

# John Brown of Wamphray, Richard Baxter, And the Justification Controversy

By Bruce R. Backensto

*There is nothing new under the sun.*

So wrote Solomon, and errors regarding that cardinal doctrine, Justification by Faith, are not an exception to this inspired observation. A prime illustration of this is found in examining the works of two 17<sup>th</sup> century theologians; one now relatively obscure, and the other still popular in Reformed circles for his practical writings. The former is the great Second Reformation Scottish theologian, John Brown of Wamphray (1610–1679), who sets forth the true doctrine of Justification

---

THE AUTHOR: Bruce R. Backensto is Co Pastor of the First Reformed Presbyterian Church, Beaver Falls, PA, and an Adjunct Professor at Reformed Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Pittsburgh. He is working on a doctoral thesis considering John Brown of Wamphray's Doctrine of Sanctification through the Evangelical Theological College of Wales and the University of Wales, Lampeter.

1. John Brown of Wamphray, *The Life of Justification Opened, or A Treatise grounded upon Gal. 2. 11. Wherein the Orthodox Doctrine of Justification by Faith and Imputation of Christ's Righteousness, is clearly expounded, solidly confirmed, and learnedly vindicated from the various Objections of it Adversaries. Whereunto are subjoined some Arguments against Universal Redemption* (Printed in the Year MD-CXCV [1695]).

2. James King Hewison, *The Covenanters: a History of the Church in Scotland from the Reformation to the Revolution, in Two Volumes (Glasgow: John Smith and Son, 1913) 2.161*. Cf. J.D. Douglas, *Light in the North* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1964) 101. In Hew Scott, *Faithi Ecclesiae Scotticanae The Succession of Ministers in the Church of Scotland from the Reformation*, New Edition, Vol. II (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1917) 224. John Brown of Wamphray is noted as "probably born and educated at Kirkcudbright."

3. John Howie of Lochgion, *The Scots Worthies Containing A Brief Historical Account of the Most Eminent Noblemen, Gentlemen, Ministers, and others, Who Testified or Suffered for the Cause of Reformation in Scotland from the Beginning of the Sixteenth Century to the Year 1688* (New York: Robert Carter and Brothers, n.d.) 497. Cf. *The Scots Worthies Their Lives and Testimonies including Many Additional Notes not Contained in the Original Collection*, edited by Rev. J.A. Wylie, assisted by Rev. James Anderson (London: William MacKenzie, Ludgate Hill, E.C., n.d.) 490.

in his masterful work, *The Life of Justification Opened*.<sup>1</sup> Among the "Adversaries of the Orthodox Doctrine of Justification" which Brown confronts is the now better known English divine of the same period, Richard Baxter (1615–1691), whose aberrant views are found in his works entitled, *Treatise of justifying Righteousness and Discourse of the two Covenants*.

Most everyone knows of the "First" Reformation of the sixteenth century, but the "Second" Reformation is not so popular. The "First" flew the banner, "None but Christ saves," while the "Second" flew the banner, "None but Christ reigns." John Brown was a prolific writer, who, for defending this standard of the seventeenth century Reformation, was exiled to Holland, where he wrote his many volumes defending the crown rights of King Jesus.

Born in Galloway, Scotland in about 1610, John Brown won the heart of Samuel Rutherford who wrote of Brown to one of his numerous correspondents in 1637, "I never could get my love off that man. I think Christ has something to do with him."<sup>2</sup> To John Brown's mother, Jean, an intelligent and pious woman,<sup>3</sup> Rutherford wrote from Aberdeen on the 13<sup>th</sup> of March 1637, while John himself was a mere youth (either 26 or 27 years old), "I rejoice to hear your son John is coming to visit Christ, and to taste of his love. I hope he shall not lose his pains, or rue that choice. I had always, 'as I said to you,' a great love to dear Mr. John, because I thought I saw Christ in him more than in his brethren. Fain would I write to him to stand by my sweet Master; and I wish you would let him read my letter, and the joy I have, if he will appear for, and side with my Lord Jesus" (Wylie, 497).

John Brown was educated in Edinburgh University (MA, 24 July 1630) as an ardent Covenanter and erudite theologian. He was ordained the second minister of the church at Wamphray, Annandale, in the Presbytery of

Lochmaben.<sup>4</sup> Howie writes that “He was indefatigable in his pastoral labours in that parish, as well as throughout Annandale” (Howie, 497). John Brown would remain on in Wamphray until he was in his very early fifties. He took a strong stand against the Prelacy which led to his being summoned to appear before the Council on 6 November 1662 charged with “abusing and reproaching some ministers for keeping the diocesan synod with the archbishop of Glasgow, calling them perjured knaves for so doing, because they had promised the contrary to him” (Howie, 497). The Council found him guilty and ordered him to be secured a prisoner in the Tolbooth until further orders.

The winter of 1662 in that prison was extremely hard on Mr. Brown. He petitioned, after five weeks therein, to be released for “want of free air” else he would lose his life. The council granted his request, ordering him to depart the king’s domain and not return without license from his majesty and the council or he would be put to death. On 11 December 1662 he was granted “free air” and given two months to arrange travel out of Scotland. In the spring of 1663 he landed in Holland and resided partly at Rotterdam and partly at Utrecht. From this asylum of banished Covenanters, Brown would write volumes with the hope of encouraging and strengthening his brothers and sisters to maintain faithfulness to the covenanting principles. His writings were used of the LORD to strengthen the faith of the Covenanters in Scotland such that Prelate Sharp encouraged Charles II in 1676 to write to the States-General of Holland demanding that the likes of Robert M’Ward, John Brown and Colonel James Wallace be expelled from Rotterdam as well. Reluctantly the States-General asked Brown to leave for Germany on 6 July 1677 because Charles II threatened to break friendship with Holland if Brown was not further exiled. A year later he was allowed to return to Rotterdam (Howie, 492).

John Brown was famous in his day “for learning and faithfulness, [for being a] warm and pathetic (i.e., evoking tenderness) preacher; in controversy he was acute, masculine, and strong; in history, plain and comprehensive; in divinity, substantial and divine” (Howie, 493). In the preface to the 1766 edition of his Commentary on the book of Romans, it is noted that “the particular grounds and causes why he was thus inhumanly and barbarously treated, was his strict attachment to, and maintaining the binding force and perpetual obligations of the nation’s solemn vows and covenants; his refusing acceptance of the then sinful Indulgences;... his public and zealous testifying against tolerations....”<sup>5</sup> This is the man who went on to write volumes in both Latin

and English while in exile in Holland, and many of his works were translated into Dutch by his colleague and friend, Jacobus Koelman.

Now that the reader is more familiar with our teacher, let us turn our attention to his critique of Richard Baxter’s view of justification and the reader will see why it is that as this writer read Brown he could not help but to think of our present day “Justification Controversy.” It is particularly the question of the role of works in justification that caught the writer’s eye.

At the root of the controversy in Brown’s day was the meaning of the Apostle Paul in his words recorded in Romans 4:3, *Faith is imputed unto Righteousness*. Is our act of believing imputed to us as righteousness? The phrases, *Abraham believed God*, and *it was counted unto him for righteousness* and *his faith is counted for righteousness* and *faith was counted to Abraham for righteousness*, all seem to the reader that one’s act of believing is imputed to the believer as righteousness. Servetus, Socinus, Arminius and the Papiſts all subscribe to this view of justification, that is, the believer’s act of faith is imputed as righteousness. Is their understanding of this verse correct? The Scottish Covenanter says, “No!” By critiquing Richard Baxter’s erroneous teaching regarding faith’s role in justification the reader will be better able to appreciate the Reformation doctrine of *sola fide*. Baxter, widely known for his excellent book, *Reformed Pastor*, was born November 12, 1615, the Lord’s Day, in a village near High Ercall, England, and died December 8, 1691, in Charterhouse Yard where he assisted the ministry of Matthew Sylvester for roughly five years. Baxter was a Nonconformist in that he rejected the idea of subscribing to the tenets of the Church of England *ex animo*. “[S]ubscription, and the [sign of the] cross in baptism, and the promiscuous giving of the Lord’s Supper to all drunkards, swearers, fornicators, scorners at godliness, etc., that are not excommunicated by a bishop or chancellor that is out of their acquaintance—these three were all that I now became a Nonconformist to.”<sup>6</sup> Baxter would speak against the *Et cetera* oath

4. *Faſti Ecclesiae Scotticanae*, vol. 2. Scott liſts John Haitlie [or Haſtie], M.A. (Edinburgh, 25<sup>th</sup> July 1618); min. in 1632; died before Sept. 1659, as the firſt miniſter of the church which was dedicated to St. Cuthbert with a chapel of St. Bernard in the pariſh, ſince the Reformation. John Brown is cited as his ſucceſſor around 1655. This would make Mr. Brown approximately 45 years of age when he was inſtalled at Wamphray.

5. John Brown of Wamphray, *An Expoſition of the Epiſtle of Paul the Apoſtle, to the Romans, with large Practical Obſervations, delivered in ſeveral lectures* (Edinburgh: Printed by David Paterson. MDCCLXVI [1766]) v.

6. *The Autobiography of Richard Baxter being the Reliquiae Baxter-*

which called ministers to swear “That we would never consent to the alteration of the present government of the Church by archbishops, bishops, deans, archdeacons, etc.” (19). He also decried the “Ship-money” as ordered by the King. Later in his life he was in conflict with Bishop Laud, as was Brown. Dean Stanley called him “the chief of English Protestant Schoolmen.” Others refer to him as an English Puritan church leader, divine scholar and controversialist.

#### THE QUALITY OF THE RIGHTEOUSNESS IMPUTED

The first question Brown asks concerns the quality of the righteousness imputed. Is it perfect or imperfect righteousness which Abraham enjoys on account of his faith? Since justification rests on perfect righteousness, the imperfect righteousness which one’s faith is only capable of demonstrating leaves one still unrighteous if one’s faith alone results in the imputation of righteousness. An impure faith is not able to result in a perfect righteousness. Brown says, “The reason is, because our faith is not perfect in itself, there being much dross admixed, and many degrees wanting in it; far less can it be a Perfect Righteousness, seeing a Perfect Righteousness must comprehend full Obedience to the whole Law of God” (314).

Brown goes on to argue that “Imputation” is something made to the believer by God which the believer did not already have. Since Abraham had this faith and exercised it, this faith itself cannot be the imputed righteousness. “Therefore, it is not the act of Believing, properly taken, that is imputed, or accounted here” (315). One is not able to bestow something which already is present. Therefore, the word “impute” cannot mean “account,” because “account” means “bestow, grant or reckon” to someone. It can only mean, “esteem, judge or repute” according to Brown. “But when God esteemeth, judgeth, or reputeth any thing to be in us, he doth not change it, nor make it something, that it was not before; but judgeth it to be, what it is indeed, for his judgment is according to truth *Rom. 2: 2*” (315). Since righteousness is revealed from faith to faith (Romans 1:17) and not according to the works of the law, for by that no flesh shall be justified, the act of believing cannot be imputed unto righteousness, it is all of grace. No room is left the believer to boast. God’s grace is set forth in the propitiation one enjoys through faith in Jesus Christ’s blood (Romans 3:24, 25). Boasting would certainly be the result of one’s act of believing if

*ianaes Abridged from the folio [1696]* (Rpt. Mobile, Ala.: R E Publications, n.d.) 17.

it was imputed as righteousness. The righteousness of Christ would be of naught. Verses 2 and 3 of Romans 4 make clear that Abraham’s works could not form the basis of his righteousness for they were imperfect only. Imperfect faith begets imperfect works, not perfect righteousness. If one’s act of believing is the ground and formal object of righteousness, room is left for glorying in oneself.

Verses 4 and 5 make it abundantly clear when Paul says, “Now to him, that worketh, is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt: but to him, that worketh not, but believeth on him, that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for Righteousness.” Brown concludes, “Now if Faith, properly taken, be imputed, the reckoning shall be of just debt: for to reckon a man righteous, who is righteous antecedent to that act of accounting, is no act of grace, but of just debt: but Faiths being accounted for Righteousness is an act of grace, and therefore it must be the Object of Faith, or the Righteousness, that Faith laith hold on, that is here said to be counted upon the Beleevers score; and this indeed is no act of just debt, but of grace.” The Scottish theologian further points out that if faith, that is, the act of believing on the part of the sinner, is imputed for righteousness, then God may not be called the justifier of the ungodly. “But if we take faith here, for the object of faith, or for the Righteousness of Christ, which faith fleeth unto, and layth hold on, all is clear and harmonious; for when a man is not a worker, but believeth, and he believeth on God, that justifieth the ungodly, that is one, that hath no Righteousness in himself, but must have it elsewhere; even imputed to him, and bestowed upon him, through Faith; and when he thus believeth, or layth hold on Christ’s Righteousness, this Righteousness, which by faith he leaneth to, is counted on his score for Righteousness, and he is thereupon Justified” (316).

Brown works his way through the rest of the verses in this fourth chapter of Romans to show that the righteousness enjoyed through one’s faith is not found in faith itself but in the object of one’s faith, namely the Lord Jesus Christ. Abraham was counted righteous before he was circumcised. If it were after his circumcision, an act of obedience, one might argue that his faith was reckoned as righteous, but this was not the case. Neither is it the case with Gentiles who are reckoned righteous through faith. Both Abraham and all Gentiles who are counted as righteous find that righteousness in the promised seed of the woman, in whom all nations of the earth should be blessed if embraced by faith (verses 9–11). In verse 13 we find that the righteousness is not an act of virtue and obedience because if that were so

our righteousness would be based on the Law. But the promise is made on the basis of the righteous seed, not on the works of the Law. If one's righteousness is rooted in one's act of believing it is not free nor gracious but earned as set forth in verse 13. Brown points out that "the very essence of justifying faith lyeth in looking to, laying hold on and leaning to a free and gracious promise" (317). Verse 15 clearly shows that the Law works wrath and not righteousness unto the sinner. An act of obedience to the Law cannot become our righteousness because the Law requires perfect obedience and not one of the natural born sons or daughters of Adam obeys perfectly. Brown moves on to point out that Baxter seeks to support his idea that one's act of believing is imputed as righteousness on two other false notions. Baxter argues, first, "that our Faith or our act of believing is the whole of our Gosþel-Righteousness ..." and "that Christ hath procured that it should be so, by procuring the New Covenant, whereof this faith is made the Condition" (327).

Drawing on Baxter's words as found on page 48 of *The Discourse of the two Covenants*, our exiled author shows again that Baxter rejects the notion that it is the righteousness of Jesus which is imputed to the believer. Baxter argues, "That God, in a way of special grace, or by vertue of a new Law of grace and favour, which was established by God, in Christ (Gal. 3:17) that is, in reference to what Christ was to do and suffer, in time then to come, did reckon his practical faith to him [Abraham] for Righteousness, that is, that which in the eye of the new Law, should passe in his estimation for righteousness, subordinate to Christ's Righteousness, which procured this grant or Law." And from page 40 of Baxter's work, Brown reveals, "That it is an act of God's special favour, and by vertue his new Law of grace, that such a faith, as he hath described (that is, a faith taking in all Gosþel Obedience, as we saw above) comes to be reckoned or imputed to a man for Righteousness; and through God's imputing it for righteousness, to stand a man in the same, if not a better stead, as to his eternal concern, as a person fulfilling of the original Law from first to last would have done. Christ's Righteousness being presupposed the only Meritorious Cause of this grant or Covenant." And further from page 50, "There are two things, which constitute and make up the Righteousness of the Law of Grace, first, that which consisteth in the forgiveness of sins and 2. the righteousness of sincere obedience: And in inference to both, he saith, faith is imputed for righteousness by vertue of the Law of Grace; for, saith he, faith as practical is imputed to a man for righteousness, as it is that and all that,

which is required of him himself by the Law of Grace, to entitle him to the righteousness, which consisteth in remission of sins." And finally from page 52 Brown quotes Baxter, "That faith is imputed for righteousness, which is practical or productive of sincere obedience, without which properly it is not a fulfilling of the Law of Grace, as a condition of the promised benefites, and consequently cannot justifie a man, in the eye of that Law: for, as he addeth, there must be repentance, and forgiving men their injuries, and faith must be such as worketh by love, and then he tels us, that Abraham was justified by his works. Jam. 2" (327-328).

