



**LIBRARY**  
**Theological Seminary,**

PRINCETON, N. J.

No. Case, 128  
No. Shelf, Sec. 6  
No. Book, 10

The John M. Krebs Donation.









THE  
ECONOMY  
OF THE  
COVENANTS,  
BETWEEN  
GOD AND MAN.

COMPREHENDING

*A Complete Body of Divinity.*

BY HERMAN WITSIUS, D. D.

Late Professor of Divinity in the Universities of Franequer,  
Utrecht, and Leyden; and also Regent of the Divinity-  
College of the States of Holland and West-Friesland.

TO WHICH IS PREFIXED,

THE LIFE OF THE AUTHOR.

*A New Translation from the Original Latin.*

IN THREE VOLUMES.

---

VOLUME III.

---

NEW-YORK:

PRINTED BY GEORGE FORMAN, NO. 61, WATER-STREET,  
FOR LEE & STOKES, NO. 25, MAIDEN-LANE.

1798.





---

---

# C O N T E N T S.

---

## B O O K IV.

### C H A P. IV.

	Page
<b>O</b> F the decalogue,	1
V. Of the doctrine of the Prophets,	39
VI. Of the types,	40
Of Abel and Enoch,	50
Of Noah and the Ark,	52
Of Isaac,	57
Of Moses,	60
Of Aaron,	64
Of the ark of the covenant,	67
Of the goats of expiation,	76
VII. Of the sacraments of grace down to Abraham,	103
Of sacrifices,	107
Of the rainbow,	115
VIII. Of circumcision,	121
IX. Of the passover,	143
X. Of the sacraments in the wilderness,	177
Of the passage through the Red sea,	178
Of the manna,	192
Of the water from the rock,	219
Of the brazen serpent,	222
XI. Of the blessings of the Old Testament,	227

	Page
XII. <i>Of the imperfections falsely ascribed to the Old Testament,</i>	238
<i>Of true and permanent blessings,</i>	244
<i>Of the circumcision of the heart,</i>	249
<i>Of the writing the law on the heart,</i>	255
<i>Of justification under the Old Testament,</i>	258
<i>Of the Spirit of adoption,</i>	273
<i>Of peace of conscience,</i>	277
<i>Of subjection to angels,</i>	279
<i>Of the fear of death,</i>	285
<i>Of the fathers under the curse,</i>	289
XIII. <i>Of the real defects of the Old Testament,</i>	295
XIV. <i>Of the abrogation of the Old Testament,</i>	319
XV. <i>Of the benefits of the New Testament,</i>	359
XVI. <i>Of baptism,</i>	382
XVII. <i>Of the Lord's supper,</i>	416

---

---

T H E  
O E C O N O M Y  
O F T H E  
D I V I N E C O V E N A N T S.

---

B O O K I V.

---

C H A P. I V.

*Of the Decalogue.*

**M**ATTERS had a quite different appearance under Moses. What was spoken here and there, and delivered only by word of mouth, was now enlarged with very many additions, digested into one system, and, at the command of God, consigned to unperishing records; which neither the rage of enemies, nor fire, nor sword, nor all-consuming time, shall be able to abolish. But neither the nature of our design, nor our intended brevity, will permit us to prosecute every thing at large, that comes under this head. In this chapter we shall treat concerning the *giving of the law*, and the *covenant of God with the Israelites founded on that law*.

II. It was the peculiar privilege of the people of Israel above other nations, that to them pertained the *covenants and the giving of the law*, Rom. ix. 4. Now, the laws given them, were of several kinds; of which there are only three mentioned by divines. *The moral.*

or the *decalogue*, the *ceremonial*, and the *political*, or *forensic*. The people of Israel may doubtless be considered three ways. 1. As *rational creatures*, depending upon God, as the supreme reason or cause, both in a moral and natural sense. And thus the *law of the decalogue* was given them; which, as to its substance, is one and the same with the *law of nature*, binding men as such. 2. As *the church of the Old Testament*, who expected the promised Messiah, and happier times, when he should make every thing perfect. And in that respect they received the *ceremonial law*, which really shewed that the Messiah was not yet come, and had not yet perfected all things by his satisfaction, but that he would come, and make all things new. 3. As *a peculiar people*, who had a polity or government, suited to their genius and disposition, in the land of Canaan: A republic constituted not so much according to those forms which philosophers have delineated, but which was, in a peculiar manner, a *theocracy*, as Josephus significantly calls it, God himself holding the reins of government therein, Judg. viii. 23. Under that view God prescribed them *political laws*.

