true, that a bare professing or giving credit to the truth of the gospel, without our living suitably to it, does not give us a right to the favour of God. And thus it appears that these two pieces of the New Testament, when rightly understood, do in no wise contradict, but agree well with one another.

In the last place, we must consider the signification of *good works*: by them are not to be meant some voluntary and assumed pieces of severity, which are no where enjoined in the gospel, that arise out of superstition, and that feed pride and hypocrisy: these are so far from deserving the name of *good works*, that they have been in all ages the methods of imposture, and of impostors, and the arts by which they have gained credit and authority. By *good works* therefore are meant acts of true holiness, and of sincere obedience to the laws of the gospel.

The terms being thus explained, I shall next distinguish between the questions arising out of this matter, that are only about words, and those that are more material and important. If any man fancy that the remission of sins is to be considered as a thing previous to *justification*, and distinct from it, and acknowledge that to be freely given in Christ Jesus; and that



ART.  
XI.

in consequence of this there is such a grace infused, that thereupon the person becomes truly *just*, and is considered as such by God: this, which must be confessed to be the doctrine of a great many in the church of Rome, and which seems to be that established at Trent, is indeed very visibly different from the style and design of those places of the New Testament, in which this matter is most fully opened: but yet after all it is but a question about words; for if that which they call *remission* of sins, be the same with that which we call *justification*; and if that which they call *justification* be the same with that which we call *sanctification*, then here is only a strife of words; yet even in this we have the scriptures clearly of our side; so that we hold the *form of sound words*, from which they have departed. The scripture speaks of *sanctification* as a thing different from, and subsequent to, *justification*. 'Now ye are washed, ye are sanctified, ye are justified.' And since justification, and the being in the love and favour of God, are in the New Testament one and the same thing, the remission of sins must be an act of God's favour: for we cannot imagine a middle state of being neither accepted of him, nor yet under his *wrath*, as if the remission of sins were merely an extinction of the guilt of sin without any special favour. If therefore this remission of sins is acknowledged to be given freely to us through Jesus Christ, this is that which we affirm to be *justification*, though under another name: we do also acknowledge that our natures must be sanctified and renewed, that so God may take pleasure in us, when his image is again visible upon us; and this we call *sanctification*; which we acknowledge to be the constant and inseparable effect of *justification*: so that as to this, we agree in the same doctrine, only we differ in the use of the terms; in which we have the phrase of the New Testament clearly with us.

But there are two more material differences between us: it is a tenet in the church of Rome, that the use of the sacraments, if men do not put a bar to them, and if they have only imperfect acts of sorrow accompanying them, does so far complete those weak acts, as to *justify* us.\* This we do utterly deny, as a doctrine that tends to enervate all religion; and to make the sacraments, that were appointed to be the solemn acts of religion, for quickening and exciting our piety, and for conveying grace to us, upon our coming devoutly to them, become means to flatten and deaden us; as if they were of the nature of charms, which, if they could be come at, though

\* Si quis dixerit, sacramenta novæ legis non continere gratiam, quam significant, aut gratiam ipsam non ponentibus obicere non conferre, quasi signa tantum externa sint, accepta per fidem gratiæ, vel justitiæ, et notæ quidam Christianæ professionis, quibus apud homines discernuntur fideles ab infidelibus: Anathema sit.  
 Si quis dixerit, per ipsa novæ legis sacramenta ex opere operato non conferri gratiam, sed solam fidem diviniæ promissionis ad gratiam consequendam sufficere Anathema sit. Conc. Trident. canon. et decret. Sessio viii. Can. vi. et viii.—[Ed.

ART.  
XI.

with ever so slight a preparation, would make up all defects. The doctrine of sacramental justification is justly to be reckoned among the most mischievous of all those practical errors that are in the church of Rome.\* Since, therefore, this is nowhere mentioned in all these large discourses that are in the New Testament concerning justification, we have just reason to reject it: since also the natural consequence of this doctrine is to make men rest contented in low imperfect acts, when they can be so easily made up by a sacrament, we have just reason to detest it, as one of the depths of Satan; the tendency of it being to make those ordinances of the gospel, which were given us as means to raise and heighten our faith