In order to further show the error of this thinking John Brown cites a work supporting the old Socinianism. Socinus writes in *de Servat.* (lib. 4. c. 4, 7, 11)

God justified the ungodly, but now converted, penitent, and after he hath left off to be ungodly: the justified are not ungodly in themselves, neither are they so called, yea they are not sinners, and which is more, they do not now sinne. And so faith and works, that is, obedience to the commands of Christ, as the forme of faith, doth jusifie us before God, and by them through them (per illa, ex illis) he justifieth us. Smalcus disþ. 4. Faith, Charity &c. are so far from being effects of justification, that without them justification can no way really exist, for God justifieth no man, but him, who is completely adorned with all these vertues – yea the study of good works and walkeing before God were the case (though not the chiefe) of the justification of Noah, Abraham and others, who are said to be justified by faith. Socin. ubi supra de Serv lib. I. c. 4. Faith doth not justifie by its proper vertue, but by the mercy and good will of God, who justifieth such, as do such a work, and imputeth it for righteousness. With Paul, to have righteousness imputed is nothing else, but to have faith imputed, and to be accounted just. [sic] faith is so imputed to us, as that because of faith, we, howbeit guilty of many unrighteousness, are esteemed perfectly righteous, or God so dealeth with us, as if we were perfectly righteous, who can doubt, that the Apostle meaneth no other thing than that we are not righteous before God, because our works require that, as a due reward, but because it hath so seemed good to the Lord, to take our faith in place of righteousness; so that we receive the reward of grace, by which we are declared righteous before him (328).<sup>7</sup>

7. Brown is citing Faustus Socinus, *De Iesu Christo servatore, hoc est, cur & qua ratione Iesus Christus noster servator fit ... disputatio* ([Krakoiw]: A. Rodecki, 1594); also in *Opera Omnia*, vol. 1 ([Amsterdam]: 1656).

These thoughts of Baxter, Brown believes, are adequately handled by the orthodox writings already in print against the Papiſts, Socinains, and Arminians, therefore he only offers a few reasons why Baxter's teaching is not to be accepted. In the firſt place Brown ſhows that Baxter is, in effect, ſaying that faith alone is not ſufficient unto juſtification. "The Apoſtle argueth thus, we are Juſtified by faith; therefore we are not Juſtified by works. This man reasoneth on the contrary, we are juſtified by faith; therefore we are juſtified by works; becauſe by a faith that includeth works; as if the Apoſtle had meant a Faith that was dead, and had no affinity with works" (329).

Second, Baxter confounds that which is required of a believer, or of ſuch who are in covenant with God, with that which enables one to enter into covenant with God. Brown uſes the example of marriage. How fooliſh it is to think that "all the marriag-duties, required of ſuch as were already in that marriag ſtate, were conditions of entering into the marriag-ſtate."

Third, Baxter confounds juſtification with glorification. He does this by "making all that Faith and ſincere obedience, which is required in order to actual Salvation and Glorification, to be neceſſary before Juſtification: And thereby muſt ſay, that no man hath his ſins pardoned, ſo long as he liveth; but if he be ſincerely obedient, he is in the way to a Pardon, to Juſtification." Baxter wrote, "The juſt man in the eye of this new Law, ... is everyone that rightly believes, repents, and ſincerely obeyes, becauſe that is all that it requires of a man himſelf to his Juſtification and Salvation." Juſtification and ſalvation obviously go together with Baxter in that they have the ſame condition.

Fourth, Baxter confounds the two covenants, "or gives us a new Covenant of Works, inſtead of the Covenant of Grace; for this practical Faith, which includeth all obedience, hath the ſame place, force and efficacy in the new Covenant, that complete Obedience had in the old. And this Goſpel is but the old Law of works, only with this change, that where as the old Law required Perfect Obedience to the end, in order to Juſtification and Salvation; this new Covenant of works requireth Sincere Obedience to the end, in order to Juſtification and Salvation ... as *Adam* would have been, if he had continued in obedience to the end; and this Faith and ſincere Obedience is as really, and to all ends and purpoſes, as effectually and formally our Righteouſneſs, as Perfect Obedience would have been the Righteouſneſs of *Adam*" (329). This would mean that the reward reckoned is a debt paid, and not of grace at all. Hence, all glory and boaiſting falls to thoſe with ſincere faith.

Fifth, Baxter confounds the *right* to, with the *poſſeſſion* of eternal life, relative to their cauſe and antecedents. For the orthodox the new and holy obedience is that the kingdom of God may be poſſeſſed, while for Baxter, "it is made the cauſe or way of the Right *jus* to the Kingdom" (330). This is contrary to Galatians 3:18.

Brown of Wamphray maintains that when Baxter talks about Chriſt's righteouſneſs, he argues that if it

is alike common to all, to the Reprobate as well, as to the Elect, and ſo it can be imputed properly to none: And as to its effective Imputation (as *Suarez* calleth it) or Imputation, as to its effects or in its cauſality (as other ſpeak) after that it is offered and held forth to all, and hath the ſame common effects, unto all, until the condition be performed, that dependeth wholly upon man's performance of the Conditions; And as to its antecedent effects, it is equally and abſolutely imputed to all; that is, it is imputed to none, but the effects are equally made common to all, in making Salvation poſſible, and the condition to be faith.... all that, which Chriſt procured, was That all ſuch, as ſhould acquire a Goſpel-Righteouſneſs of their owne, ſhould be juſtified &c. And thus Chriſt died to purchaſe a vertue and merite to our faith, and that to this end, it ſhould become a Goſpel-Righteouſneſs, whereby they might have whereof to boaiſt and to glory before men, at leaſt (331).

Baxter ſeeks to answer this objection and Brown quotes him, "In regard of that juſtification, which is from the accusation of the Law of works, I ſay faith is but a condition and no otherwiſe juſtifieth, but becauſe it is made that condition by a New-Law, per legem remediamentem, and we muſt be judged by that Law: therefore, when the caſe is, whether we have performed the conditions of that new law, or not? then faith is materially that Righteouſneſs, by which we muſt be juſtified, againſt all accusations of Non-performance" (333). Brown ſtill ſees in this that faith is made the condition of the believer's righteouſneſs and becauſe it is made a new condition by the new law, this righteouſneſs is ſaid to be complete and perfect, as all righteouſneſs muſt be, however that is impoſſible for man to offer.

From this concern Brown takes his readers to conſider how faith may be a condition of juſtification. "It may be of ſome uſe.... to enquire in what way faith is and may be called a Condition.... The orthodox never denied, that it may be called a Condition.... yet withal we muſt alwayes look upon Faith, as an Inſtrument, or Inſtrumental Meane in Juſtification, becauſe of its

being as the hand of the soul to receive, bring-in, grip to and lay hold on the Righteousness of Christ, as the Righteousness of a Cautioner and of a publick person, to the end they might be Justified, Absolved from the sentence of the Law, and Accounted and pronounced Righteous, in the sight of God" (339). Because Socinians and Arminians cast the whole Gospel in a new mould, they deny faith to be an instrument and "assert, that it is only a Condition, or a *cause sine qua non*, as they speak ..." (339). Because they understood "that Faith properly taken was imputed unto Righteousness, and by vertue of Christ's merites was accepted of God for a Righteousness, and was so accounted and now consequentially they must say, that Faith (together with new Obedience, which they, also adde and conjoine, as making up one Righteousness) is to be looked upon, as a Condition, or *causa sine quo non*" (340).

After a careful consideration of the various ways the word "condition" is used in the writings of the 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> centuries, Brown concludes, "We know, how variously the word *Condition* is used, in our ordinary language: and how some time, that is called a condition, which is the real price, and worth of the thing given upon that condition; as when a man is willing to quite his house, lands or horse to another, upon condition of so much money, which is the real price, or valuable consideration: if we should call Faith and Good Works such a condition, the error would be worse than Popish" (340–341). There are times when a person of whom a certain condition is required, has the full power to perform the condition, except when there is some inevitable and unforeseen impediment which befalls the person, but how can faith be reckoned in this fashion? It is not within man's power to believe. "Whereby to all, who are not Pelagians, Socinians and Arminians in this matter, but acknowledge Faith to be the pure gift of God, and wrought by the Spirit, Regenerating the soul and giving an heart of flesh, it may be manifest, that no kinde of Conditions, spoken of by *Lawyers*, who treat only of *Compacts*, and other *Actions*, betwixt man and man, can comprehend this matter; whereof we are now speaking" (341).

No one makes a promise based upon a condition unless that condition is fully within the ability of the person making the promise doing it. If one made a promise based on a condition which could not be met, it would be an *impossible condition*. A *casual condition* is one which the person making the promise is capable of keeping. What sort of condition is faith unto one's salvation? From a human perspective it is an *impossible condition* to meet if one must exercise faith to be

justified. Brown uses the following illustration in this connection. "If a father should promise his little child an apple, on condition he should touch the Crown of his fathers head with his finger, which were impossible for him to do, unless the Father should either stoop so low unto him with his head; or take him up in his armes, that he may reach his head; who would call this a *potesstative condition*" (341)? This is what Baxter calls the condition of the Covenant, a *potesstative condition*. Baxter wants to talk about a "Potential Right" according to Brown. With this Baxter's universalism seems to be revealed.

But what is a Potential Right? Is it the same with a remote right? and how very far remote must that Right be (if it be at all) which the Reprobats have? And is there no difference as to this *Remote* and *Potential Right*, or what way it may be called, which is opposite to an *Actual Right* betwixt the Reprobats and the Elect, before Faith? It is like, Mr. Baxter will say, there is none, by reason that the Redemption is Universal and for all alike, and so that Right, how ever it be called, that proceedeth the Actual Right, is equally common to all, if we meane that Potential Right, which followeth upon the Redemption. But to us, who affirme, that Christ died only for the Elect, and that he took on their debt, and in due time made full satisfaction, according to his undertaking, these Elect ones for whom Christ engaged, in the Covenant of Redemption, have another sort of right, call it Potential, or what you will, than the Reprobats have: because Christ hath purchased all the blessings, promised in the Covenant, unto them: and he hath a Right kepted, for them, and not for the rest: so that a Right unto all these good things, being purchased by their Lord Redeemer, and Cautioner, and left to them as his sure legacie, in his Testament, and all so ensured, that in due times: according to the methode condescended upon, they shall be put in possession of the same, their Right is in Christ's purchase, and they are put in actual Possession of Justification, when they believe; which Faith is also purchased for them: all the benefites they shall enjoy concerning grace and glory are equally by him purchased, and are equally neer related unto his merites and death, as to the right, though as to the actual collation, Sovereigne wisdom hath appointed an Order and determining of one, before another, and so hath resolved to give faith, and then Justification &c. Although it be true, that in this case, what is *in conditione, non est in obligatione*, as to the actual possession; yet we cannot think, but a holy and Just God, having received satisfaction from the Mediator, in behalfe of such, for whom it was laid down, is under an obligation (as we

may conceive, and speake) unto the Mediator, to cause him see of the travel of his soul, and to give him his seed, and those he purchased, and in due time to call them effectually, and work Faith in them, and then Justifie &c. Adopt them &c thus bestow all the benefites purchased upon them, in the time and methode wisely determined. But if Mr. Baxter understand by this *jus actuale*, that is constituted upon the performance of the condition, a plaine, and simple Right unto the benefite, we can acknowledge no such Condition, lest we render the death of Christ void: for in him alone, have we all our Law-title and Right to all the blessings of the Covenant, to Faith, and all that follow upon it (342).

After giving ten reasons why faith cannot be a condition of justification, Brown gives the following reason as to why faith may be spoken of as a condition of one's justification.

That Christ having purchased all the good things of the Covenant, all the sure Mercies of David, all Grace, and all Glory, unto the chosen ones, and the Father having promised the actual collation and bestowing of all and every one of these mercies and blessings, so purchased and procured; and Jehovah and the Mediator both, in the counsel of their will condescending on such a methode and way of making the ransomed ones the owners of the Blessings purchased, that is, first to give the New Heart and the heart of flesh and in effectually calling, worke them up to Faith in and Union with Christ and so draw them to the mediator, and cause them accept of him, and wait upon him, and rest there, for life and salvation; and then to Justifie, Accepte of as Righteous, Adopte them, and then worke the works of holiness by his Spirit and more, in their soul; and so carrie on the work unto Perfection, till grace be crowned with glory: matters, I say, being thus wisely ordered, in the council of heaven, there is a Priority of order; Faith, receiving Christ, and resting on his Surety-righteousness, going before; and Justification following, and a firme connexion made betwixt the two, that who so ever beleeveth thus, shall be justified, and none shall be justified who beleeveth not thus: Now, when by vertue of this constitute order and Method, explained and revealed in the Gospel, the Ambassadors of Christ, in obedience to their Injunctions, call upon all, who heare the Gospel, to receive Christ and refuge themselves under his wings, and receive the atonement through his Righteousness, and promise them thereupon, in their Masters name, Pardon, Peace with God, Reconciliation; and acceptance &c. nothing more is here insinuated, than that such a Methode and Order is wisely

determined, and that there is a fixed connexion made betwixt Faith and Justification; so that who ever would be saved from the wrath to come; would enjoy God for ever, must come unto God in this way, and according to this methode, and must receive his blessings and Favours, in this order, first believe, and lay hold on Christ's and his Righteousness, and then receive Justification &c. Thus we see faith is no legal, Antecedent Condition, no Proper or Potesstative Condition; but only a consequent, or Evangelick Condition, or a Condition denoting a fixed and prescribed Order and Method of receiving of the blessings purchased by Christ, with a firme and fixed connexion betwixt the performance of the condition, and the granting of the thing promised thereupon. Thus Christ hath the whole glory of the work; Man is abased, and hath nothing to glory in himself; The reward is not of debt, but purely of grace; The wisdom and love of God is wonderful and remarkable; All ground of carnal security and self confidence is removed; A plaine and powerful ground is laid for ministers, to press, exhort, and obtest to Faith in the first place, with all seriousness and zeal; Full security and ground of confidence of being Justified and Accepted of God upon our believing, is given; The difference betwixt the Covenant of works and the Covenant of Grace, is distinctly observed; The *Antinomian* mistakes, saying we are Justified from eternity, or at the death of Christ, or at any time before faith, are manifestly obviated; And all grounds of excepting against, or dissatisfaction with this way, are removed from all such, as will willingly comply with the designe of free grace, in the Gospel (345-346).

In contrast with Baxter, Brown is in harmony with the majority of Reformed thinkers in speaking of faith as *Instrumental* in one's justification. He says, "[O]ur Divines did owne and plead for Faiths Instrumentality, in the matter of Justification, viz. because the Righteousness, which they called the Formal, or others the Material Cause thereof, was not any Righteousness inherent in us, as *Papists* said; but the Surety-Righteousness of the Cautioner Christ, without us: And therefore they behoved to look on Faith, in this matter, otherways then *Papists* did, and not account it a part of our Formal Righteousness, but only look upon it, as an hand to lay hold on and bring in the Surety-Righteousness of Jesus Christ; and therefore judged it most fit to call it only an Instrumental Cause" (348).

The Scotsman moves to discuss briefly, yet quite helpfully, what the *Papists* say with respect to justification as an instrument. "[Papists] judge the whole Protestant cause naught, because we erre in these, and yet make

this the maine part of the Protestant cause; yet we must not be scarred from these truthes; Yea, because this point hath such a connexion with the other, concerning the Righteousness, upon the account of which we are to be Justified in the sight of God, we are called to contend also for this, and that so much the rather, that though *Papists* do utterly mistake the Nature of Justification, and confound it with Sanctification; yet Mr. Baxter hath more rational apprehensions there about, and yet will not have Christ's Righteousness to be Formal Righteousness, upon the account of which we are Justified." Furthermore, Baxter "will not have Christ's Righteousness to be that Formal Righteousness, upon the account of which we are Justified" (348–349).

This instrumental nature of faith is not to be seen in a strict philosophical sense. Brown and others use the term instrumental as "the Application of the Righteousness of Christ, which is made by Faith, as a meane or mid's laying hold upon without which we cannot be Justified, according to the Gospel; And though in these borrowed expressions from Causes, metaphysical accuracy be not intended, yet the true meaning and intendment of the users of these termes being obvious, it is but vanity, to raise too much dust thereabouts; unless difference about others more Principal Questions, in the matter of Justification, enforce it, as indeed all such as place the Formal Cause or reaction of our justification before God in our own Inherent Righteousness, and not in the Righteousness of Christ imputed to us and received by faith, must of necessity deny all interest of faith here, as an Instrument, or as any thing like it; because, having all their Righteousness within them, they have no use for Faith to lay hold on and bring in one from without" (349).