III. We are first to speak of the *decalogue* and its promulgation. Moses has accurately described it Exod. xix. & xx. The *Lawgiver*, or if you will the Legislator, is God himself. *The one Lawgiver, who is able to save and to destroy*, Jam. iv. 12. who has a right of dominion over the consciences of men: who, as the supreme reason or cause, is the rule of all reasonable creatures; and as the supreme Lord, is the Ruler of all, and, by taking Israel to himself for a people, in an especial manner shewed himself to be their God. In the first words of the law, he asserts his own Divinity, proclaiming, *I am Jehovah thy God*.

IV. But we judge it criminal for any to doubt, that this is to be understood of the whole undivided Trinity, whose equal majesty in one Deity we are all bound to acknowledge and worship. Nevertheless, as the *Son of God* was then, in a certain peculiar respect, the King of the people of Israel, and of the church at that time; the giving of the law is also, in a singular manner, ascribed to him. For Stephen, in express words, declares, Acts vii. 38. compared with ver. 35. that it was an *angel*, who spoke with Moses and the fathers on mount Sinai, even that very angel, who appeared to Moses in the bush, and said, that he was the *God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob*. Now, no Christian will deny, that this was Christ. And Christ certainly is he *who ascended on high, &c.* Psal. lxxviii. 18. compared with Eph. iv. 8. But he himself *went forth before his people in the wilderness, when the earth shook, the heavens also dropped at the presence of God; even Sinai itself was moved at the presence of God, the God of Israel*, that is, at the giving of the law, Psal. lxxviii. 7, 8. Certainly the apostle, Heb. xii. 26. says, that he *who spoke from heaven, and whose voice then* (namely, at the giving of the law) *shook the earth*, was our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom we are now also to hearken; as Zanchius has learnedly observed, tom. iv. lib. 1. c. 12; who professedly and at large proves, that he who promulgated the law, was the Son of God, *de tribus Elohim*, lib. 2. c. 3.

V. What the celebrated Jac. Altingius has observed on Deut. v. 6. from a catechism of the ancient Jews, very much deserves our notice. The Jews say, "Three spirits are united in one; the lowest spirit, which is called the *holy spirit*: the middle spirit, which is the *intermediate*, and called *wisdom and intelligence*; and this is the spirit which proceeds from the midst of the most consummate beauty, *with fire and water*: the su-

preme spirit, which is absolutely in silence, in whom all the holy spirits, and all the bright persons consist," *Rahanat. fol. 132. col. 3.* They also say, that *I, and thou, and he,* are names of God, denoting three persons, and, at the feast of tabernacles, they all profess it in their prayers: *I and he, save, I pray.* Moreover, they say, that, when the law was promulgated, there were two persons. For, quite to the end of the second commandment, the discourse runs in the first person, *I the Lord thy God, &c. For I the Lord God, &c. of those that hate me, &c. of those that love me, &c.* In the third and following commandments, God is mentioned in the third person: *Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God, &c. The sabbath of the Lord thy God.* Which having observed, they proceed thus: "That the two first words or commandments, were spoke by the supreme spirit; but the other words, by his glory, called EL SCHADDAI, known to the fathers, by whom the prophets prophesied, who is called JAH, in whom is the name of God, the beloved of God who dwelt in the temple, and the mouth of God, and the face of God, and the rock, and that goodness which Moses saw, when he could not see God," *Bechai, fol. 88. col. 3, 4.* Elsewhere they call him the Schechinah, "by whom there is access to God, by whom prayers are poured out to God: who is that angel, who has the name of God in him, who also himself is called God and Jehovah." I inquire not now, how solid these reasonings of the Jews are. It is sufficient to have mentioned these remarkable records of an ancient catechism concerning the plurality of the divine persons; of which there are also indications in the decalogue itself.