\* It is of vital importance that the doctrine of the church of Rome respecting the justification of a sinner should be well understood; for this, after all, the grand distinguishing difference between us and the papacy. Unacquaintance with this article has led many to charge upon the papal church what she does not receive, while it has deprived them of the opportunity and power of attacking her system where it is most vulnerable; thereby giving to the adversary an easy triumph, and to true religion a severe blow. It will not, therefore, be deemed out of place to here point out, in the words of the great Hooker, how far we agree, and wherein we differ from, and protest against the church of Rome, in this momentous question: 'There is a glorifying righteousness of men in the world to come: as there is a justifying and sanctifying righteousness here. The righteousness wherewith we shall be clothed in the world to come, is both perfect and inherent. That whereby here we are justified is perfect; but not inherent. That whereby we are sanctified is inherent, but not perfect. This openeth a way to the understanding of that grand question, which hangeth yet in controversy between us and the church of Rome, about the matter of justifying righteousness. First, although they imagine, that the mother of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ were, for his honour, and by his special protection, preserved clean from all sin: yet touching the rest, they teach as we do, that infants that never did actually offend, have their natures defiled, destitute of justice, averted from God; that in making man righteous, none do efficiently work with God, but God. They teach as we do, that unto justice no man ever attained, but by the merits of Jesus Christ. They teach as we do, that although Christ, as God, be the efficient; as man, the meritorious cause of our justice: yet in us also there is something required. God is the cause of our natural life, in him we live: but he quickeneth not the body without the soul in the body. Christ hath merited to make us just: but, as a medicine, which is made for health, doth not heal by being made, but by being applied, so, by the merits of Christ there can be no justification, without the application of his merit. Thus far we join hands with the church of Rome.

'Wherein then do we disagree? We disagree about the nature and essence of the medicine, whereby Christ cureth our disease; about the manner of applying it; about the number and the power of means, which God requireth in us for the effectual applying thereof to our souls' comfort. When they are required to shew what the righteousness is whereby a Christian man is justified: they answer, that it is a divine spiritual quality; which quality, received into the soul, doth first make it to be one of them, who are born of God: and secondly, endue it with power to bring forth such works, as they do that are born of him; even as the soul of man being joined to his body doth first make him to be of the number of reasonable creatures; and secondly, enable him to perform the natural functions which are proper to his kind; that it maketh the soul amiable and gracious in the sight of God, in regard whereof it is termed grace; that it purgeth, purifieth, and washeth out all the stains and pollutions of sins; that by it, through the merit of Christ, we are delivered as from sin, so from eternal death and condemnation, the reward of sin. This grace they will have to be applied by infusion; to the end, that as the body is warm by the heat which is in the body, so the soul might be righteous by inherent grace: which grace they make capable of increase; as the body may be more and more warm, so the soul more and more justified, according as grace should be augmented; the augmentation whereof is merited by good works, as good works are made meritorious by it. Wherefore the first receipt of grace in their divinity is, the first justification; the increase thereof,

and repentance, become engines to encourage sloth and impenitence.

There is another doctrine that is held by many, and is still taught in the church of Rome, not only with approbation, but favour; that the inherent holiness of good men is a thing of its own nature so perfect, that, upon the account of it, God is so bound to esteem them just, and to *justify* them, that he were unjust if he did it not. They think there is such a real *condignity* in it, that it makes men God's adopted children. Whereas we, on the other hand, teach, that God is indeed pleased with the inward reformation that he sees in good men, in whom his grace dwells; that he approves and accepts of

the second justification. As grace may be increased by the merit of good works: so it may be diminished by the demerit of sins venial—it may be lost by mortal sin. In as much, therefore, as it is needful in the one case to repair, in the other to recover, the loss which is made: the infusion of grace hath her sundry after-meals; for the which cause, they make many ways to apply the infusion of grace. It is applied to infants, through baptism, without either faith or works, and in them really it taketh away original sin, and the punishment due unto it; it is applied to infidels and wicked men in the first justification, through baptism without works, yet not without faith; and it taketh away both sins actual and original together, with all whatsoever punishment, eternal or temporal, thereby deserved. Unto such as have attained the first justification, that is to say the first receipt of grace, it is applied farther by good works to the increase of former grace, which is the second justification. If they work more and more, grace doth more increase, and they are more and more justified. To such as diminished it by venial sins, it is applied by holy water, Ave Mary's, crossings, papal salutations, and such like, which serve for reparations of grace decayed. To such as have lost it through mortal sin, it is applied by the sacrament (as they term it) of penance: which sacrament hath force to confer grace anew, yet in such sort, that being so conferred, it hath not altogether so much power, as at the first; for it only cleanseth out the stain or guilt of sin committed, and changeth the punishment eternal into a temporary satisfactory punishment here, if time do serve; if not, hereafter to be endured, except it be lightened by masses, works of charity, pilgrimages, fasts, and such like; or else shortened by pardon for term, or by plenary pardon quite removed and taken away. This is the mystery of the man of sin. This mazes the church of Rome doth cause her followers to tread when they ask her the way to justification.