Brown further elaborates on faith as an instrument,

That God justifieth ἐκ πίστεως, δια πίστεω, *by faith and through faith* and πίσει *by faith* Rom. 3:24, 25, 28, 30. Gal. 3:8. and 2:16. and that even when justification is denied to be by works; So that Faith must have a far other interest in; and must otherwise concur unto our Justification, than any other Works, or Graces; and therefore must be looked upon, as having some peculiarity of interest and influence here, and this peculiarity of interest, can not be otherwayes better expressed, so as the matter shall be cleared, then by calling it an Instrument. Not as if it did concur to the producing of the effect of justification by any Physical operation, as Physical Instruments do; but as a medium and mean required of us, in order to justification, according to the free pleasure of God who disposeth the order and methode of his bestowing

of his Favours upon us, and the Relation and Respect, that one hath unto another, as he seeth most for his own glory, and for our good; and that such a mean, as concurrereth therein, and thereunto, according to what is said, in such a way, as we can best understand by calling it an Instrument.... for Justification is not here taken simply and strictly for that, which is properly God's act, but more largely and complexly, including other things requisite unto justification, such as the Imputation of the Righteousness of Christ, which Faith, as the Instrument or hand of the soul, layeth hold on, and bringeth in, for this end, that the man being clothed therewith, may be acquitted before the Tribunal of God, Pardoned, and accepted of as Righteous. And howbeit it be God, that justifieth, and as to this act of God justifying, Faith hath no real interest or influence; yet Scripture saying, that God justifieth by Faith, and through faith, we must acknowledge some interest, that Faith hath, in the work and Effect; as when the Scripture saith, that He *purifieth the heart by faith* Act 15:9. the purifying of the heart is God's work, and yet it is said to be done by Faith, which is our work. It is said Heb. 11:11 that *through faith Sara herself received strength to conceive seed* and vers. 33. 34 that some *through faith subdued Kingdomes, stopped the mouthes of Lions, quenched the violence of fire &c.* all which were the works of God, and yet while they are said to be done by faith, faith must have had some interest and influence in these effects. So in working faith in the soul, which is God's work alone, the Lord useth the preaching of the Gospel, and ministers, and the peoples hearkening and listening to what is preached, as means and midses thereunto; though preaching and hearing be mens work, yet God useth them for his ends; and as he sendeth Preachers to preach and moveth persons to hear, that thereby he may, according to his own will and pleasure, work Faith in them; so he worketh Faith in souls, that he may, thereby Justify them ... But that Faith hath some Influence, is manifest from the Scripture, not of it self, it is true, but by the gracious appointment of God; and that this Influence cannot be better and more saifly expressed, than by the name of an Instrument, appeareth to us clear; hereby nothing of the glory due to God, or unto Jesus Christ, and to his Righteousness, is ascribed unto man, nor is any more hereby granted unto Man, than a beggar, as to the enriching of himself, when it is said his hand made him rich, by receiving the Purse of gold, that was given unto him: yea hereby is Christ and his Righteousness more fixedly established, in their due place, because faith is considered not as a Righteousness of it self, nor as a part of Righteousness; but purely and simply as an Instrument of the soul laying hold on

the Righteousness of Christ, and pleading the same, as the only Formal ground of his justification before God (350–351).

Brown explains what he means by faith justifying.

When we speak of Faiths justifying, as an Instrument, we consider the physical, or *quai* physical way of its operation, and denote only its kindly acting on Jesus Christ, and on his Righteousness which it layeth hold on, applyeth, apprehendeth, and putteth on. And when we say it justifies as a condition, we consider it as appointed of God unto that end, and as placed by Him, in that state and relation unto justification, which now it hath: And either of these can be called the *proxima ratio causalis* of Faith, according to its different consideration: if justification, (meaning not God's act only, but the complex relative change) be considered in *genere Physico*; or *quasi physico*, then the nearest causal interest of faith, is its instrumentality: but if it be considered in *genere morali*, or *legali*, then its nearest causal interest is, that it is a condition. As when a rich man bestoweth a purse of gold on a beggar, and requireth that he, in order to the possessing of it, stretch forth his hand, and take it, considering this an act of enriching him in *genere physico*, his hand acteth herein, as an Instrument, apprehending the purse, and taking it to himself: considering this, in *genere legalis* or *moralis*, the stretching forth of the hand, and apprehending the purse is a condition; for the donor hath determined to give the riches, after such a manner and methode, for his own ends, according to his own good pleasure. Thus we see, how faith can, in its way, produce one and the same effect of justification, both as Instrument, and as a Condition (352).

Another way Brown seeks to show the difference between what he means by faith being an instrument and what Baxter means when he speaks of faith as an instrument is found in the following:

In our sense, faith is no more, but as the hand receiving bread, and as the mouth eating it, in order to food and nourishment thereby; in their sense, faith is made the very food and nourishment, or meat it self that nourisheth: When we say, that Faith Justifieth as an Instrument, it is but, as if we said, man liveth by his hands taking meat, and by his mouth eating it; when they say, that faith justifieth as a work, and that the  $\tau\delta\ \textit{credere}$  is imputed for Righteousness, it is, as if they said, the hand and the mouth are the very food, or the meat it-self, by which we live and are nourished: we look upon

Faith as an Instrument, as upon the hand and mouth, as instruments of nourishment, ascribe all the vertue of nourishment unto the meat. They, denying the hand and the mouth to be considered here as Instruments, and saying that we live and are nourished by the hand and the mouth, (just as they do, when they make the  $\tau\delta\ \textit{credere}$  our Righteousness, in reference to justification) ascribe all the vertue of nourishment unto the hand and the mouth, and so set up the hand and the mouth, in the place, that is due unto the meat, and rob the meat, of that power and vertue, that is only proper to it. Yet with all, when we say, that hands and mouth nourish us as Instruments, we do not deny, but in a general sense, our receiving of meat with our hands, and eating of it with our mouth, are conditions of nourishment, importing hereby, that the wise God hath appointed this order and methode, giving us hands to receive meat, and mouths to eat it, and a stomach to digest it, in order to the living, and receiving thereby nourishment; only we do not say, they are such conditions, as have all the vertue of nourishment in them (353–354).

Brown contrasts the idea of faith being a condition in the Covenant of Works and in the Covenant of Grace this way. “Adam's perfect obedience might have been called the condition of a free gift: and we cannot give the same place and power to Faith in the New Covenant, that perfect obedience had in the old; for Adam if he had perfectly obeyed, had gote his reward without any intervention of a Price by a Mediator, purchasing it, but we must hold all our reward solely of Christ, that he may have the glory of all” (355).

#### REPENTANCE

Brown spends a whole chapter discussing the interest repentance has in one's justification. It will help us to understand what this Scottish Covenanter believes biblical *repentance* means.

The Hebrew word, which is rendered *repent*, is of a general signification for it signifieth *to return*, whether from a place, or from the distemper of our minds, or from our former courses; and so denoteth a motion or change of the body from one place to another; or of the mind from any purpose, or of the whole way and walk, and in special, it sometime signifieth a change of the whole man to the better, both as to his Mind, Resolution, and Deportment, and thus denoteth a mans turning unto God: And accordingly we read in the *New Testam.* of the Prodigals coming or returning to himself, or to his right

mind and wits; and we heare of Repentance towards God. In the *New Testam.* there are two greek words, the one μεταμέλεθαι importing such a change, as it attended with after care; and the other μετανοειν signifying such a change, as denoteth after-wit or after thought. Some do so difference the two, as that they say the last signifieth so to sorrow for what is done, as to amended it, called by the latines *Resipiscere* and therefore properly is meant of a good and saving Repentance, wherein the penitent returneth to his right wits, so as to reforme and amend what hath been amisse; and the *other* denoteth properly care, anxiety and solicitude after something done, called by the Latines *panitere*, and this may be used in an evil sense, as denoting properly no change of minde or carriage to the better, but simply such a trouble and anxiety for what is done, as maketh them wish, it were not done, whether the thing done was good or evil. But in the *New Test.* we finde not this difference constantly observed; for μεταμέλομαι is taken both in a good sense, for a good Repentance, and saving *Mat. 21:32, 29.* and for a common Repentance, that is not saving, *Mat. 27:3.* where mention is made of *Judas* repenting μετανοέω indeed and μετανοια that cometh therefrom, import a good and saving Repentance, except. *Heb. 12:17* (357).

Brown finds the word repentance is used in three ways. First, repentance is used in a common sense. There may be a legal sorrow brought about by conviction of hazard, because of sin, with the accompanying grief, however, nothing more than what happened with Judas when he exercised repentance for his betrayal of Jesus takes place. This sort of repentance is not accompanied with the forgiveness of sins. 2 Corinthians 7:10 is cited as the biblical basis for repentance having this sense. Second, there is a repentance which is common to those who are already justified and pardoned. Such repentance is accompanied by “Self-abhorring, Self-lothing, Melting of heart, and Tenderness and the like. *Ezek. 16:63 ... 36–25, 26, 27, 28. comp. with vers. 31*” (358). Finally there is repentance which is a saving work of the Spirit going along with Faith. This repentance arises from the sense of sin committed and an apprehension of the mercy of God in Christ. This causes spiritual grief, sorrow and indignation at themselves and their sinful ways. Sin is hated and there is a fixed purpose to forsake it accompanied with a turning to the Lord. This is frequently mentioned in the Bible. It is this repentance which Brown says may be understood in two ways. “*First* as it is in these, in whom the Lord is working a work of Conversion, and whom He is translating out of darkness into the Kingdom of his

dear Son, and *Secondly* as it is in such, as are already brought in to a justified state, after new sins committed (358).

It is to the first use which the Scot directs our attention “because we are speaking of Justification, which holdeth forth a change of state, as was formerly explained” (358). Brown finds nine different senses of the word repentance in the Scriptures. Briefly they are:

(1) It denotes grief, sorrow or what is called contrition. This is explained by sitting in sackcloth as in Luke 10:33. Jeremiah 8:6 and 2 Corinthians 11:21 are also cited as examples of this sense of repentance.

(2) It denotes mostly a change of former courses and ways, whether from error as in 2 Timothy 2:25 or from dead works as in Hebrews 6:1. Other Scriptures include 2 Chronicles 7:14, Ezekiel 18:21, Acts 8:22 and Revelation 2:21, 22.

(3) It denotes the entire work of conversion and turning unto God. Acts 26:20, 3:19, Ezekiel 18:30, Deuteronomy 4:29, 30, Hosea 5:4, 2 Chronicles 7:14, and Revelation 3:19 all demonstrate Brown’s point.

(4) It is sometimes expressly distinguished from Godly sorrow and is mentioned as a consequent or fruit and effect as 2 Corinthians 7:9.

(5) It is sometimes expressly distinguished from faith as Acts 20:21, Hebrews 6:1 and Jeremiah 31:19.

(6) It may signify nothing else than receiving the Gospel and believing in Christ. Mark 1:15 is Jesus’ proclamation of what John the Baptist proclaimed as in Matthew 3:2, 11, Mark 1:4, Luke 3:3, Acts 13:24, 19:4, Matthew 4:17, Mark 1:14, Luke 10:9, Matthew 10:7, Luke 6:9, Mark 6:12, Matthew 9:13, Mark 2:17, Luke 5:32, Luke 15:7, 10 and Matthew 18:11, Luke 15:4, 19:10, Matthew 11:20, Acts 2:38, 11:18, 26:18, 20.

(7) Sometimes it denotes a recovery from some measure of defection into which a person has backslid as Revelation 2:5 and 3:3.

(8) It is distinguished from works of obedience that follow upon and flow from repentance. Matthew 3:8, Luke 3:8 and Acts 26:10 show this sense of repentance. Finally,

(9) Sometimes it includes everything pertaining to salvation upon man’s part as 2 Peter 3:9. Luke 13:3, 5, Acts 5:31, 17:30 and Luke 24:47 all help us understand how repentance may be taken to refer to the whole of salvation (359–360).

#### ROMAN CATHOLIC DOCTRINE OF REPENTANCE

Our attention is now directed to understand that Brown does not accept the *Papists* doctrine about repentance.

He says, “That the Question is not, whether the doctrine of *Papists* about Repentance in order to Justification, be to be owned, in whole, or in part? for none now appeareth in the direct owning of their Assertions, who commonly are utterly ignorant of true Justification, as different from Sanctification, as may sufficiently appear by the very naming of their positions for (1) They look upon Repentance as having force and efficacy to expell sin, as light hath to expell darkness, taking Remission to be a destroying of the very being of sin, and expelling of Corruption by contrary gracious Qualities, and inherent Holiness, of which they make Repentance a part. (2) They make Repentance concur, as a material cause disposing the soul for receiving a gracious Quality, for the expelling of sin. (3) They make Repentance to obtain pardon by way of merite, and (4) by way of Satisfaction. Not to mention (5) their Sacrament of Penance” (360).

The question is not “whether the Lord call for Repentance as a duty, at the hands of such as either are to be Justified, or are already justified? for both these we willingly grant, as being divine truthes, richly confirmed in the Scriptures, what ever *Antinomians* say to the contrary.” Neither is the question “whether Repentance be a Condition of the Covenant, or not? For by *Condition of Covenant*, we understand every thing, that is a duty, required of the Covenanters, it is readily granted, as was said, that Repentance is a duty required of such as are really in Covenant with God; but if by a *Condition of the Covenant* be meant a duty required in order to the closing of the Covenant, or entering into Covenant, upon the performing of which the Covenant is immediatly closed and entered into, this is denied; and abundantly confuted ...” (361). The question is,

if Repentance hath the same Place, Office, Use and Consideration in Justification, that Faith hath; so that it may be every way as well, and as fully called the Condition of Justification, as Faith is; and so that it is called for in order to Justification, upon the same account, and under the same formality, that Faith is called for. *Socinians and Arminians* (as we heard above) joine Repentance and Faith, in the same Order and Place, and ascribe the same Office Use and Power unto both, in order to Justification. And *Baxter* tells us *Confess. Pag. 37. n.12.* The Repentance is made by God, in the Gospel, a proper Condition of our first general pardon of sin, as well as Faith is. And he [Baxter] laith down a ground for this interest of Repentance (which, I suppose, will reach to the including of other works also) in the foregoing n. 18, saying, a quare nus ad omne valet consequential. *If faiths formal interest in*

*pardon be, as it is the Condition of the act of pardon, then whatsoever is such a Condition, must have the same Kind of formal interest, as faith.* By the first general pardon of sin here, he meaneth Justification; for with him Remissions of sins and Justification is all one thing. And yet afterward pag 96. *Concl. 29.* he hath words which would seem to give some peculiar interest unto Faith; and so contradict what is here said, for he saith. *If any say, that seing faith hath a peculiar aptitude to this office, therefore it must have a peculiar Interest.* I [Brown] answer, so it hath. 1. *it doth alone, without (merites, or) any positive Gospel works of obedience (as such at least) procure (as far as belongs to its office) our first full Justification.* 2. *The love of Christ received, Gratitude &c. are but as modification of Faith, which is called the receiving itself. Though some of them be distinct physical acts, yet all the rest, morally considered, are but as it were, the modification of faith: I mean of that act, which is the acceptance of Christ, and life freely given &c.* Now I suppose, he will grant (as he doth above, as we may see) that Repentance hath not that peculiar aptitude, to this office, as he confesseth: I suppose also, that he will put Repentance, in the same rank with Gospel-Works of Obedience; and consequently it must no more share of that special Interest, that belongeth to Faith, in this office, than they: I suppose likewise, that he will grant Repentance to be but a Modification of Faith, as well, as Love and Gratitude: and then I would know, how Repentance can be said to be as proper a Condition of Justification, as Faith is? Sure, if it be as proper, it must have as peculiar an interest, for this peculiarity of Interest cannot respect its aptitude merely, but its designed and appointed state, in that office; otherways the objection, which he moved and answered, should have this sense, seing Faith hath a peculiar aptitude to this office; therefore it must have a peculiar aptitude to this office, which were non sense (361–362).