VI. *Angels* were present, as *ministers*, at the giving of the law by the Lord Christ. Whence Stephen says,

Acts vii. 53. that the *Israelites received the law by the disposition of angels*, EIS DIATAGAS ANGELOH. Grotius observes, that EIS here signifies amidst, and that DIATAGAS, denotes troops, ranged in military order: that the meaning is, the law was given in a magnificent manner, amidst many troops of angels, and that there was a reference to Deut. xxxiii. 2. These things are not improper. But others would rather take DIATRAGE, for a *command, ordinance, and sanction*: as \* Rom. xiii. 2. And they render EIS, at: in which sense the Son is said to act *at the pleasure of the Father*. Ludovicus de Dieu has learnedly expressed that meaning; and as his words tend to explain several passages, we shall not scruple to insert them as follows. “Stephen had said, ver. 38. that the angel spoke with Moses in mount Sinai, even the same, who had appeared to him in the bush, ver. 35. who, though he was in himself God, yet is here œconomically considered as the angel of God, and the Captain of the other angels. He gave the law to Moses, from the midst of the angels, who surrounded him on all hands. Of which there was a figurative representation in the sanctuary, where God sitting between the cherubim, delivered his oracles.—Hence Psal. lxxviii. 17. when he had said, The chariots of God are twenty thousand, even thousands of angels, the Lord is among them; he adds, *Sinai is in the sanctuary*: to teach us, that as God, when formerly surrounded on Sinai with myriads of angels, and riding on them, as on chariots, gave forth the law, so the sanctuary resembles mount Sinai, where God rides on a chariot of cherubims. Seeing therefore the law came forth from an assembly of angels, whose president

\* Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth TE DIATRAGE, the *ordinance* of God.

was the supreme angel Jehovah, the apostle justly said, that it was *pronounced and ordained by angels* ; Stephen, that it *was received* by the people *by the disposition of angels*. DIATAGE ANGELON is here the same thing, as *the decree of the watchers, and the word of the holy Ones*, Dan. iv. 17. The decree and mandate of the angelic senate is understood, over whom the Son of God presided as supreme ; in regard of whom the same decree is called, ver. 24. *the decree of the Most High.*" Thus far de Dieu.

VII. But what kind of ministry did the angels perform to God at giving the law ? 1. It is certain, that with their heavenly choirs they surrounded the mount, and added to the majestic pomp of the Lawgiver, and were witnesses of all that was transacted. The consideration of this was capable of striking not only terror into the Israelites, but should also have inspired their minds with reverence, that the angels, in whose assembly the law was given, might not be witnesses of their perfidy. To this purpose is Deut. xxxiii. 2. *Jehovah came from Sinai, he came with ten thousands of saints ; from his right hand went a fiery law for them.* 2. It is not improbable, that the sound of those words, in which the law was conceived, was formed in the air by the means of angels. For God properly uses not a voice : this is a degree of imperfection : but yet it is called the voice of God, formed in the air in some extraordinary manner, to express the mind of God, for which purpose he uses the ministry of angels : namely, the law was given in thunder and lightning ; the thunder indeed, which formed the matter of the voice, which proclaimed the words of the law, must certainly have had an articulation superadded, which was framed by the means of angels. Philo, *in enarratione decalogi*, says, God spoke not by himself, but " filling a reason-



able mind with a distinct knowledge, which moulding and attenuating the air, and changing it to a flaming fire, he gave forth an articulate sound ; as breath does through a trumpet." I know not, whether he intended the same thing that we do. We mean nothing, but what the apostle said, when he calls the law, *the word spoken by angels*, Heb. ii. 2. Not that it was any created angel, who said, *I am Jehovah thy God*. These are the words of God ; but that the thunder, in which God spoke, was produced by the means of angels, and articulated into words intelligible to man. They who understand *by angels* only their presence and attendance, as 2 Tim. ii. 2, *among many witnesses*, too much lessen the force of the apostle's comparison, by which he prefers the gospel to the law on this account, that this last was promulgated by the ministry of angels, the former published by the ministry of the Son of God manifested in the flesh. See Cameron and Mestresat on the place. 3. It is probable, that the tables of testimony, on which the law was written by the finger of God, were delivered to Moses by the intervention of angels : and to this I refer Gal. iii. 19. *The law was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator*.

VIII. *Moses* was the other minister of God at the giving of the law. *Moses commanded us a law, even the inheritance of the congregation of Jacob*, Deut. xxxiii. 4. *The law was given by Moses*, John i. 17. And *Moses* is that *mediator*, in whose hands, as we have just learned from Paul, the law was ordained by angels. We can by no means agree with a certain learned author, who denies, that *Moses* was the mediator of the moral law, and maintains, that by the law we are to understand the ceremonial only ; and he thinks, the history of the promulgation of the ten words or commandments removes *Moses* to such a distance