Whether they speak of the first or second justification, they make it the essence of a divine quality inherent, they make it righteousness which is in us. If it be in us then it is ours, as our souls are ours though we have them from God, and can hold them no longer than pleaseth Him; for if he withdraw the breath of our nostrils, we fall to dust: but the righteousness wherein we must be found, if we will be justified, is not our own; therefore we cannot be justified by any inherent quality. Christ hath merited righteousness for as many as are found in him. In him God findeth us if we be faithful, for by faith we are incorporated into Christ. Then although in ourselves we be altogether sinful and unrighteous, yet even the man which is impious in himself, full of iniquity, full of sin; him being found in Christ through faith, and having his sin remitted through repentance; him God upholdeth with a gracious eye, putteth away his sin by not imputing it, taketh quite away the punishment due thereunto, by pardoning it, and accepteth him in Jesus Christ, as perfectly righteous, as if he had fulfilled all that was commanded him in the law: shall I say more perfectly righteous than if himself had fulfilled the whole law? I must take heed what I say: but the apostle saith, "God made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin: that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." Such we are in the sight of God the Father, as is the very Son of God himself. Let it be counted folly, or frenzy, or fury, whatsoever; it is our comfort, and our wisdom; we care for no knowledge in the world but this, that man hath sinned, and God has suffered; that God hath made himself the Son of Man, and that men are made the righteousness of God. You see therefore that the church of Rome, in teaching justification by inherent grace, doth pervert the truth of Christ, and that, by the hands of the Apostles, we have received otherwise than she teacheth.—[Ed.]

their sincerity; but that with this there is still such a mixture, and in this there is still so much imperfection, that even upon this account, if God did straitly mark iniquity, none could stand before him: so that even his acceptance of this is an act of mercy and grace. This doctrine was commonly taught in the church of Rome at the time of the Reformation, and, together with it, they reckoned that the chief of those works that did justify, were either great or rich endowments, or excessive devotions towards images, saints, and relics; by all which, Christ was either forgot quite, or remembered only for form sake, esteemed perhaps as the chief of saints: not to mention the impious comparisons that were made between him and some saints, and the preferences that were given to them beyond him. In opposition to all this, the reformers began, as they ought to have done, at the laying down this as the foundation of all Christianity, and of all our hopes, that we were reconciled to God merely through his mercy, by the redemption purchased by Jesus Christ; and that a firm believing the gospel, and a claiming to the death of Christ, as the great propitiation for our sins, according to the terms on which it is offered us in the gospel, was that which united us to Christ; that gave us an interest in his death, and thereby justified us. If, in the management of this controversy, there was not so critical a judgment made of the scope of several passages of St. Paul's Epistles; and if the dispute became afterwards too abstracted and metaphysical, that was the effect of the infelicity of that time, and was the natural consequence of much disputing: therefore though we do not now stand to all the arguments, and to all the citations and illustrations, used by them; and though we do not deny but that many of the writers of the church of Rome came insensibly off from the most practical errors, that had been formerly much taught, and more practised, among them; and that this matter was so stated by many of them, that, as to the main of it, we have no just exceptions to it: yet, after all, this beginning of the Reformation was a great blessing to the world, and has proved so, even to the church of Rome; by bringing her to a juster sense of the atonement made for sins by the blood of Christ; and by taking men off from external actions, and turning them to consider the inward acts of the mind, faith and repentance, as the conditions of our justification. And therefore the approbation given here to the homily, is only an approbation of the doctrine asserted and proved in it; which ought not to be carried to every particular of the proofs or explanations that are in it. To be *justified*, and to be accounted righteous, stand for one and the same thing in the Article: and both import our being delivered from the guilt of sin, and entitled to the favour of God. These differ from God's intending from all eternity to save us, as much as a decree differs from the execution of it.