Brown offers several reasons why repentance does not have the same interest in justification as faith does. First, he points out that the Scriptures nowhere say that justification is by repentance as it does time and again say that justification is by faith. Since the Scriptures do not say we are justified by repentance as it does regarding faith, there must be a vast difference between the two. Some may say that these are “equipollent when it is said, *Repent that your sins may be blotted out: and Repentance and Remission of sins* are joyned together and the like. I [Brown] answer, Leaving the particular examination of these and the like passages alledged, untill afterward, I shall only say this at present. (1) That justification and Remission of sins are not every way

the same. Though *Mr. Baxter* hath several times said it; yet in his *Catholick. Theolo. of God's Covenant &c. Sect. XIII. N. 208.* he saith *our first constitutive justification is in its own Nature a Right to impunity* (and this, as he oft elsewhere tells us, is Remission) and *to life or glory*. Now what is beside a Right to Impunity, also a Right to life and glory, is more than Remission of sins: And therefore the consequence from Remission to Justification cannot stand. (2) In like manner, because it is said *Luk. 6:37 – forgive and it shall be forgiven you*, it may be inferred, that for-giving of our Neighbour some fault, that he hath done us, is the Condition of our Constitutive Justification, and hath as great an interest in our Justification, as Faith it self, and by it we have as really Right to impunity, and Right to life and glory, as by Faith.... I doubt, if *Mr. Baxter* shall make this one and the same with Faith, as he laboureth in his *Catholick Theol.* to make Faith and Repentance” (362).

That being said regarding Baxter's unwillingness to connect forgiveness with faith, he nonetheless desires to have faith and repentance connected.

“*Mr. Baxter* cleareth. *Of God's Govern. Sec. XII.* how Faith and Repentance is all one thing. I [Brown] *Ans.* (1) if the Spirit of the Lord had but once said, in his word, that we were justified by Repentance, we might then be allowed, to think of such explications, as might make either both one thing, or shew, how both hath the same interest in Justification: but when the Scripture never once saith, that we are justified by Repentance, for us to divide such explications, as to make the Scripture speak what it never speaketh, is not faire, nor is it to edification, because it has no tendency to explaine the matter, as expressed in the Scriptures; and is so far from clearing up the truth, that it darkeneth all; for hereby we are taught to understand faith, wherever we hear of Repentance, and Repentance, where mention is made of Faith; so that we may ascribe all to Repentance, that is spoken of Faith *Heb. 11.* and say, that Repentance is the substance of things hoped for, and the evidence of things not seen &c. (2) Though it is true, the word *Repentance* (as we have seen) is sometime taken so largely, as to include faith; yet that will not allow us, to say, we are Justified by Repentance, as we are justified by Faith: It is best for us to follow Scripture language: The Scripture expressly denieth, that we are justified by works; and yet Repentance is sometimes, taken in such a large sense, as to include all acts of Obedience; This way then would allow us to say, we are justified by all works of obedience, (even as to constitutive Justification) as we are by Faith: Yet *Mr. Baxter* in his *Confess. P. 89, 90.* putteth a difference betwixt Faith and Evangelick

Obedience as to this Constitutive Justification, making the one, like consent to marriage relation, or taking one to be my Captaine; and the other conjugal fidelity and obedience, or obeying the captain, and fighting under him, and tells us, that he no more comprizeth all Obedience in Faith, than conjugal obedience in the marriage consent. (3) That Repentance is not the same with Faith in the matter of justification; (in reference to which, we now speak of both) will appear from our following reasons: So that whatever paines be taken to make them one, on other accounts, will be to no purpose, as to our present business” (362–363).

John Brown continues to demonstrate that if faith and repentance are considered alike in the matter of justification,

then works shall have the same interest with Faith; but this is diametrically opposite to all the Apostles dispute *Rom. 3. and 4. and Gal. 2. and 3.* The reason of the Consequence is, because Repentance includeth works, and is a special work and act of obedience itself *Mr. Baxter* tells *Confess. p. 94.* That *Paul's scope is both to take down Moses's Law (especially its necessity and conceited sufficiency) and the Dignity of legal works (and consequently of any works) and that therefore by works Paul meaneth to exclude only merites, or works, which are conceited Meritorious, or which for the worth of the deed done, should procure Pardon and acceptance with God, without a Mediators blood; and so Paul himself described the works, that he speaketh against Rom, 4:4. That they are such as make the Reward to be not of Grace, but of debt. Ans.* This is but the same we heard before from *John Goodwin*,<sup>8</sup> the same answer may suffice. (1) If the scope of *Paul* had been only to take down Moses's Law; why did he speak so much of the Gentiles, and shew how they were all under sin, and therefore must be justified by Faith, and not by the Law, or by works? This had no manifest tendency to that scope. (2) Why brought he in the Instance of *Abraham*, who was before the Law of *Moses*? *Abraham's* not being justified by works, could not prove the insufficiency of *Moses's* Law thereunto: (3) To think, that the Jewes did conceite, that they would obtaine Pardon and Acceptance with God, only by their laborious performance of Ceremonies and costly Sacrifices, excluding all Moral acts of obedience, is apparently groundless; contrary to *Rom. 9:30, 31, 32 and 10:3, 4, 5.* and would say, that *Paul* took not a right medium to destroy the nullity of that Law, now under

8. John Goodwin (1594?–1665) is the person whose works initiated Brown's *Life of Justification Opened*.

the Goſpel; hereby all occasion of further debate being perfectly removed. (4) *Paul* is so far *Rom. 4:4* from describing the works, that he ſpeaketh of, to be ſuch only as make the reward of debt, that he proveth that Juſtification cannot be by works, by this *medium*, because then the reward ſhould be reckoned, not of grace, but of debt, and ſo telleth us, that all works make the reward of debt: This is a manifeſt perversion of the Apoſtles argument: for he ſaith not, *now to him, that ſo worketh, as to conceite his works meritorious, the reward is not reckoned of grace, but of debt; but now to him that worketh*: far leſs can this be the meaning or conſtruction of the words, *now to him, that maketh the reward to be not of grace, but of debt*: for what ſenſe is here? And further the meaning of the following words muſt accordingly be this: *but to him that ſo worketh, as not to make the reward of debt but of grace, his working is counted for Righteouſneſs*. While as the Apoſtle ſaith a plaine other thing. *But to him, that worketh not, but beleeveth on him, that juſtifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousneſs*. Sure, working without conceite of merite, is not believing on him, that juſtifieth the ungodly, neither are theſe works counted for Righteouſneſs; for holy *Abraham* wrought without that conceite and yet he was not juſtified by works, *vers. 2, 3*. Nor did *David* meane, that mans bleſſedneſs did conſiſt in the imputation of ſuch works; nor did he deſcribe that bleſſedneſs, when he ſaid, *bleſſed are they, whoſe iniquities are forgiven &c*. Conſider *1 Cor. 4:4. Ephes. 2:9. Phil. 3:9. Tit. 3:5* (363–364).

Furthermore, Brown points out that repentance has no inſtrumental acting on Chriſt and his righteousneſs ſo that we may be juſtified. “But faith hath this as was ſhown in the foregoing *Chapter*. Therefore Repentance hath not the ſame Inter-eſt in Juſtification, that Faith hath. It is requisite and neceſſary, in order to our Juſtification, that we be clothed with a Righteouſneſs, even the Surety-Righteouſneſs of Chriſt: and Faith only can lay hold on this and put it on, and not Repentance. Repentance doth not act ſo upon any thing without a man, to bring it home that it may become the mans Righteouſneſs, it hath other work, and acteth upon another object, upon ſin within the man” (364). For Baxter

Faith's accepting of Chriſt, and life offered on that condition, only its aptitude to the office, and that the formal reaſon of its office as to our Juſtification, is its being the performed condition of the Covenant, as he there ſpeaketh; yet that will not invalidat our argument: for (1) Faith's aptitude (as he calleth it) or rather its work and acting in Juſtification, is not merely an accepting of Chriſt and life

offered on that condition; but it is the accepting, laying hold on, leaning to, and applying the Surety Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, preſuppoſing the accepting of Chriſt himſelf. (2) Though it may be ſaid, that the neareſt formal Reaſon of Faiths office, is the Lord's appointment; yet this being too Philoſophical here contributeth nothing to the clearing up of the matter, in order to practice, ſo neither was Philoſophical accuracy the ground whereupon they went, who ſaid, that Faiths inter-eſt in Juſtification, was as an Inſtrument, but rather their end was to clear the matter in order to Practice; ſo as poor ſouls might not fall into miſtakes; and this I [Brown] judge to be the beſt Theological acuracie, howbeit he ſhould account many ſuch ſpeeches nothing but unintelligible phrases, and ſuch doctrine to contain ſuch ſenſeſſneſs and conſequences, as the opening up of would offend, as he there ſpeaketh. (3) It is certaine, that Repentance doth not ſo act on Chriſt, and his Surety-Righteouſneſs, in order to Juſtification, as Faith doth, Repentance, as ſuch is no acceptance of a free gift, far leſs of a gift of Righteouſneſs, and of an Atonement there-through; Repentance acteth not this on Chriſt: Yea the reaſon he giveth *Confess. p. 39*. why Repentance was made a condition of pardon, doth ſufficiently ſhew, that it cannot have that inter-eſt, that Faith hath. His reaſon is this. *Because without it (Repentance) God and the Redeemer cannot have their end in pardoning us; Nor can the Redeemer do all his work, for which we do accept him: for his work is, upon the pardoning of us, to bring us back, in heart and life to God; from whom we were fallen and ſtrayed. This was Chriſt's work. Therefore the conditions, which Chriſt maketh are, as if he ſhould ſay, If you will be ſaved by me, and are willing that I ſhall bring you back to God, I will both bring you into his favour by Pardon, and into a capacity of perſonal pleaſing and enjoying of him. Now our Repentance is our conſent to God, and the change of our mindes, by turning from former ſin, that was our idol, and being willing by Chriſt to be reſtored to obedience. By this, I [Brown] ſay, it is clear, that Repentance hath a more direct aſpect upon, and reference to the conſequences of Pardon and Juſtification itſelf; we grant its neceſſary preſence unto all the ends mentioned, and its neceſſary preſence in ſuch as are Juſtified and that its contrare, or poſitive impenitency, cannot conſiſt with Faith, in ſuch as are to be Juſtified: Yet that will not give ground to inferre, that it hath the ſame Inter-eſt, Influence and Conſideration, in Juſtification, that Faith hath* (365).

Baxter ſtill argues that “*God hath made them [repentance and faith] the Condition of the promise*” (366). Brown does not find any proof offered by Baxter to ſhow

that God indeed made such conditions for one's justification, much less that man is able to find repentance and faith within himself naturally. Furthermore, while repentance is necessary in one that believes, that is, faith cannot be without repentance, "Yet Repentance hath no place in the office of Justification, it hath no plaine formal and immediat interest in the receiving of Justification; as that turning of the minde from other Suitors to that one hath no formal interest or place, in closing the Marriage Covenant, though it be a very necessary prerequisite unto right closing and consenting the marriage Covenant." Brown uses the illustration of a woman changing her mind from other suitors to one to demonstrate that repentance does not have justification as its interest. Baxter holds that repentance is unto faith, "but as the woman changing her mind from other Suitors to one, is to the consenting unto the Marriage proposal. And if upon a Persons being a Penitent it cannot be formally inferred, that he is in Covenant with God and a Justified person, that Repentance hath not that interest in Justification, that Faith hath, for upon a mans beleving, it can formally and immediatly be inferred, that he is in Covenant, and is Justified" (366).

To this the Scotsman adds, "I say *formally*; because consequentially it will follow, that a Penitent man (meaning one that is truly penitent) is justified, upon this account, that where ever there is true Repentance, there is also true Faith: But as the change of the womans mind is not formally the making up of a marriage Covenant; So neither is Repentance that, which formally constitutes a man a Covenanter with Christ, and a Justified person, only Faith doth this; as the womans consent maketh up the marriage Relation" (366–367). Certainly one would not want to argue that repentance which precedes faith is to be understood as that Gospel-Righteousness spoken of by Baxter because that would make justification actually to rest upon repentance and not faith alone. Brown argues that repentance which is connected with faith follows faith and therefore is manifested only in those who have been justified through faith alone. He cites 2 Corinthians 7: 10 and 11 along with Jeremiah 31:19 to show how repentance follows faith. Godly sorrow which leads to repentance is the fruit of faith. "And repenting *Ephraim Jer. 31: 19 said, after I was turned, I repented; and after I was instructed, I smote upon my thigh: I was ashamed, yea, even confounded &c.* This *being instructed*, and *being turned* includeth Faith; and the rest, that followed upon it, are expressions of Repentance: and hence it would follow, if only completed Repentance be that Repentance, that hath Interest in justification that Faith hath,

a man cannot be said to be justified upon his believing, no not untill Repentance be brought to this Perfection; And then Faith cannot be the consenting act, whereupon the bargane is closed" (367).

Brown further fears that the notion that repentance has the same interest and impact on one's justification as faith does, that

many poor awakened sinners" will be kept "off the Rock of ages, and at least, a meane to hinder or retard their motion Christ-ward, in order to Peace and Reconciliation with God: for experience teacheth such, as deale with wakened Consciences, that the most of their work oft times is to keep them from resting on something within themselves, in order to Peace, and particularly from relying and resting upon some sort of Griefe, Sorrow, or Repentance, which they conceive to be in themselves and to bring them unto a cleanly resting upon Christ and his Righteousness, forsaking all other things: And when now they hear, that Repentance hath the same interest in justification that Faith hath, how will they be fortified in their Resolutions, so that all the labour and paines of Ministers, or other Christians may prove much fruitless, unless the Lord come in a wonderful manner, and many others may perish in their presumptuous thoughts, founded on their inward Sorrow and Repentance, as they supposed, because they would never go out of themselves to leane to Christ and his Righteousness. It is true, These of the contrary minde, presse not Repentance alone, but Faith and Repentance together. Yet by their way, I finde not the right Gospel-exercise of Faith-pressed, that is, faith bringing in an imputed Righteousness, or laying hold on Christ for Righteousness, and refuging the Soul in Him, and resting upon that, as the only and absolutly surest ground of Confident appearing before God, and of expecting Pardon and Peace; but only such or such an act of faith pressed, as being under the *New Covenant* in the same place, that Perfect Obedience had in the *Old*, whereby, as the *Old Covenant*<sup>9</sup> is but rewarded, so the wakened or alarmed sinner is but taught to look after and lean to something within himself, as his immediat Righteousness, upon which he must be justified (368).

Because Baxter wants to make faith and repentance together to be conditions for one's justification, it does

9. We do well to remember what John Brown means by "Old Covenant" because one may be tempted to think he is setting the New Covenant in contrast with what some call the Mosaic Covenant or Sinatic Covenant. This is not what he has in mind when talking of the "Old Covenant." Brown means the covenant God established with our first parents in the Garden of Eden.

not surprise us that repentance or some other gospel righteousness will be necessary to maintain one's justification. In chapter 30, *Whether Love, Purpose of Obedience, or perseverance be Conditions of Justification*, Brown addresses the matter of love or perseverance being a condition of justification, and arguing against it in the following way. He raises the question as to whether perseverance is a condition of justification and answers,

it is apparent how false this is. Every thing, that is required of such, as are believers, cannot be called a Condition of Justification. It is said, that a Condition suspendeth the obligation, to bestow the benefite promised upon Condition, untill it be performed: And so it will hence follow, that, if Perseverance to the end be the Condition of Justification, no man can be justified, untill he have persevered to the end; and so no man shall be justified in this life; whereby an end is put to all our present debate, the subject thereof being taken out of the way.