from the office of a mediator, that it places him in the same rank and order with the people, Exod. xix. 25. *So Moses went down unto the people, &c.* and Exod. xx. 1. *And God spake, &c.* But, if I mistake not, the very learned person mistakes the case. Moses indeed went down from the mount, to put the people on their guard, not to break through the boundary, by coming up to Jehovah: and having executed that commission, he, together with Aaron his brother, went up again, at the command of God, some little way at least, Exod. xix. 24. and stood nearer when God promulgated the laws. Which done, he again spake with the Israelites. Very many considerations sway with us, thus to range these matters. Let us, first, consider ver. 9. *And Jehovah said unto Moses, Lo, I come unto thee in a thick cloud, that the people may hear when I speak with thee, and believe thee for ever.* From this it appears, that, from among the whole assembly, God called Moses by name, and recommended him to the people, as the messenger of God, when he promulgated this law. *And Moses himself declares this, Deut. v. 4, 5, 6. Jehovah talked with you face to face in the mount, out of the midst of the fire (I stood between Jehovah and you at that time, to shew you the word of Jehovah: for ye were afraid by reason of the fire, and went not up into the mount) saying, I am Jehovah thy God, &c.* And what is plainer than that of Stephen? *That Moses was in the wilderness with the angel, which spake to him in the mount Sinai, and with our fathers, who received LOGIA ZONTA, the lively oracles, to give unto us, Acts vii. 38.* Where Beza says, “It is not to be doubted, but Luke calls LOGIA, *oracles*, what the Hebrew calls *the words*, and has an eye to God himself, who is said to have pronounced, and delivered them to Moses, written with his own finger.” And what appearance of truth is

there, that by *LOGIA ZONTA*, *lively oracles*, we are only to understand the ceremonial laws, and not those precepts of the moral law, which whoever does, shall live in them? And this very learned author himself has elsewhere observed, that the words, *law, statutes, and judgments* are often synonymous: but whenever they are thus joined together, they are distinguished from each other by a peculiar signification; and that by *TORAH*, is understood the *moral law*; by *CHUKKIM*, the *ceremonial*, and by *MISHPATIM*, the *forensic law*. But now these three are so joined, as that each of them is ascribed to Moses, Mal. iv. 4. *Remember ye the law of Moses my servant, which I commanded unto him in Horeb for all Israel, with the statutes and judgments.* You see, that the law equally with the statutes and judgments are ascribed to Moses. In like manner, Lev. xxvi. 46. *These are the statutes, and judgments, and laws, which Jehovah made between him and the children of Israel, in mount Sinai, by the hand of Moses.* Moses therefore was even the mediator of the moral law, and his institutions are erroneously restricted to the ceremonies.

IX. The *time* of the publication of the law is supposed to be the fiftieth day from the departure of the people out of Egypt, and from the celebration of the pass-over. How to find out this number of days, see Rivet on Exod. xix. 1. And thus the Israelites were taught, that they were not then to be at their own disposal, when they were delivered from Egyptian bondage by a bountiful hand, so as for the future to live at their own discretion; but to enter into the service of God, and to apply themselves to it with the greater earnestness, the more they were set at liberty from the bondage of others: as Zacharias also prophesies, Luke i. 74, 75. *That being delivered out of the hands of our enemies, we*

might serve him without fear, in holiness and righteousness before him, all the days of our life. God likewise ordered three days to be set apart for preparation; because none has access to familiar converse with God, but he who has duly consecrated himself to him.

X. The place was mount Sinai, sometimes also called *Horeb*, Deut. v. 2. Exod. iii. 1. and sometimes *the mount of God*, 1 King xix. 8. *The law was given in the mount.* Beza on Exod. xxiv. says, "that from the height of the place we may gather, how sublime, or how different from human institutions, the law was, which Moses received." That mountain was situated in the deserts of Arabia, an uncultivated and barren spot, far from Canaan, opposed to mount Zion, which was greatly cultivated and very pleasant, Psal. xlviii. 3. and situated in the heart of the promised land, from whence came forth the law of faith, Is. ii. 2, 3. For the law cannot give life to sinful man, render him fruitful in the practice of true holiness, and introduce him into the heavenly country. That is the province of the gospel, *which is the power of God unto salvation*, Rom. i. 16. We are not to despise the observation of Lud. Capellus on Gal. iv. 25. that mount Sinai was so called from the word *SENEH*, which both in Hebrew and Arabic signifies a *thorn, bush, and briers*. For God spoke here to Moses *from the bush*. Mount Horeb also denotes *driness and desolation*: for God made choice of such places and names in giving the law, with a particular purpose, that the names might answer to the things; and the things typified, to their types. The law, considered in itself alone, is *more dry* and barren to sinful man than any rock or sandy desert, from which not even a drop of true piety can penetrate into the heart of man; it also forms a horrid waste and desolation by its threats and curses, with which, as with so

many *thorns*, it pricks and wounds the conscience of the sinner. And what the most excellent Lightfoot has remarked, deserves also to be added, *Miscellan. c. 59.* *The ceremonial law*, which only regarded the Jews, was given (at least, as to a great part of it) privately to Moses in the tabernacle, Lev. i. 1. and was demolished along with the tabernacle, when the vail was rent. *The moral law* concerns the whole world, and was published in the sight of all; namely, from the top of a mountain; and ought to last, as long as any mountain shall stand. *The judicial law*, which is more indifferent and may stand or fall, as shall seem most expedient for the common-weal, was not published so openly as the one, nor so privately as the other.