ART.  
XL

A man is then only *justified*, when he is freed from wrath, and is at peace with God: and though this is freely offered to us in the gospel through Jesus Christ, yet it is applied to none but to such as come within those qualifications and conditions set before us in the gospel. That God pardons sin, and receives us into favour only through the death of Christ, is so fully expressed in the gospel, as was already made out upon the second Article, that it is not possible to doubt of it, if one does firmly believe, and attentively read, the New Testament. Nor is it less evident, that it is not offered to us absolutely, and without conditions and limitations. These conditions are, *repentance*, with which *remission of sins* is often joined; and *faith*, but a 'faith that worketh by love, that purifies the heart, and that keeps the commandments of God;' such a faith as shews itself to be alive by good works, by acts of charity, and every act of obedience; by which we demonstrate, that we truly and firmly believe the divine authority of our Saviour and his doctrine. Such a faith as this *justifies*, but not as it is a work or meritorious action, that of its own nature puts us in the favour of God, and makes us truly just; but as it is the condition upon which the mercy of God is offered to us by Christ Jesus; for then we correspond to his design of coming into the world, that 'he might redeem us from all iniquity,' that is, justify us: and 'purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works;' that is, sanctify us. Upon our bringing ourselves therefore under these qualifications and conditions, we are actually in the favour of God; our sins are pardoned, and we are entitled to eternal life.

Our faith and repentance are not the valuable considerations for which God pardons and justifies; that is done merely for the death of Christ; which God having out of the riches of his grace provided for us, and offered to us, justification is upon those accounts said to be *free*; there being nothing on our part which either did or could have procured it. But still our faith, which includes our hope, our love, our repentance, and our obedience, is the condition that makes us capable of receiving the benefits of this redemption and free grace. And thus it is clear, in what sense we believe, that *we are justified both freely, and yet through Christ; and also through faith, as the condition indispensably necessary on our part.*

In strictness of words, we are not *justified* till the final sentence is pronounced; till upon our death we are solemnly acquitted of our sins, and admitted into the presence of God; this being that which is opposite to *condemnation*: yet as a man, who is in that state that must end in *condemnation*, is said to be *condemned already*, and *the wrath of God* is said to *abide upon him*; though he be not yet adjudged to it: so, on the contrary, a man in that state which must end in the full enjoyment of God, is said now to be *justified*, and to be at peace with God; because he not only has the promises of

Gal. v. 6.  
Luke xxiv.  
47.  
Acts ii. 38.

Tit. ii. 14.

John iii. 18.

ART.  
XI.

that state now belonging to him, when he does perform the conditions required in them; but is likewise receiving daily marks of God's favour, the protection of his providence, the ministry of angels, and the inward assistances of his grace and Spirit.

*This is a doctrine full of comfort*; for if we did believe that our justification was founded upon our inherent justice, or sanctification, as the consideration on which we receive it, we should have just cause of fear and dejection; since we could not reasonably promise ourselves so great a blessing, upon so poor a consideration: but when we know that this is only the condition of it, then when we feel it is sincerely received and believed, and carefully observed by us, we may conclude that we are *justified*: but we are by no means to think, that our certain persuasion of Christ's having died for us in particular, or the certainty of our salvation through him, is an act of *saving faith*, much less that we are justified by it. Many things have been too crudely said upon this subject, which have given the enemies of the Reformation great advantages, and have furnished them with much matter of reproach. We ought to believe firmly, that Christ died for all penitent and converted sinners; and when we feel these characters in ourselves, we may from thence justly infer, that he died for us, and that we are of the number of those who shall be saved through him: but yet if we may fall from this state, in which we do now feel ourselves, we may and must likewise forfeit those hopes; and therefore we must 'work out our salvation with fear and trembling.' Our believing that we shall be saved by Christ, is no act of divine faith; since every act of faith must be founded on some divine revelation: it is only a collection and inference that we may make from this general proposition, that Christ is the propitiation for the sins of those who do truly repent and believe his gospel; and from those reflections and observations that we make on ourselves, by which we conclude that we do truly both repent and believe.