If it be said. That faith is the Condition of Justification, as it endureth to the end. I Ans. That that faith, which will endure to the end, is the Condition, I grant. But I deny, That Faith is the Condition of Justification, as it endureth to the end, we no where read of Faiths being the Condition, under this reduplication, as enduring to the end; for then it would follow, that no lively faith, how strong so ever, could unite a soul to Christ, untill it had endured to the end, and so man upon his first Beleiving, let his faith be never so livly and strong, can be said to be justified, to have passed from death to life; contrare to all the Scriptures. And this would too much assimilate the New Covenant unto the Old, wherein *Adam* was to work out his dayes-work to the end, ere he had Right to his wages. Yea and hence it would follow, that in this life, there were none of the fruites of justification to be had, such as Peace with God, Accesse to God, Glorying in tribulations, Joy and Comfort, contrare to experience, and the Scriptures. *Rom. 5:1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 11. and 8:35.* to the end. *Luke 7:50. Mat. 9:2. 2 Thes. 2:16. Heb. 6:18, 19. 1 Pet. 1:4.*

So that in a word, from what hath been said, it is evident, how little ground Mr. Baxter hath to glory in this way of his, and though to an inadvertent person it may appear Plausible, what is adduced for a reason, yet when considered, it will be found froath and a flourish of words: for be it so, that justifieing faith receive whole Christ (which we doe not deny: for Christ is not divided: for as

there is but one faith, so but one Christ. And I will have occasion to speake more fully to this matter afterward.) Yet what doth Mr. Baxter gain? hath he gained his Pepper-corne of Faith or Gospel-obedience to be imputed unto us for Righteousness according to the new law (he should say, the new edition of the Old Covenant, or rather the Old Covenant newly established?) no, by no means: for be it granted, That Justifieing Faith as such respected Christ equally as King and Prophet, as it doth him as Priest (which yet I deny, and shall, without dividing Christ, make it appeare) I aske him, how doth it receive Christ Jesus the Lord? Surely he cannot but say, as he is offered in the Gospel; well then, the Lord, who knoweth what we are, offereth him to us, and makes him to us wisdom, Righteousness, Sanctification and redemption, so that God in the offer of his Christ as a King, lookes upon the sinner in the same capacitie to obey him, as in the offer of him as a Priest he is to pay his debt, and that is not onely in no capacitie but as opposit to such a thing of himself, Hence it is as evident that Faith receives Christ as a King not by promiseing or purposeing to obey him, but from a Conviction of its own aversion to purpose to please God, that he by his Kingly Power shall kill the enmity, Conquer the soul, bring it to purpose, as well as practice, work in it to will as well as to doe, cast down imaginations, that exalt themselves against the knowledge of God, and bring every thought in captivitie to his obedience, so when Faith acts on Him as a Prophet, there is in this act neither purpose nor promise, to obey him as a teacher &c. But from a Conviction that the mind is not onely void of light, but it is prepossessed with corrupt principles, so that the man that hath nothing but the soul of a man, takes up the whole Gospel Myserie as foolishness. And it is impossible for him, to know these things, since they must be spirittually discerned. I say from this Conviction he receives Christ as his wisdom, as he that shall give him an understanding, to know him that is true; and to make him who is not onely as a beast, but so much worse, that his light is darknesse, of a quick understanding in the feare of the Lord, and wise to salvation. Now this exactly answereth the sinners need, and hath all his wants made up by Jesus Christ according to his riches in glory, and God's end in making his Christ to poor sinners wisdom, Righteousness &c. That so he, who glorieth may glory in the Lord. Now if Mr. Baxter will Consider this, he will even lay aside his Pepper-Corne as of no Price; for here all is without money and without Price to the poor soul &c. and he is considered as a receiver of all from Christ (382–383).

GOSPEL OBEDIENCE NOT THE CONDITION OF  
JUSTIFICATION

Brown's next chapter is entitled, *Gospel-obedience is not the Condition of Justification*. The exiled theologian writes that Baxter "himself will not say, that Gospel-obedience is the Condition of Justification," and cites Baxter's comments from page 132 of the *discourse of the two Covenants*. "That the sense, in which the Apostles did assert it, (i.e. Justification by Faith without the works of the Law) was, that faith Justifieth without works, antecedent to believing (This is what Bellarmin<sup>10</sup> and other Papiſt's say) and without works, as the works of a literal observation of Moses law, which was opposed by the jewes to faith" (383). Brown calls this "his fiction, and its grounds may come to be considered afterward. But what is this Faith? It is Faith (saith he) that hath Repentance, Regeneration and sincere Obedience in a holy life for its inseparable effects. Then (1) this Faith is not fruite of Regeneration, because Regeneration is an effect of it. (2) Then upon a mans sincere Beleeving, he cannot be said to have passed from death to life, and be freed from Condemnation, nay not untill all the effects of faith be produced. And this he expresseth more clearly within a line or two, calling *Regeneration and new obedience parts of the Condition*; thus making men able to Regenerate themselves, with some help of the Spirit, according to his former doctrine" (383–384).

Brown proceeds to consider each of the ten grounds Baxter offers in defense of the idea that *Faith hath Repentance, Regeneration and sincere Obedience in a holy life for its inseparable effects*, and finds the fundamental error in Baxter's thinking in his statement. "That works of Evangelical obedience are never in Scripture opposed to God's grace in reference to Justification and Salvation" (384). By putting justification and salvation together in a way that it is all antecedently required unto salvation, and also unto justification, Baxter "muſt acknowledge no justification, untill Salvation come . . ." Brown cites Ephesians 2:8–10 as a perfect contradiction of Baxter's teaching. "Here grace is opposed to works, to good works, unto which we are created in Christ Jesus, and in which we are to walk, and that in reference to the Salvation, that is in justification." Brown believes that Baxter "cannot but grant, that Works and Grace are opposed to other: but he giveth us a very sceptick evasion, telling us, that then *by works we are to understand either works antecedent to conversion, or as they are denyed* (I think he would have said *deemed*, or some such thing) *to merite, at the hands of God; or the works of the Law of Moses, as erroneously contended for by the jewes; or*

*the works of the Law as Typical and as opposed to things typified; or the works of the Law, as the Law is in its rigour opposed to the milder oconomie of the Gospel.*" This is, as Brown points out, contrary to Paul's statement that Abraham was not justified by works but by faith as seen in Romans 4:1–3. "And Abraham's works here excluded from Justification, can be reduced to none of these heads of works here mentioned; They were not works antecedent to Conversion, for in opposition to these it is said, his Faith was reckoned unto him for Righteousness, long after his Conversion." Furthermore, "Faith was reckoned to Abraham for Righteousness, even when he was in uncircumcision. *Rom. 4:9, 10, 11, &c.*" (384).

Of course, Brown points out, this is in opposition to what Paul says in Romans 4:1–3 concerning Abraham being justified by faith and not works. Abraham's works muſt be seen as extending from justification. "They are not works antecedent to Conversion; for in opposition to these it is said, his Faith was reckoned unto him for Righteousness, long after his Conversion. Nor did the holy father dreame of any merite in his works, nor were these the works of the Law in any of the senses mentioned; for Faith was reckoned to Abraham for Righteousness, even when he was in uncircumcision. *Rom. 4:9, 10, 11, &c.*" (384). Baxter cites Titus 3:5, *not by works of Righteousness, which we have done, but according to his mercy, he saved us*. [Baxter's copy of Titus 3:5 cited]. "But," Brown counters, Baxter "giveth us p. 143, this glosse. *This change of their condition was not effected, or so much as begun among them by any reformation of their own, till the Gospel came to work it (which is meant by the appearing of the kindness and Love of God vers. 4. and is of like import with. Ch. 2:11, 12. Ans. By what either Law or Reason he restraineth that appearing of the kindness, and Love of God, mentioned vers. 4. to the Gospel, I know not. (2) And though the Gospel were here understood, that would not help the matter; for the Text saith, that after this did appear, he saved them (that is Justified in the first place, as we see vers. 7.) according to his mercy, and not by work of Righteousness. (3) These works are called works of Righteousness; But no works of their own, before Conversion, can be so called: can the works of such as are foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving diverse lusts and pleasures, living*

10. Robert Francis Romulus Bellarmine (1542–1621) was a distinguished Jesuit theologian, writer, and cardinal. He entered the Society of Jesus at the height of the Counter-Reformation. He began his theology at Padua in 1567 and finished it at Louvain in 1569 where he obtained a fuller acquaintance with the prevailing heresies. His first major work, *The Controversies*, was published in 1586 and became the standard apologetic used in disputes with Protestants.

in malice and envie, hateful and hating one another, be called works of Righteousness? and yet such were these, before the kindness and Love of God reached them, as *vers. 3* showeth. He thinks the same answer may be given to *2 Tim. 1:9*" (384–385).

On page 144 Baxter says, "That Paul, in speaking against Justification by works, giveth sufficient caution not to be understood thereby to speak against Evangelick obedience in the case. That is, not to speak against justification by Evangelick works; which were to say, he took much paines for nothing; for if he had but said, that the Ceremonial Law was abrogate, he had sufficiently confuted justification by the Ceremonies, if that had been all the Law he meant." But to this Baxter adds Romans 3:31. Brown then asks,

But I wonder how did the Apostle by his doctrine establish the Ceremonial Law? *In spirit of it* (he saith) *in as much as in preaching Justification in the Gospel way, he preached in plaine precepts, the necessity of that Spiritual purity unto Salvation, which was but darkly taught by the Ceremonial Law.* *Ans.* (1) Then this man supposeth, that he is establishing the Ceremonial Law, by his doctrine in this book; for he thinks, that therein he is preaching up Justification in the Gospel way. (2) Neither did the Ceremonial Law more darkly, nor doth the Gospel in more plaine termes preach the necessity of spiritual purity, as the Condition of Justification: So this Author beggeth what he cannot prove. (3) But that this is the Moral Law, hath been frequently shown above; as also it hath been shown, how and what way it was established, by the doctrine of justification without works; so that we need not regard his saying; *that by the doctrine of justification by faith, they established the moral law, both in the letter and Spirit of it, in teaching the necessity of Evangelical obedience to it, after a more spiritual and forcible manner, than had been taught before.* For this saith nothing for their pleading for obedience to this Law, as a Condition of Justification; which is the thing, he should have said: And if he know not, how Justification without the works of the moral Law, can consist with necessity of Obedience to the Moral Law, upon Gospel-grounds, he is ignorant of the Gospel, and hath been more educate in *Socinus* his School, than in the orthodox Church (385).

11. Jonas Schlichtingius (1592–1661) argues against the imputation of Christ's righteousness unto one's salvation because Socinians believe this distracts from the person who is justified by faith alone living a holy life. The active and passive obedience of Jesus are not necessary unto our salvation either. And on goes the heresy of the Socinian.

Baxter comments on Romans 10:4 with a line which the Scottish writer calls a Socinian gloss: "*Christ was the end of the Law in his doctrine, having taught that Righteousness of living, which the Law itself taught, but in a more excellent spiritual and effectual manner*" (385). A clear reading of Romans 10: 7–10 dispels Baxter's teaching according to Brown. Even though Baxter cites Romans 7:4 and Galatians 2:19, 20 in support of his position, Brown finds no hint of holiness to be performed as a Condition of Justification. He argues, "... for we are not against the necessity of holiness, but see more Sure, more Comfortable, more Heart quieting, more Divine, and more Gospel like grounds, whereupon to presse holiness, than any he discovereth in all his book, according to his principles" (386).

Baxter argues on page 147 of the same work, "*That Regeneration or the new creature, as including Evangelical Obedience, is opposed to works of the Law, in the business of mans Justification, as well as Faith is, and as well as the grace of God itself is.* And this he thinketh to prove from *Gal. 6:15.* as *Schlichtingius*<sup>11</sup> the Socinian did before him *cont. Meysner* p. 143" (386). Schlichtingius is further cited by Baxter commenting on Galatians 5:6 and circumcision. He says,

*That Evangelical obedience as well as faith, and together with faith, is opposed to the works of the Law, in reference to Justification and Salvation....* *Ans.* He supposeth here, that Circumcision is the same with the works of the Law, while as these that were crying it up at that time, took it only for a privilege, which might be kept together with Christianity; and therefore the Apostle told them *vers. 3.* which they did not take notice of, that by their taking on that badge of circumcision, they made themselves debtors to do the whole Law. (2) All that is required in reference to Salvation, is not required in reference to Justification. (3) Faith working by Love denoteth the right and the lively Faith, which only is Justifying and Saving, but bringeth not in all Evangelick Obedience under Love, as sharing with faith, in the same prerogative of justification, as was shewed above."

Again drawing on Schlichtingius Baxter argues from 1 Corinthians 7:19 that "*Evangelical Obedience alone is opposed to the works of the Law, in reference to Justification...* [but Brown says] two things are wanting, to make this passage a confirmation of his Assertion, one is, that by Circumcision here is meant the keeping of the Law: and what shall then be understood by Uncircumcision? The other is, that the Apostle is speaking this reference to Justification, contrary to the whole context" (386).

The assertion that “*faith itself is an act of Evangelical obedience*” has already been answered. It has been shown that faith is not considered an act of Gospel-obedience, but an instrument which lays hold on the Righteousness of Christ, the Cautioner. Next is Baxter’s assertion “*That by Gospel-obedience Christians came to have a Right to Salvation Revel. 22:14. This εἰσουσία liberty* (as it is in *1 Cor. 8:9*) Power or privilege, as it would seem to import *1 Cor. 9:18*. and elsewhere, is no proper Right; for all that can be called proper Right, the Saints have it through the purchase of Jesus Christ; his blood and his blood alone, hath brought the inheritance to us: And hereby we see the true tendency of this Man’s doctrine, even to give us heaven as that, which we have bought with our labour and obedience; that is, to give us heaven by a new Covenant of Works, which Christ hath procured to be made with us ... And can only prove, what we deny not, *to wit*, the necessity of Holiness, in order to the actual enjoyment of life: but what saith this unto justification? He will not have us put any difference betwixt them, alledging that, such as do, are more curious and nice indistinguishing, than *Paul* was. And why so? *Paul calls Justification*, the Justification unto life. *Rom. 5:18*. Therefore Justification and Glorification is one and the same, and have every way the same conditions: *Ans*. It followeth not. He citeth next *Rom. 8:30*. which clearly maketh them distinct. What more? *He* (i.e. *Paul*) *proves that men shall be justified by faith, because it is written, the just shall live by faith Gal. 3:11. and with him to be justified and blessed are all one Gal. 3:8, 9. Rom. 4:7, 8, 9. Ans*. What that from *Gal. 3:11*. can be made to prove him, I know not. And as for the text, it will prove as much, that is, just nothing” (387).

Baxter uses righteousness and justification and life as synonymous terms because of his understanding of Galatians 3:21. But that implies, according to Brown, that “justification were not a state of life, unless it were the same with Glory.” Baxter asserts “*Salvation as well as justification is promised to believing Joh. 3:16. Act. 3:31. Heb. 10:39. and therefore both must be the immediat effect of faith. Ans*. Himself answereth all this, by adding, *if we take Salvation, as begun here in this life, as the Scripture represents it to be Joh. 5:24. 1 Joh. 3:14. and 5:12*. He would further prove it from *Jam. 2:14*. As if in one *Chapter* the Apostle could not speak, both of Justification and Salvation, unless he would make them both one thing: But though there be a life begun in Justification, that shall at length end in Glory, we see no ground to say, for all that he hath brought forth, that they are so the same, as to require previous Conditions: How profitable so ever *Mr. Baxter* account this Treatise to be, yet

I cannot think, that he shall approve of this, which yet is the maine designe of the book” (387).

The promise of the forgiveness of sins, in Baxter’s mind, is sometimes made unto Evangelical obedience as based on *1 John 1:7*. Brown points out that John is not talking about those who first confess sin that they may be justified. The Apostle is talking about those who entered the Justified life through faith alone and are now confessing daily sin that they may be forgiven. Those mentioned in *1 John 1:7* are already in a justified state. But Baxter adds *1 Peter 1:2*, *they were not elected to the benefite of being sprinkled with the blood of Christ, without obedience*. To this the Scotsman comments, “Making that a condition of being sprinkled with the blood of Christ, which the Apostle mentioneth, as a distinct medium, to which they were elected, in reference to eternal life, the supream end, as to them: And he might as well say, they were not elected to the benefite of obedience without being sprinkled with the blood of Christ: and that too agreeth more with truth” (388).

Baxter cites the petition of the Lord’s Prayer in *Matthew 11:25* relative to one’s sins being forgiven upon the forgiveness of others by the petitioner. This, in Baxter’s thought makes the asking for forgiveness a condition of justification. To this Brown replies, “Though men cannot be pardoned without this, it will not follow, that therefore it is a part of the condition of Justification: but only proveth, that this must be present, as an evidence of their acting Faith on Jesus Christ, in truth and reality, in order to pardon: And these passages are explications of the fift petition of the Lord’s prayer, the sense whereof is well given in our larger Catechisme. 194. in these words, *which we are the rather emboldened to ask. and encouraged to expect, when we have this testimony in ourselves, that we from the heart forgive others their offences*” (388).