XI. Besides, though the people were in their manner externally sanctified, yet they had not free access to the mountain. God commanded that the mountain and the people should be kept within bounds, and threatened those with death, who should dare to go up to the mountain, or to touch any part of it, Exod. xix. 13. This command appeared so severe, that Paul declares, *they could not endure it*, Heb. xii. 20. And as it is truly delightful and *good to draw near to God*, Psal. lxxiii. 28. so it is unpleasant and melancholy to be debarred from access to him. That command was a proof that the Israelites were impure, and unworthy of the presence of God. The very animals, appointed for their service, were reputed impure. And therefore proclamation was made, *If even a beast touched the mountain, it should be stoned or thrust through with a dart.* To such a degree were all things brought into the bondage of corruption by and on account of sinful man, Rom. viii. 21.

XII. There were likewise awful signs, such as loud claps of thunder, quivering flashes of lightning shining

along the cloud of thick darkness which covered the top of the mountain, black vapours of smoke ascending up to heaven, the earthquake, the quaking of the very mountain, as if sensible of the approach of God, and many other circumstances recorded, Exod. xix. 16, 18. Deut. iv. 11. Heb. xii. 18. Now, to what purpose was all this apparatus? It was, 1. To proclaim the tremendous majesty of the Lawgiver, and to beget in the souls of men a reverence for his law; *God himself is come—that his fear may be before your faces, that ye sin not*, Exod. xx. 20. 2. To display the nature of the law, which, by demanding perfect obedience, and by the addition of dreadful threatenings, wonderfully strikes sinners to the heart, and, without any mixture of gospel-grace, leads to despair, and is to them *the ministry of death and condemnation*, 2 Cor. iii. 7, 9. But it is otherwise with the gospel, which, in this respect, is opposed to the law, Heb. xii. 18, 22. 3. To put the faith and constancy of the Israelites to the trial, whether this terror of God would bring them to humility and obedience, or whether through forwardness they would pour contempt upon him, or out of despair rebel against him, Exod. xx. 20. *That he might prove you.*

XIII. But, notwithstanding this display of majesty, the Israelites saw no form or similitude of God, Deut. iv. 12, 15. This was on purpose to prevent them from entertaining gross conceptions of the God of heaven, or *corrupting themselves, and making to themselves a graven image, the similitude of any figure, the likeness of male or female*, ver. 16. For to what could they liken him, of whom they saw no similitude? Is. xl. 25. *To whom then will ye liken me, or shall I be equal? saith the holy One.*

XIV. The law, which God, in this manner, published, consists of *ten words* or *commandments*, Exod. xxxiv. 28. Deut. iv. 13. Wherefore the Greeks also called it *DECALOGOS*, the *decalogue*. Moreover the contents of those ten words are various. 1. There is the prescription of certain duties; and in this the nature of a law, as such, properly consists. 2. The threatening of divine vengeance against the transgressors thereof, as in the second and third commandments: and this is the sanction of the covenant of works, from which all threatenings are derived, as we explained at large, book iii. chap. i. sect. 22. 3. The proposal of divine grace and favor; and as this is made to sinners, and that under a condition, not of perfect, but of sincere obedience; so far it flows from the covenant of grace.

XV. All the duties, required by the law, are comprehended under this one, viz. *love*, which is therefore called the *fulfilling of the law*, Rom. xiii. 10. and the *bond of perfectness*, Col. iii. 14. Moreover, seeing love either ascends to God, who, as the chief good, is to be loved above all, and with all our strength; or extends itself to our neighbour, whom we are bound to love as ourselves, since he belongs to God equally with ourselves; therefore Christ divides the whole law into those two capital precepts, Matth. xxii. 37, 38, 39.

XVI. The most high God was not only pleased to publish his laws to Israel with a loud voice, in the presence of the most august assembly of the whole people, but he likewise engraved them with his own finger on tables of stone, polished by himself for that purpose, Exod. xxiv. 12. & xxxi. 18. Deut. ix. 10. He chose to write his law, in order to prevent the oblivion of it, and to perpetuate the memory of the giving and receiv-

ing it in Israel. And hence these tables are called *the tables of testimony*, Exod. xxxi. 18. & xxxiv. 29. both because they contained the declaration or testimony of the divine will, and because the preservation of them by the Israelites, was a testimony of the law given to, and received by them at Sinai. This writing also signified the purpose of God, to write the law on the hearts of his elect, according to the promise of the covenant of grace, Jer. xxxi. 33.

XVII. Nor is it for nothing, that God himself would be the author of this writing, without making use of any man or angel. For this is the meaning of the Holy Spirit, when he says, that the tables were written *with the finger of God*, Exod. xxxi. 18. and that the writing was *the writing of God*, Exod. xxxii. 16. The reasons were, 1. To set forth the pre-eminence of this law, not only above all human, but also above the other divine laws, which he permitted to be written by Moses. 2. To intimate that it is the work of God alone, to write the law on the heart, which is what neither man himself, nor the ministers of God can do, but the Spirit of God alone. And thus believers are *the epistle of Christ, written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God*, 2 Cor. iii. 3.

XVIII. It likewise merits our attention, that this writing of God was not a drawing of certain letters on a plane, but *an engraven writing*, by incision and \* excavation, Exod. xxxii. 16. The term CHARUTH, which occurs no where else, seems by a commutation of letters of the same organ PETH and THAV, to be from CHARAT, which signifies a *graver*, graving instrument or tool: so that CHARATH signifies *to cut with a graver or stile*, as R. Salomon has observed. This sig-

\* The author says, *per incisorem et excavationem*, which last signifies making hollow



nified not only the perpetuity of the law, in respect of its obligation (for characters so engraved are with much greater difficulty effaced, than letters drawn upon a plane) but also its deep engraving in the inward parts of the elect, which Satan himself, with all his power and stratagems, cannot erase. If we consider ourselves as corrupted by nature, *our sin is written with a pen of iron, and with the point of a diamond, it is graven upon the table of our heart*, Jer. xvii. 1. But the grace of God will cancel that writing of sin, and, in the room of it, with the graver of his most holy Spirit, will engrave on the same table of our heart the characters of his law.

XIX. Nor must we omit, that God would not write his law on paper or parchment, nay nor even on wood, but would engrave it on *tables of stone*. That was done, as Abrabene well remarks, “that the foundations of the law might always remain uncorrupted, and this be a monument of the perpetuity of the law.” The other laws, which were to continue at least till the time of the restitution, and whose abrogation was at hand, *for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof*, Heb. vii. 18. were written by Moses on a less durable material. But this law, which is of eternal obligation, was engraved by God himself on stone. And why may we not, on this occasion, reflect on the stony hardness of our own hearts; on which, however, the characters of the divine law are imprinted by the Spirit of sanctification? Musculus in *Locis communibus de decalogo* says, “It was not enough to have heard the voice of God, unless there was also a literary monument, written by the finger of God, for the benefit of posterity, and for the conviction of the rocky conscience of a hardened people; and therefore tables of stone, and not paper were used.” See also J. Gehardi *Loc. commun. de lege*, sect. 5. § 24.

XX. These tables were two in number, enjoining the sanctification both of soul and body, the love both of God and our neighbour. They were also *written on both their sides ; on the one side and on the other were they written*, Exod. xxxii. 15. Which is either to be understood thus, that the tables shut or closed on each other like writing tables, and were written on their two sides that faced each other : or, what appears to be more simple, that each table was filled up with writing on each side thereof, in the manner of that which the Greeks call *OPSTHOGRAPHIA*, *opsthography*. And thus provision was actually made against a possibility of either taking from, or adding any thing to this law : which also God expressly charged upon his people, Deut. iv. 2. and xii. 13. Nor is it preposterous to think, that, by this means, the sanctification of the whole man was shadowed forth. As there was no part of these tables left unwritten by God, so there is no part of the believer, which the Spirit, by his sanctifying influences, does not pervade, 1 Thess. v. 23.

XXI. But we cannot well determine, what number of precepts God inscribed on each table. For, when we refer the former precepts, treating of love to God, to the first table ; and the six following, which treat of love to our neighbour, to the second table ; we do not so much consider the manner of God's writing, as the nature of the things ; as Christ also did, Matth. xxii. We have just heard, that the tables were written on both sides : and that they were of equal size, is very probable. But the four former precepts greatly exceeding the other six in length, it is scarce credible, they were contained in one table.