Finally, Baxter cites *Acts 17:30* and *Luke 13:3, 5* as teaching “*That Repentance is an act of Evangelical Obedience Act. 17:30. and yet pardon of sin, which is essential to justification, is not to be obtained without it. Luk. 13:3, 5*” (388). Since *Luke 13:3, 5* do not mention remission of sin, how may these verses be used to prove Baxter’s position? Luke’s point is that one will perish if one does not repent. On page 117 of Baxter’s work he argues “that doubtless *Paul’s denial of Justification and Salvation to be by the Law, is to be understood in the very same sense, in which the incredulous jewes, against whom he disputed, did hold these to be attainable thereby*, so that for the use of the Church unto the end of the world.” Brown replies,

But sure, if no other works here understood, than this Author will have here understood, it could be of little use to the Gosþel churches, after the subject of the question, the Ceremonial Law, it self is taken away: And had it not been a shorter and most effectual way to have confuted the jewes error here, simply to have proven (as he doth elsewhere) the abolishing of that Law? Beside, we finde many things spoken of this Law, against Justification by obedience to which the Apostle disputeth, that cannot agree to the Ceremonial Law, as hath been several times touched. But let us hear what the true question was. *He must understand him* (he saith) *to deny a freedom from the eternal punishment to be attainable by legal Sacrifices: and also to deny that the promise of eternal life was made upon Condition of literal Circumcision, and a literal observation of the Mosaical Law.* Ans. If this had been to what purpose, I pray, did the Apostle labour so much to prove, that not only the jewes, but the Gentiles also were under sin, *Rom. 1 and 2.* The Gentiles were not, nor yet were to be under Law of Ceremonies. (2) How could the Apostle inferred, that by the deeds of the Law, there should be no flesh justified, from his proving, that both jewes and Gentiles were guilty of the breach of the Moral Law, whereby every mouth was stopped, and all the world become guilty before God *Rom. 3:10–20?* (3) did only the Law of Ceremonies give the knowledge of sin? Himself proveth the contrary *pag. 57.* (4) did the curse only belong unto the Ceremonial Law? or did Christ only become a Curse, in reference to the breaches of that? *Gal. 3:10.*

He will not so much as yield p. 119. that *Paul* doth, on the bye, deny Justification by other works: And that merely because it would destroy his fabrick of a *Judaical Socinian* justification: though he pretend, that thereby the Apostles doctrine would be made inconsistent, not only with the Faith of the holy men of old, but also with his own doctrine: But neither did the holy men of old express the Condition of Justification (which he confoundeth with the Condition of the Covenant of mercy) by loving God and keeping his commandments: nor doth *Paul* speak any such thing, as we have seen, what ever he with *Socinians* and *Arminians* say (389).

#### THE OBJECT OF JUSTIFYING FAITH

Having shown in Chapter 31 that “Gosþel-obedience [is] no Condition for Justification,” chapter 32 is titled, “Of the object of justifying Faith.” Brown believes that to understand the object of justifying faith is to know what it is to live by faith. Here is a glimpse of what he

says on this subject. When one properly exercises and exerts faith it is unto “accepting the offered Saviour and Salvation through him, a Conviction of sin and misery, in one measure, or other, finde no remedie, or reliefe for himself, within himself, and to a concluding, that he is an undone man, if there be no other remedie, than what he is able to do for himself,” and after fleeing to many hands for help finally “preventing grace” comes and draws that soul to “comply with the only Man-abasing and Grace-exalting way of Salvation, through Faith in Christ, revealed in the Gosþel ... And further, it is presupposed, as necessarily requisite hereunto, some knowledge of the grounds of Religion; and particularly of the Gosþel, of Christ, of his offices, Work &c. all revealed in the Gosþel” (391).

Of course this faith is that which unites one to Christ and closes with Him as He is offered in the Gosþel so that it improves upon Him to all ends and uses. “So that it is one and the same Faith, whether it be called Uniting Faith, Saving Faith, Justifying Faith, Sanctifying and heart-purifying Faith, or the like” (391). It is this faith “whereby the believer is Married to Christ, and Covenanteth with Him, as Head, Husband, Lord and Saviour, by the same is he justified, adopted and brought into a state of Peace and Reconciliation with God. By the same Faith also doth the man get his heart Purified, and liveth the life of Sanctification. By the same also he getteth Strength, Reviving, Comfort, and Support in time of Temptation and Trial. So that the Belevers life first and last is by Faith, the beginning, progress, all the steps of it, and final Salvation is by Faith, whence it is called Saving Faith, to distinguish it from that Historical Faith, which, (though true in its kind yet) is not from the saving grace of God, nor hath it effects accompanying Salvation” (392). And while this faith is necessary for life from first to last, it does not act in the same manner as it is serviceable and useful to the Christian according to the need of the moment. It acts differently when seeking comfort, or when subduing sin, or when desiring justification, nevertheless, in every case what counts is “his apprehension to Christ, according to his Condition and wants, which he would have helped and supplied.” Furthermore, while the object of this faith is always the same, “there may be some particularities in that object, which Faith eyeth more in one case, than in another: As we finde the Saints, in their adresses to God, in their several straits and necessities, sometimes pitching upon one attribute of God, sometimes upon another; according as thereby Faith presented God to the soul in a suitableness to the present case, it was in....” Brown argues that there are times when one’s faith leans

more toward Christ as Prophet, other times as Christ is King, and other times in His Priestly office Christ is sought by faith. “Yet, (which is carefully to be observed, to prevent *Mr. Baxter’s* challenge) I do not say, nor see I any necessity to say, that these several acts of Faith, are as so many several Conditions unto the receiving of the several favours, taking the term *Condition* in his [Baxter’s] sense; I do not say, that Faith acting one way on Christ is a proper Condition of Justification, and Faith as acting another way on Christ is the proper Condition for Adoption, and that Faith acting a third way on Christ is the proper Condition of Sanctification &c. but that, as the effects and benefites, which sinners stand in need of, are ascribed unto several effectuating acts of Christ, and to the several Relations and offices he hath taken on: so Faith in order to the receiving of these benefites, acteth suitably on Christ, and the believer is, taught so to do by the Spirit of the Lord, to his Comfort, Hope and Encouragement” (393).

The formal object of all divine faith, according to Brown is the “Truth and Veracity of God; for all divine faith giveth credite unto divine Revelations upon the Creator, the Truth and Veracity of the Revealer, *Thus saith the Lord*, who is true, and who is Truth itself, is the sole Formal ground and Ratio of this Faith” (393). Furthermore, the comprehensive material object of all divine faith “is the whole will and mind of God, concerning whatsoever thing it be revealed, whether by the Scriptures, or by the Light of Nature. If the Truth and Veracity of God be the only Formal Ground of this Faith, then all that this God revealeth must be believed and received, as true, when known to be revealed by Him” (393).

It must be cautioned that the believer does not need to know all truth in order to be assured that he enjoys saving faith for what is embraced as true is understood to be revealed as such by God. Now what object of faith does immediately and directly concern “our delivery from our natural state of sin and miserie; and our eternal Salvation: And this, we judge, to be *whole Christ Jesus, as he is hold forth in the Gospel*” (393). To speak of the “whole Christ” is to speak of Him in all that He is. Therefore, according to Galatians 2:6 “this Faith is called *the Faith of Christ* ... and the Faith of the Son of God, *Gal. 2:20*<sup>12</sup> So then Saving and Justifying Faith taketh whole Christ” (394). Faith lays hold of Jesus according to His nature and offices, according to the relations he has taken on with reference to His people (i.e., husband, head, chief cornerstone, vine, witness, leader, commander, and light), according to the work and ends He performs and secures according to each office and

relation He exercises with respect to His own. Faith lays hold of Jesus according to “the *Furniture and Qualifications*, whereby he was fitted for the discharge of the duties, belonging to the Offices, which he did execute both in his Estate of Humiliation and Exaltation; and for throughing and perfecting of the work, which he undertook to do.... “ Faith receives him “as to all the sinners Necessities, Cases, Wants, Straits, and Difficulties, which they either are, or may be into, from first to last: All the vessels must hand on Him.” To embrace Jesus with this faith “receiveth Him, with all Sufferings, Crosses, and Inconviences, that can follow: Faith taketh up the Crosse, and followeth Christ. *Mat. 10:37, 38. Mark. 8:34. Mat. 16:24. Luke 9:23*” (395). Since “Christ as revealed, held forth, and offered in the Gospel, is the object of Saving and Justifying faith ... He is received, as the result (so to speak) of the wonderful Contrivance and Designe of free Grace, Love, Goodness, Mercy, and Wisdom, concerning the glorifying of God, in the Salvation of the chosen ones, in and through Him.... He is received as the great Gift of God.... as offered and held forth in the Promises ... as the great meane of declaring and setting forth the glorious Attributes of God ... as the grand and only Meane to bring about all the great Ends, designed of God, and desired by them ... And, in a word, He is received as the grand meane to Interest them in God, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, as theirs; to bring them nigh unto God, in Covenant with Him, and to enjoy the several Effects and Benefites of their Workings. They come to God through Him, as the only way to the Father *Joh. 14:6*. They close with the Father as their God and Father through Him, and with the Holy Ghost, as their Sanctifier, and comforter through Him, who sendeth the Spirit from the Father. *Joh. 15:26. and 14:26*” (395–396).

#### THE OBJECT OF FAITH IN JUSTIFICATION

Chapter 33 is entitled “The Righteousness of Christ is the special Object of Faith in Justification.” It is here that we are able to see just how Socinian Baxter is when he denies the imputation of Christ’s righteousness unto the Justifying of the believer. It is

because *Mr. Baxter* in his *Apologie* against *Mr. Blake*

12. Obviously Brown has in mind the Authorized Bible’s translation of Galatians 2:20 when he speaks of *the faith of the Son of God*. This author recognizes that there are compelling reasons given by exegetes today to understand that phrase in Galatians 2:20 to speak of a life of faith “in the Son of God Who loved me [Paul is speaking] and gave Himself for me.”

11. is pleased to tell us, that *Faith, which is the Justifying condition, is not terminated on the Righteousness of Christ: And that it is meer fancy and delusion to speak of the receiving a Righteousness, that we may be justified constitutive thereby, in such a sense, as if the Righteousness were first to be made ours, in order of nature before, our Justification, and then justification follow, because we are Righteous.* But, sure, this eyeing of, laying hold on, and leaning to the Righteousness of Christ, holdeth clear correspondance with the experience of the Children of God, not only at their Conversion, when delivered from under the Convictions of sin, and the terrours of the Law; but even afterward, when exercised with new assaults of Satan, objecting unto them their Unworthiness, and Filthiness, and hence inferring their exclusion from the face of God: for then their maine quieting refuge is the Righteousness of Christ; wherein they seek only to be found, acknowledging that in themselves, they are but sinners, and so rejecting their own worth and holiness, as too ragged to cover the shame of their nakedness, wherein they have the Apostle *Paul* going before them *Phil. 3:8, 9.* (which may also serve, for a Scriptural proof of the truth in hand) He rejected all these things, wherein sometime he gloried, and he did now (even long after his Conversion, while a prisoner at *Rome* and after all his great Labour and Paines in spreading the Gospe) *count all things* (nothing is here excepted) *but loss* (saith he) *for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus, my Lord, for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung, that I may win Christ, and be found in him, not having mine own Righteousness* (it is not good that *Mr. Baxter* should carp at Writers and Preachers, for speaking and teaching after this manner, as he doth *Cath. Theol. Mor. Works. 176.*) *which is of the Law; but that, which is through the faith of Christ, the Righteousness which is of God by faith.* This saith clearly, that in order to Justification before God, faith laith hold on a Righteousness, which is of God, and which is had by the Faith of Christ.

And this Surety-Righteousness of Christ, is that which can only prove sutable unto the case of a wakened sinner, pressed with the guilt of sin, and seeing justice armed against him, stopping his way to life, because of his Unrighteousness. What can be more welcome to such a sinner, than the news of a Righteousness, and of having Christ to become the Lord his Righteousness, as made of God Righteousness? And what can his faith gripe to more earnestly, than to this Righteousness, that he may be covered therewith, and think with joy of appearing before God? How else shall he think to be justified by God, who

is just, even when the justifier of a believing sinner. He knoweth, that God is Righteous, and will not acquit the guilty; and therefore he must have a Righteousness, that he may be in case to stand before the Righteous God: So that he can have no peace, till by faith he have interest in the Surety-Righteousness of Jesus Christ; for he knoweth, that he hath none of his owne, and that there is none any where else to be had (398–399).

It takes the righteousness of God to render a sinner righteous before such a God, Brown goes on to argue.

Hence, this Righteousness is called the *Righteousness of Faith*, or of Christ beleevd in, and laid hold on *Rom. 4: 13. and the Righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ Rom. 3:22. Phil. 3:9. and a Righteousness through the faith of Christ, ibid.* All which and the like expressions do manifestly say, that faith laith hold on a Righteousness, even on the Righteousness of God. And this Righteousness is said to *be unto all, and upon all them that beleeve Rom. 3:22 πάντα καὶ ἐπὶ πάντα.* And imputed, or reckoned upon their score. *Rom. 4:24. Mr. Baxter* in the forecited book. *Cath. Theol. 131.* saith that the meaning of this *Rom. 4:24. is no more, but that God reputeth, or judgeth us Righteous*, either of our own, or from some other: of ourselves, we have not a Righteousness, unless he account believing all our Righteousness, against which we have said enough above; and the very words of the text will not admit of this glosse, as was also shown above. If it be the Righteousness of Christ, who was delivered for our Offenses, and was raised againe for our Justification *vers. 25.* then it is a fit object for faith to lay hold on, it being Christ's Surety-Righteousness, or the Righteousness, which he performed and wrought out, when he was delivered for our offenses; and which was publicly declared to be accepted, when he was raised againe for our Justification. And whatever *Mr. Baxter* think, this is, and must be so far made our owne, through the gracious Imputation of God, that the Righteous God, whose judgment is to according to truth, may pronounce us Righteous, and accept of us, as such. But saith he, *Imputing Righteousness to us, is a consequent act (after faith) of God as judge, and not an antecedent donation.* Yet it is such a consequent act of God, as necessarily presupposeth God's free antecedent Donation: for it is God's reckoning that Righteousness upon the beleevers score, in order to the Justifying of him thereupon; and because this Righteousness must be given, we not having it of ourselves, there must a free donation antecede, and this groundeth Faith accepting thereof, and receiving of it (400).

Baxter joins Righteousness and Remission while Brown separates them thusly:

“But to us Remission is a benefite purchased by this Righteousness, and followeth upon our having interest therein through Faith, according to the appointment of God: a Pardoned man, as such, is not a Righteous man. But he tels us there, that *our divines of the Assembly do perfectly define justifying Faith to be, a receiving and resting on Christ alone for Salvation, as he is offereth in the Gospel. It is of dangerous consequence to define justifying faith to be the receiving of justification, or Righteousness.* Ans. Here we have Justification and Righteousness made one and the same, which with me, differ as Cause and Effect; our divines of the Assembly give a more full definition or description of Justifying Faith, in the Larger Catechisme, and there tell us, that thereby the convinced sinner *receiveth and resteth upon Christ, and (N.B.) his Righteousness therein (i.e. in the Gospel) held forth, for pardon of sin, and for the accepting and accounting of his person Righteous in the sight of God for Salvation.* And if Mr. Baxter would say so much, as is here, this debate would bear an end, and yet I finde not this among his exceptions, against that Catechisme, in his *Confession.* And when our devines mentione this Receiving and Resting upon Christ’s Righteousness, they make not Justifying Faith to be a receiving of Justification; but the one cause of the other: And he addeth a little thereafter, (which is considerable to our present purpose) *That reception Ethica activa of justification, or of Righteousness (for they are both one thing with him) goeth before Justification, as a small and secondary part of condition, it being the accepting of Christ himself, that is the maine condition:* And we never spoke of the receiving by Faith of Christ’s Righteousness, as exclusive of the receiving of himself. He tels us next. *That Christ’s Satisfaction or Redemption (solvendo preuum) and merit, cannot properly be received by us; for they are not in themselves given to us.* We grant the price was payed to God, but it being payed to God for us, it may be imputed to us, and reckoned upon our score; and we may that way receive it by faith, and Lean our soul upon it, to the end, that the fruit of it may be given to us” (401).