XXII. When Moses came down from the mount, with the tables, written by God, in his hand, and, on his approach to the camp of the Israelites, observed the

calf, which Aaron had cast or founded at their command, he was moved with a holy indignation, and threw the tables out of his hand and broke them, Exod. xxxii. 19. Deut. ix. 16, 17. We are by all means to conclude, that Moses, fired with a zeal for God, broke these tables consistently with his duty. For this conduct tended, 1. To strike the Israelites with shame and terror, since, by *this alarming* action, he much more effectually convinced them of their breach of covenant, than he could possibly have done by any vehemence or warmth of words; by depriving them of that inestimable treasure, whereby they had otherwise excelled all other nations of the world. 2. To demonstrate, that, by their breach of the most solemn covenant, they made themselves unworthy of the symbol of the divine presence. For the words of the covenant were written on the tables, in order to their being placed in the ark, and that God might dwell upon the ark in the tabernacle. Therefore, by this indignation of Moses, God so ordering it, it came to pass, that there was nothing which could be deposited in the ark; and so the tabernacle could neither be erected, nor the propitiatory or mercy-seat be in the midst of Israel.

XXIII. Nevertheless God, being entreated by Moses, renewed the broken covenant, commanded Moses to hew two other tables, like the former, on which God himself might write the same words, Exod. xxxiv. 1. Thus he was pleased to manifest his grace, that some token of his displeasure should remain, lest the facility of pardon should produce indolence and sloth. There was no art of man used in the former tables; both the tables and the writing were God's. But now some part of that so great dignity was impaired; since Moses was commanded to bring the stones, when polished by the hands of man, that God might write the ten words

upon them. We are, however, taught, that the most holy persons can, indeed, offer nothing to God (if even they can do that) but smooth tables without any characters. The whole writing is to be entirely ascribed to God the author of holiness.

XXIV. While these things were doing, God again prohibited the Israelites from coming near the mount; nor, indeed, did he suffer either sheep or oxen to feed in sight of it, *Exod. xxxiv. 3.* because, by their idolatry, they had made themselves abominable in the sight of God. We men, perhaps, might have thought, that the miracle would have been more illustrious, if the writing had been made to appear in an instant on the bare tables in the sight of all: but now the writing was performed in secret, before Moses alone, in order to leave some room for faith, to embrace even what it sees not. However, God sufficiently obviated the cavilling of carnal reason; it being evident, that Moses neither took any graving-tool with him, nor could find any in the mount. For God so orders the dispensation of his heavenly doctrine, as to prove the obedience and docility of believers, and yet to leave no room for doubting; as Calvin has ingeniously observed.

XXV. But there was another way by which God asserted the authority of his law; namely, by that extraordinary splendor, which glistened in the face of Moses, when he came down from the mount, with the tables of the testimony in his hands, so that the Israelites were not able to look upon him, but he was obliged to put a vail on his face, when he spoke with them, *Exod. xxxiv. 30, &c.* This also was a part of the ornament and glory of the law, as the apostle intimates, *2 Cor. iii. 7.* For, if Moses himself, who was a minister, appeared in such eminent glory, the ministration itself could not be less glorious. But since the Israelites

could not bear that splendor, that was to them an indication, how far they had departed from God by their ingratitude, who were so much afraid at the sight of the servant. This distinction therefore might really humble them ; since Moses was favored with a nearer view of the glory of God himself, and with having the effulgence of that glory in the skin of his face ; while they, being struck with terror, started back at the sight of a mortal man. Moreover, it being said, that Moses, when he spoke to Israel, put a *vail* on his face, this was a proof, that the great mysteries, and the true end of the law, which is *Christ for righteousness, to every one that believeth*, Rom. x. 4. were concealed from them, 2 Cor. iii. 13. And finally, the apostle observes, that the glory of the face of Moses was to be done away as useless, 2 Cor. iii. 7. It might be, that this shining splendor of his skin lasted not long ; at least it vanished at death : which was a visible proof, that the glory of the Mosaic ministration was afterwards to have a period, to make way for the more eminent glory of the ministry of Christ.

XXVI. These tables were deposited in the ark of the covenant under the mercy-seat, Exod. xxv. 16. Deut. x. 5. 1 Kings viii. 9. not only to be kept there as a most precious piece of furniture, and a symbol of the divine covenant ; but especially to signify, that Christ, who was typified by the ark, was to have the law of God in the midst of his bowels, or *within his heart*, Psal. xl. 8. and to fulfil it perfectly for his people : likewise, that Christ had not only the propitiatory or mercy-seat, whereby our sins are covered, but also the law, which was to be the rule of life and directory of gratitude to those who are reconciled with God.