Brown would have his readers understand that “Our being made Righteous is different from the obedience of one Christ Jesus; and by the Imputation of this Obedience to us, do we become Righteous, as our being made sinners is different from Adam’s act of Disobedience; and we are made sinners by the Imputation of it to us. And as sin and death are different, when it is said, *that*

*sin hath reigned unto death; so Eternal life is different from Righteousness, when it is said, so might grace reigne through righteousness unto eternal life”* (403).

In chapter 34, “Faith in Justification respecteth not in a special manner Christ, as a King, but as a Priest,” Brown cites Baxter saying in *Aphorismes*

That the Accepting of Christ for Lord, is as essential a part of Justifying Faith, as the accepting of him for our Saviour; that is, as he explained himself, That faith, as it accepteth Christ, for Lord and King, doth justify. And this was asserted by him, to the end, he might cleare and confirme how Sincere Obedience cometh in with Affiance to make up the Condition of Justification; for his *Thesis LXXII.* Did run thus. *At the accepting of Christ for Lord (which is the hearts Subjection) is as essential a part of Justifying Faith, as the accepting of him for our Saviour; So consequently, sincere obedience (which is the effect of the former) hath as much to do in justifying us before God, as Affiance (which is the fruit of the later).* Hence the question arose, and was by some proposed thus; Whether faith in Christ *qua* Lord, be the justifying act: or, whether the Acceptation of Christ, as a Lord, and not only, as a Priest, doth justifie. And Mr. Baxter in his *Confess.* p. 35. 13. saith, that *it is only without any ground in God’s word, but fully against it, to say, that faith justifieth only, as it apprehendeth Christ, as a Ransome, or Satisfier of justice, or Meritier of our Justification; or his Righteousness as ours; and not as it receiveth him, as King, or as a Saviour from the staine and tyranny of sin* (403–404).

To this the Scotsman objects “because Justifying Faith receiveth Christ, as King; Therefore Obedience is a part of the Condition of Justification, yea, or therefore a Purpose, or a promise of Obedience is a part of the Condition of Justification.”

So that, in order to the disproving of that Assertion, that maketh obedience, or a Purpose, or a promise of obedience, an essential part of the Condition of Justification we need not trouble ourselves with this question: Yet, in regard that the speaking to this may contribute to the clearing of the way of Justification by faith, (which is our great designe) we shall speak our judgment there aent.... [W]ether Christ, as a King, belongeth to the compleet and adequate object of that faith, which is the true and justifying faith: [is not the question] for this is granted, as was shown above, this faith, being the same faith, whether called True Faith, or Saving Faith, or Uniting and Covenanting faith, or Justifying faith, it must have one and the same adequate Object. [W]eather

Faith in order to Justification, doth so act on Christ, as a Priest, as to exclude either virtually, or expressly, the consideration of any other of his offices, or of Christ under any other of his offices: for under whatever office Christ be considered; when faith acteth upon him, whole Christ is received, and nothing in Christ is or can be excluded; So that there is no virtual exclusion; nor any other of his offices is looked to a right and received; for such an exclusion would be open rejection of Christ, and no receiving of him (404).

Brown goes on to explain what it means to accept Christ as Priest and what it cannot mean, and concludes the argument

That the wakened sinner, in that case, while seeking reliefe from sin and guilt, and from the curse, by Absolution and Justification, in the sight of God, in compliance with the Gospeleth methode and designe, making Justification to be by faith, and in obedience to the Gospeleth command, saying, Beleeve and be justified, is to act faith in a special manner on Christ's Mediation and Satisfaction; and to betake himself to Christ as a Priest, and rest on him and on what he did as a Priest, that is, on his death, Blood, and Satisfaction. This is it, which others call the justifying Act of Faith: or that special act of faith, required in order to Justification (405).

Of the seven reasons Brown offers for not accepting the idea that justifying faith must be especially on Christ as King, allow the sixth to stand for the whole.

The end and designe of asserting Christ, as King to be as specially the Object of Faith, in Justification, as is Christ, as Priest, may sufficiently render it suspicious; for it is, as we touched above, to bring in *our Obedience*, as distinct from Faith, or as included in it, to be the Condition of Justification, the same manner or way, that Faith is: though, as was cleared above, the consequence will not be found good. The real question here (as is well observed by others) is not, whether any thing of Christ, is to be excluded from being the Object of Justifying Faith. But what, in and of our selves, under the name of Receiving Christ as King, is to be admitted to share with Faith, in its place and interest, in our Justification (409)?

The final chapter to be discussed is chapter 35, "Faith is the only Condition on our part, of the continuance of justification."

Having spoken of *Justification*, as to its beginning, or as to a Beleevers entering into that State of Living; and having spoken to some Questions for further clearing of the truth: We come to speak a word or two of the Continuance of this Privilege and State: That it is a continueing and permanent State, we have seen above. The Question then, that we have to discuss, is, Upon what termes and Conditions is this State continued? or what is it, which the Lord requireth in order thereunto? or whether any thing more be required of us for continueing this Relation than was at first required to the making of it? that is, whether Faith alone, or Faith together with Works of sincere obedience. *Mr. Baxter* in his *Confess.* p. 47. n. 40. tells us, that *there is much more goeth to the continueing and consummating our Justification, than doth at first to justify us as to the condition on our parts, to be performed to that end: This Continueing of our State of Justification, and Not-losing of it, he maketh one and the same, and that, which he requireth, as necessary unto the Not-losing or Continueing of this State, he maketh to be Sincere obedience, and many particular materials of this obedience, as to be humble, to forgive others, to confess Christ, and suffer for him, if called to it* (414).

Brown first reminds Baxter and his colleagues "that there is an Holiness and Personal Obedience and Conformity to the Law, called for at the hands of all Justified persons, that are come to age... for we still affirme that the Law is in force and obligeth unto obedience, and that all such as are justified, have received a new frame and disposition of soul, inclineing them to obedience; Yea, and that they have now both peculiar Obligations unto Holiness, and also Advantages and Helps thereunto: They are his workmanship created in Christ Jesus unto Good Works; which God hath before ordained, that they should walk in them, *Ephes. 2:10* (414-415).

The second point Brown considers which Baxter maintains is, in Baxter's words, "*that no justified person shall ever lose his justification; and that God hath promised to cause them persevere.*" Brown points out that being in the state of justification is a completely unique state. It may not be compared with the state of marriage, for instance, because that state is losable. If a state is not losable, why would one speak of conditions of not losing that which is fully secured from all losing? "[T]o speak of Conditions of not losing it [our justification], may occasion Apprehensions in the mindes of men of its being losable. It were saifer then, in my apprehension, to enquire how or what way is this State and Relation continued? or what is required on our part, in order thereunto? then to

enquire what are the Conditions of Not-losing this State” (315 [sic 415])?

The exiled theologian is unsettled by Baxter’s clear position as set forth in *Confess.* p. 109, that there is no new sin which would destroy one’s state of justification, because he insisted on enumerating conditions of not-losing the state of justification. Brown points out that the use of the term “condition” here must be in the same sense as it was used earlier when speaking of the condition of our first entering the state of justification. Because it was used to indicate “a proper legal antecedent Poteſtative condition” because if all Baxter means by “condition” is “a mere Consequent Evangelick Condition: the question only would be. What is the Lord’s Way, Methode and Manner, how and by which he persevereth his own, in that State of Juſtification? But, according to their acceptation of the word *condition*, the question really cometh to this, What that is, which believers betake themselves unto, and which they can, may, and should plead with God upon, for the continuance of their state, that is, of their Reconciliation unto, and Acceptance with God, of the Pardon of their sins and Right to glory?”

Brown points out that the question being asked is not “what is required on our part for keeping the sense and evidence of our justification in our own Consciences ... But the Juſtification here ſpoken of, is that which is before God, whereby the Beleever is indeed brought into a State of Peace and Reconciliation with God, and hath obtained a Right unto the Inheritance of Life” ([4]15–416). Because Brown understands the fundamental question raised by Baxter to be what conditions are necessary to maintain the state or relation of justification there are “two diſtinct questions. What is the Condition of our final Abſolution in Judgment; and what is the Condition of the continuance of our juſtification here; which *Mr. Baxter* seemeth to confound *Confess.* p. 83. as the *Papiſts* do confound their second juſtification with the laſt judgment, when they are pleading for works, being required as the cauſes thereof” (416).

The heart of the matter is seen in the fact that “Juſtification importeth more than Remiſſion of ſins. Yet in this queſtion of the Condition of the Continuance of Juſtification, the matter ſeemeth to be brought to this iſſue; whether works of Obedience be the Condition of future Remiſſion of ſins, in the juſtified.” Thus, one muſt ask how future ſins will be remitted, “for if it be found, that the ſame courſe is taken for Remiſſion of future ſins, that was taken at firſt, it will be manifeſt, that juſtification is continued upon the ſame termes, or in the ſame manner, that it was at firſt obtained, if

properly we can ſpeak at all of the Conditions of its Continuance.”

The queſtion comes to this,

Whether faith alone, or works alone, or faith with works, are the condition required on our part, for the Continuance, or not-losing of the ſtate of juſtification? And I judge as faith alone was required at firſt, in order to juſtification, ſo that alone is to be called the Condition of the continuance of juſtification: or that the Condition both of our firſt inſtalling in that ſtate of juſtification, and of the Continuance of the Privilege, or of Beleevers continuing in that ſtate, is the ſame grace of Faith. Yet theſe two things would be noted. 1. That though the firſt act of Faith in Chriſt, doth ſuffice to the entering of a ſoul into the ſtate of juſtification; Yet we do not meane, that that one firſt, ſolitarie, and numerical act ſufficeth for all coming, albeit it ſufficeth for making up of the Relation, according to the appointment of God; for the ſame Faith is to continue in its habite; Yea and in its actings. So that we ſtate not the Queſtion ſo ſtrickly, as *Mr. Baxter* ſeemeth to do, *Confess.* p. 47. when from the Continuance of the habite of Faith, and from the renewing acts of that Faith, required after the firſt act of Faith, he inferreth, that much more goeth to the continueing of our juſtification, than doth at firſt juſtifie us. But our queſtion is about the addition of *sincere Obedience* which he there mentioned. 2. When we ſuppoſe the Continuance of Faith, not only as to its habite, but as to its renewed actings; we do not ſuppoſe, that the actings and Effects, or Concomitants of Faith afterward, are every way the ſame, with what they were at firſt; ſo that we may alſo yield to this difference, and grant that ſome thing more may be requisite afterward. Particularly, in order to the Remiſſion of ſome heinous ſin, in the acting of Faith, or in the Effects or Concomitants thereof, at leaſt as to meaſure, or outward ſignifications, *to wit*, in Godly ſorrow, Humiliation, Forgiving others, Reſtitution, or the like; and yet it will ſtill remaine true, that juſtification is continued by Faith, and not by Works (416–417).

Beginning with Habakkuk 2:4, “the juſt live by faith,” Brown offers the grounds for the doctrine that the juſt remain in faith and not works to continue in the ſtate of juſtification. Theſe words are ſpoken of thoſe who already believe and are juſtified, therefore, they point the way one is to live in an evil time. Hebrews 10:38 and 39 ſay the ſame thing. “Now the juſt ſhall live by faith; but if any man draw back, my ſoul ſhall have no pleaſure in him. But we are not of them, that draw back, unto perdition, but of them that beleeve to the ſaving

of the soul” (417). Here we see that living by faith is opposed to drawing back through unbelief, for to do so is to enter upon perdition.

[S]o believing is to the saving of the soul; and therefore the Continuation of this life of justification unto the end, even unto the final Salvation of the soul, is by Faith. This life of justification, as it is begun by Faith (as the Apostle evinceth *Rom. 1:17*. and in our present Text citing in both places these same words, for that end) so it is continued by Faith, as the only condition thereof... Therefore, as this assertion, that the *just liveth by faith*, proveth justification by faith without the works of the Law; so the same proveth the Continuation of Justification, without the works of the Law, as the Condition thereof.

From Romans 3:22, 34–36 the grounds and causes of justification are set forth as being necessary at the first, that being the righteousness of God apart from the Law, it follows that to continue in the state of justification the same grounds and causes are necessary. “Justification first and last is free by his grace, through the Redemption, that is in Jesus Christ, whom God hath set forth to be a Propitiation, through faith in his blood. And there is not the least hint given, that the matter is altered, in the Continuation of Justification.”

Since all boasting is eliminated at the outset of justification, so it must be void with regard to the continuance of justification. If

works be admitted, as Conditions of the Continuance of Justification, though they be denied to be the Condition of the Beginning thereof, all boasting shall not be excluded, contrary to *Rom. 3:27*. for if a sinner, after that he is justified by the merite of Christ, at first, should have it to say, that for the Continuance of his justification, he were beholden to his own Works, he should surely have matter of boasting in himself, in so far at least, *Papists* think to exite this Argument against their Second Justification by works, by saying that all these good works are not of themselves, but of the Father of Lights. But this shift will not help, for all these works are not the Righteousness of Christ, but are works of Righteousness, which we do, and are excluded in this matter, as occasioning boasting, or giving ground thereunto; as the next Argument will more fully cleare.

Moving to that argument just anticipated by Brown we find

13. The edition of Brown's work cited misquoted James 2:26 by leaving “out” off “with”.

*Abraham* is said to have Righteousness imputed by faith unto him, and Faith imputed unto Righteousness, and so to be justified by faith, not only when he was first justified, but many years thereafter, even when he offered up *Issac* his son. *Rom. 4. and Jam. 2:21, 23*. So was he justified first and last, as to have no ground of glorying, and therefore not by works. *Rom. 4:1, 3, 4*. But it will be said, that *James* saith expressly, in the place cited, that our father *Abraham* was justified by works, when he had offered his Son *Isaac* on the Alter. I *Ans.* Not to engage in the whole explication and vindication of that Passage of Scripture here, which is of late to good purpose, and most satisfyingly done by the learned *Doctor Owen*; I only say, that *Abraham's* being justified by works, was such, as thereby the Scripture was fulfilled; which saith, *Abraham* beleeveth God, and it was imputed unto him for Righteousness &c. *vers. 23*. Now if *Abraham* had been justified by works, properly so taken, the Scripture had not been made good, *to wit*, that works were imputed to him, and he was justified by them, as by his Righteousness. But the meaning is, that *Abraham* was justified by faith, a true faith, that proved itself such, in time of trial, by works of obedience, and particularly by obedience to that command, whereby the Lord tried or tempted him *Gen. 22:1, 2*. and by such a Faith as wrought with his works, and was perfected, or discovered and manifested to be real, after trial of the fire. *Jam. 2:22*.... The Proposition is set down *vers. 14*. *What doth it profite, my brethren, though a man say he, hath faith, and have not works, can faith, (or that faith) save him.* Whereby we see, that the Apostles scope is to prove, that that Faith, which the man supposeth he hath, who hath no works, is not that Faith, by which we are Justified and saved; and that because it is unprofitable to poor indigent brethren, in necessity *vers. 15, 16*. is dead *vers. 17, 20*, it can not be shown by works *vers. 18*. it is a Faith that devils have *vers. 19*. All which and what followeth is cleared from the Conclusion *vers. 26*. *for as the body without the Spirit is dead, so faith with[out]<sup>13</sup> works is dead also* (418).

From this Brown points out that “if the Continuance of Justification were by works; and works were counted for Righteousness, in order to the continuance of justification; God should not continue to be the justifier of the ungodly,” as stated in Romans 4:5, “but should justify the ungodly at first, and thereafter justify the Godly; whereof the Text giveth not the least hint. The Instance of *David* cleareth this also *Rom. 4:6, 7, 8*. for *David* is there *Psal. 32*. speaking of himself, long after he was first justified, and yet his words saying *blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven* &c. prove Justification

by faith, without the works of the Law..." Furthermore, "that Pardon of sins committed after Justification, is not had by works, but by the imputation of Righteousness, without works, for saith *Paul*, *David describeth the blessedness of the man, unto whom God imputeth Righteousness, without works*: And how did *David* describe this? When he said, *blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven &c*" (419).

Romans 5:2 tells us that we have access by faith into grace and that we stand in that faith rejoicing in the hope of God's glory. Since we enter this state of justification through faith, it stands to reason that we continue in that state through faith alone and not by works. Galatians 2:20 confirms this according to Paul's own experience as he sets that forth in that verse. Paul lived unto God as one who was dead to the Law, therefore he lived *by the faith of the Son of God*. "As this was true of the life of Sanctification: so much more of the life of justification; for the whole life of a Christian, now crucified with Christ, and living unto God, is here spoken to: And this is in opposition to the works of the Law, as is clear from *vers. 16.* and from the following *vers. 21*" (419).

Brown then cites Ephesians 2:8–10 as further proof that to continue in justification one must live by faith alone and not works. Of these verses he says, "This Salvation taketh in both the Beginning, Continuance and End of our life, of Justification; and all this is by Faith alone, lest any man should boast ... and these works are of Gospel-obedience, and he tells us of another end and use of these, than to be the Condition of the Continuance of our Justification, even to be the way we should walk in, according to the fore-ordination of God, and carry as his workmanship, created thereunto" (419–420).

The following verses are offered as further proof of Brown's point that the continuance of justification is by faith alone and not of works: Philippians 3:9; Galatians 2:16; and Titus 3:5–7. Paul often declared that he rested not in his own righteousness to maintain fellowship with God because it is faith which is the entrance unto justification, therefore, it is faith which demonstrates continuance in the state of justification. Some of the reasons Brown offers for his point are worth noting as well. He says,

We have proved above, that justification at first is by the Imputation of the Righteousness of Christ, received by faith; and we have shown, that Faith in Justification specifically eyeth the Righteousness of Christ, and resteth thereupon. If then our personal Obedience be brought in to be the Condition of the Continuance of Justification,

Christ's Righteousness is quite laid aside from having any Further interest therein, and the Believer is never, after the first time, to act faith upon that Righteousness of Christ; and the reason is, because works do not act so upon the Righteousness of Christ, as Faith doth; neither have they that capacity to do so. But how absurd is it to think or say, that the Believer hath no more to do with Christ's Righteousness? And how contrary is it to the fixed resolution of *Paul Phil. 3:9.* And how inconsistent with the whole scope of the Gospel, which is the power of God unto Salvation to every one that believeth, and wherein is the Righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith, as it is written, the just shall live by faith *Rom. 1:16, 17?* If it be said, That this cannot militate against such, as take-in Faith with works. I *Ans.* It will militate against such; for works cannot act upon the Righteousness of Christ, as faith doth; and therefore if faith and works concur as conditions, in one and the same manner, Faith is not here considered, as acting on the Righteousness of Christ, but only as a work, and another moral virtue: and so the Righteousness of Christ is quite excluded (420–421).

Brown next addresses each passage Baxter offers in support of his contention that there are conditions set by which one continues in the state of justification. The first set of verses Baxter adduces is Matthew 12:36, 37. Brown contends that these verses do not speak of justification but of the final judgment. There is no reason to understand justification "with the last judgment, as *Papists* do confound their second justification with this last judgment; and abuse the same Scriptures here adduced by *Mr. Baxter* and the like, to prove their second justification to be by works" (423).

James 2:24 is the next verse put forth by Baxter to prove the idea of conditions for continuance in the state of justification. Brown finds in this verse what is necessary at the beginning of justification. Justification is not enjoyed

by a dead faith or by a faith, that cannot produce works of Obedience, or by such a faith, as devils have; but by a faith that is working, and making the soul prompt and ready to yeeld all Obedience unto the Lord: and this is the true meaning of the words ... and the whole scope of the place of evidenceth. Will *Mr. Baxter* say, that by a dead Faith, and by a Faith that cannot save, and by a Faith that is the devils and is attended with no Christian Love, we are brought into a justified state at first? ... and yet this faith, that *James* opposeth unto works, or rather unto a working faith, whereby we are justified first and last, as

was *Abraham vers.* 21. whose faith was such, as it wrought with his works, and by the same was manifest to be what it was, the true and saving faith of God's Elect. And sure, this Faith of *Abraham*, and the Faith that wrought in *Rahab*, was another sort of Faith, than is the Faith of devils, of that Faith, that is but a dead carcase (423).

Matthew 6:14, 15 speaks of the forgiveness of sins. How is this a criteria for remaining in the state of justification? What is to be thought of heathen or wicked persons who may forgive someone their sins? Does that mean God is obliged to justify such persons?

If it be said, that such cannot forgive others a right, not having a principle of grace, and not being in Christ. True, but then we see, that it is not this forgiving abstractly considered, that is spoken of here, but a Forgiving, flowing from faith and principled thereby; and so the meaning of the place is, That without such a Faith in Christ, as principled and prompteth to Pardoning of others, we can expect no pardon of our own sins from God; nor have ground to suppose that we are indeed pardoned of God: our forgiving of others then is here mentioned as the native Effect and evident Signe of Faith (423).

Other commentators (Pareus and Gualter)<sup>14</sup> are referenced by Brown as dealing with this matter and he cites Pareus' discussion of Matthew 18 to show that it "will not have our forgiving of others said to be the *causa sine qua non* of our obtaining Remission from God. This place then saith, That while we cannot finde in our heart, a readiness cheerfully and heartily to forgive others, we have no ground to imagine, that our sinnes are pardoned; for all such as are pardoned on God, have this Christian disposition flowing from faith in Christ: They may have this, as to the seed and root; but till it grow up to yeeld this fruite, they want the evidence of their faith and consequently of pardon" (424).

1 John 1:9 certainly calls upon the person who will confess sin to be doing so "with a running to the Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the Righteous, who is the Propitiation for sins *Chap.* 2:1, 2. Most wicked persons, as *Saul* may make confession of their sins; but not so as to run to the fountaine, the blood of sprinkling: And by a Confession, that is not accompanied with this acting, they can attaine to no Remission before God:

14. David Pareus (1548-1622), *Operum theologicorum*, 3 vols. (Frankfurt, 1647), Rudolphus Gualter (1519-1586), *D. Matthæus Evangelista* (Tiguri: Excudebat Christophorus Froschouerus, [1581]).

And therefore faith only acting in humble Confession to the glory of God, and to the taking of shame to themselves, is the condition of Pardon, and of Continuance of Justification, as to this" (424).

The Papiſts use Revelation 22:14 to prove their doctrine of the second justification to be by works.

The word ἐξουσία, here used, doth not always denote *right*, or *jus*: for it sometimes signifieth mere freedome, liberty and power to do such or such a thing, as *1 Cor.* 9: 4, 5, 6. And so here the words import, that such as do his commandments, are blessed; for thereby they have free access unto the tree of life, unto Christ, their objective blessedness, which is the same with that, which is commonly said, *viz.* that Works of Obedience are the way of the Kingdom, but not the cause of reigning. It will not suite with the Gospeł, to say, that by our works of obedience we buy a right to the tree of life, even in part, or in subordination to Christ's blood; for Christ hath purchased the whole Right: and nothing of ours must be joined, as a part of that price, otherwise must we have a proportionable share of the glory to ourselves. Nor can it be said, that by our works of Obedience we obtaine a Right to Christ and to his Merites; for before we have a Right to Christ, we can do no works of Christian Obedience, and Christ alone hath brought to us both Grace, and Glory: But our works of Christian Obedience, though they cannot precede our Right to, yet they may go before our Possession of the Inheritance purchased; now Right and Possession are different things. But *in sine* we say, that this place, speaking of the possession of glory, is not apposite to the purpose now in hand, for Justification is different from Glorification. *Rom.* 8:30. And of Justification, as continued are we here speaking (424).

The fifteenth chapter of John and verses 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, and 10 are given by Baxter as evidence of a condition of continuance in the state of justification, but this cannot be because "Vers. 4 sheweth that there is no fruitfulness in Grace, but by a constant abiding in, and sucking of sap by faith from Christ the true Vine, which none denieth. Verse 8. sheweth that by fruitfulness in good, the Father is Glorified, and thereby a demonstration is given to the world, who are indeed the true disciples of Christ, vers. 6. holdeth forth the dreadful punishment that attendeth Apostates; but we hope, true beleivers are secured against full and final Apostasie. Vers. 10 proveth indeed, that keeping of Christ's commands, is a mean to keep the sense of our being beloved of Christ fresh in our souls, and to enjoy the fruites of his Love of Beneficence: but saith nothing of good works being

the Condition of our Continuance in the state of justification: unless we will also say, that Christ's obedience was the Condition of his Continuing in the State of Justification" (424–425). 1 John 2:24 "proveth, that full and final Apostasie from the faith and truth of the Gospel will indeed cutt off from all Interest in Christ, and from benefite by him: But as true beleivers are secured from this, as *vers.* 27 cleareth. So this will only prove, the continuance in Faith, is the Condition of continuance of Justification" (425).

Finally, Matthew 18:35 is offered as proof of a condition of continuance in Justification, however, Brown points out that it "Only proveth (and so confirmeth what was said to *Mat.* 6:14.) that such as do not from their hearts forgive their brethren their trespasses, can have no ground of Assurance, that God hath forgiven them theirs.... our Cruelty and Unmercifulness towards our Brethren, may give us sufficient ground to doubt of our Pardon, whatever seeming assurance we had formally. So that this place speaketh nothing of the Condition of our pardon, but of the condition of our Sense, Feeding and grounded Assurance of Pardon; which is a far different thing."

Having gone through all these verses by which Baxter would prove his first argument, Brown now offers the following quote from him as his second argument.

*Our first faith having then the nature of a Covenanting with Christ, and giving ourselves to him, and taking him for our Lord and Redeemer: therefore it follows, that as the Covenant making and accepting was of necessity, as the condition of our first right and remission; so is our Covenant keeping of the same necessity to our continued right. And that God is, as it were, disobliged, if we should not keep Covenant. And the keeping hath more in it, than the bare making. No Covenant-relation usually are entered among men, but the Covenant keeping is more the making; and the condition of their continued right more than of their first right. So it is with a Subject to his Prince, wife to a husband, Souldier to a commander, Scholer to his Teacher. Servant to his Master &c. Promising will give them the first right, but performing (in the essentials) must continue it, it or [sic, or it] will cease: for the end of the promise was its performance: And in that respect faith, which is the Covenant, is inferiour to obedience, which is promised, though in other respect, it may be superiour (425).*

Our Covenanter theologian offers an eight point answer to this argument.

(1) Though Justifying Faith be also a Covenant faith, and

so uniteth [t]he soul with Christ; Yet in order to Justification, it hath not (to use his words) the true Nature of a Covenanting with Christ, nor a giving up ourselves to Him: but rather it is a receiving and resting on Him, and his Righteousness, and a fleeing to his Merites for refuge. (2) Nor doth faith, in order to justification, (as we cleared above) receive Christ, or goe to him, as Lord and King, but rather as Priest. (3) Nor doth the receiving of Christ at first, as King, formally include Obedience, or a promise of obedience; as was also manifested above. (4) Therefore, from this first acting of faith in order to justification, it can no way follow, that Obedience, or Covenant keeping (as he speaketh) is the condition of our continued Right, or of our continued justification. (5) What God hath promised upon Covenant-keeping, he is, it is true, disobliged from giving to speak so, when the Covenant is not kept: But we finde not, that he hath promised Justification, or the continuance thereof upon these termes. (6) There is no Covenants among men, that can fully quadrate, either with God's Covenanting with us, or with the matter of Justification, about which we are now speaking. The sentences of judges absolving the debtor, upon the payment of the Cautioner instructed, agreeth more with this; and we finde not in such sentences, any such-like Conditions, mentioned of their Continuance in force. (7) Some of these Relations or Covenants mentioned are purely aliene, being betwixt a Master and his servant, and the Captain and the Souldier; these are meer mercenary contracts, having Obedience and service for their only end, and promising a reward upon that Condition. Our justification hath no likeness to this. (8) Even in these Relations, every act of disobedience, or non-performance of the duties required, doth not dissolve the Relation; and therefore it cannot be said, that upon the contrare performance, as a condition, the continueing of the Relation dependeth; *Mr. Baxter* seeing this, addeth a restriction, (*in the essentials.*) And in our case, I would require, what he will account Essential? It must be that, sure, the contrary whereof is inconsistent with a Justified state: and what can this be, but a total Apostasie? From which there is full securitie laid-in, in the New Covenant, (which is not in any of the Covenants among men, which he hath mentioned.) And this total Apostasie must include a full renouncing of Christ, and his Righteousness, as to Justification: And this rather would say, that the continuance of Justification dependeth on the continuance of Faith, adhering to Christ and his Righteousness: and to this I shall willingly assent. And this taketh away the force of the 3. Arg. which he adduceth, saying,

3. Arg. *If there were no more necessary to the continuing of our Justification, but only the same thing, which did constitute it, then we should be justified by no act of faith, to our lives end, but only the first instantaneous act; and so our faith, after that instant, should never more be justifying faith. But that's false, &c.* Ans. This whole argument, I yeeld unto; for I plead not against the interest of faith here; but against our works being the condition of continued Justification; as was said above (425–426).

John Brown of Wamphray has shown us what happens when we begin to attribute justification to something other than the finished work of Jesus Christ in behalf of those given to Him by His Father before the foundation of the cosmos in the Covenant of Redemption. It is only by faith alone, and that faith is a gift of God itself, that the finished work of Jesus is embraced as the sole means of one's right standing with a thrice holy God. Baxter began to leave the path of orthodoxy with respect to justification when he attributed one's justification to one's exercise of faith through a misunderstanding of Romans 4:3. With the precision of a surgeon's scalpel Brown cuts through the web woven as a result of such a poor foundation. Is our act of believing imputed to us as righteousness? Certainly not. Why? Because our act of believing cannot be what is imputed unto us as righteousness because imputation implies something is granted from the outside. A believing act initiates with the one believing. "Imputation" is something made to the believer by God which the believer does not already have. For Baxter the word "Imputation" means "esteem, judge or repute." It cannot mean "account" in the sense of "bestow, grant or reckon." There is the further complication of the perfection of one's act of believing. Justification rests on perfect righteousness alone. Is any one's act of believing perfect? Of course not. If the act of believing on the part of the sinner is imputed for righteousness then God may not be called the justifier of the ungodly. Baxter wants our faith to be seen as "our Gospel-Righteousness" because, according to Baxter, Jesus' death secured a new condition for one's justification. Justification is based on a sinner meeting the condition of exercising faith. It is not obedience to the Law of Moses but obedience to the new condition of faith. Of course, faith is a condition for justification, however it is not so as Baxter defines it. Brown points out that faith is a condition in that faith lays hold of Jesus Christ and His righteousness as a beggar lays hold of a morsel of food when it is offered.

From his distorted view of faith, Baxter finds two things which constitute "the righteousness of the Law of Grace." First, there is the need for forgiveness being

exercised by the one who desires to be justified. Second, there is the need for the righteousness of sincere obedience. Furthermore, Baxter writes about repentance, forgiveness and sincere obedience as necessary for one to be justified. As we find in some circles today, justification is no longer *an act of God's free grace, wherein he pardons all our sins, and accepts us as righteous in his sight, only for the righteousness of Christ imputed to us, and received by faith alone* (Shorter Catechism 33). Justification is confused with sanctification which is *the work of God's free grace, whereby we are renewed in the whole man after the image of God, and are enabled more and more to die unto sin, and live unto righteousness* (Shorter Catechism 35). Baxter confounds that which is required of a believer, or of such as are in covenant with God, with that which enables one to enter into covenant with God: "The just man in the eye of this new Law, . . . is everyone that rightly believes, repents, and sincerely obeys, because that is all it requires of a man himself to his Justification and Salvation" (329). This would mean that the reward reckoned is a debt paid, and not of grace at all. And this would further mean that justification would not be enjoyed until one lived the days allotted by God unto the person's death.

I leave the reader with one of Brown's illustrations concerning faith being a condition of justification. Remember the story he told of the man who promised his son a gift. All the son had to do was to take the gift from the top of his father's head. As long as the father stood uprightly, it was impossible for the son to receive the gift offered to him. The father needed to stoop low enough for the son to remove the gift from his father's head.

God the Son, like the father in the illustration "stooped." He came in the form of human flesh, lived a life of covenant faithfulness unlike our first parents, went to the cross to shed His life's blood as the propitiation for our sins, was buried, rose again the third day, and ascended to the right hand of God the Father where He sat down to govern the affairs of men and nations. God the Holy Spirit was sent by the Father and the Son so that those sinners whom the Father gave to the Son would be justified. Our justification is in no way a result of anything that we did, do or will continue to do. Our justification is an act of God's free grace which is enjoyed at a moment in our life, when by grace, through faith, we "take the gift off our father's head," as it were, and it is held securely by the promise of the One Who begins a good work in us and continues it unto the day of salvation. Our justification is indeed *sola fide, sola gratia, solus Christus*. ■