XXVII. It has been formerly, and is to this day a matter of dispute in the church, whether the laws of

the two tables, as they were given to the people of Israel by Moses, are of perpetual obligation, and extend even to us Christians. Hieronymus Zanchius, *operum* tom. iv. lib. 1. c. 11. maintains at large and by several arguments, that we Christians have nothing to do with the moral precepts, as they were given to the Israelites by Moses; but only in so far as they agree with the law of nature, common to all nations, and were confirmed by Christ, whom we acknowledge to be our King. And Musculus writes to the same purpose, *Loc. commun. de abrogatione legis Mosaicæ*. But while David Pareus gives his opinion about the opposite opinions of Dominicus a Soto and Bellarmine, the former of whom denied, that we are subject to the law of the decalogue, as it was delivered by Moses; but the latter, on the contrary, maintained, that the law, as given by Moses, was also binding on us; though he premises (*ad libr. Bellarmini de justificatione* iv. c. 6.) that it is of small importance to dispute about the ministry of Moses, by which the law was formerly promulgated, provided the law, and the obedience thereof, be in vigour or force in the church: yet he says, that Bellarmine's opinion is to be retained, as the safer and more preferable. Rivet, *in explicit. decalog.* thinks, that the difference is not in the thing, but in the manner of expression: for all agree, that all the moral duties contained in the law, are of perpetual observance among Christians, in so far as they are natural precepts imprinted on the minds of all, by God, the author of nature; and as, by way of instruction, they are contained in the written laws, they are a great, nay a necessary help to our weakness and ignorance. Yet he rather seems to incline to the sentiment of Zanchius and Musculus. We shall comprehend our own opinion in the following positions.

XXVIII. 1. Seeing the decalogue contains the sum of the law of nature, and, as to its substance, is one and the same therewith, so far it is of perpetual and universal obligation. And thus far all divines are agreed, the Socinians themselves not excepted. See Volkel. lib. iv. c. 5.

XXIX. 2. We are not only to perform the duties which it requires, because they are agreeable to reason; and to abstain from the contrary vices, because reason declares them to be base and vile; but also under this formal notion, because God has enjoined those duties, and prohibited those vices; that his authority, as Lawgiver, may be acknowledged, and our goodness have the nature of an obedience; which, as such, is founded on the alone authority of him who commands. And who can doubt, that it is the duty of a rational creature, to acknowledge God as his supreme Lord and Governor, to whose will, without any further examination, he ought to submit, saying, *Lord, what wouldst thou have me to do?*

XXX. 3. The Gentiles, who had heard nothing of the giving of the law in the wilderness, were not bound to the observance of that law, as it was published to the Israelites, but only as inscribed on their own consciences. Hence the apostle says, *that as many as have sinned without law, namely, the written law, shall also perish without law*, Rom. ii. 12. that is, shall not be condemned in consequence of the law, as delivered to Israel in writing, but of the violation of the natural law. However, if any of the Gentiles came to have any knowledge of the giving of this law, they were to believe, that the precepts of it were spoken to them no less than they were to Israel; nor could they neglect them without throwing contempt on God, and incurring the forfeiture of salvation.

**XXXI.** 4. Though the precepts of common honesty, in some special manner, and with some particular circumstances, were originally appointed for a peculiar people, yet they are still binding, by a divine authority on all those who come to know, that God formerly enjoined them to their neighbours. For instance, what Paul wrote to the Romans, is no less binding on us, than it was on them ; because the obligation is founded on the manifestation or discovery of the divine will and pleasure. When therefore God has said to any particular person, that this or that duty is incumbent upon him, as a rational creature, who ought to bear a resemblance to the divine image ; all other men, who hear this, are as much bound to that duty, as he to whom it was first proposed ; not only because they apprehend the matter of that precept to be consonant to reason ; but also because that command was given by God, no matter to whom it was given at first.

**XXXII.** 5. Common precepts, which bind all to whom they are made known, on account of the authority of him who enjoins them, may be pressed upon some by certain peculiar reasons. For instance, the precept concerning constancy in the faith of the gospel, might be pressed on Jews and Gentiles from different motives ; and yet the precept remain common to both. Thus, when God published the decalogue to the Israelites, he annexed some reasons, which, according to the letter, were peculiar to them alone : because what was a common duty to all, he was pleased, in an especial manner, to recommend to them. Yet in his wisdom he published those reasons, in such a manner, as to concern others also, by way of analogy, and in their mystical signification.

**XXXIII.** 6. As the people of Israel constituted the church at that time, and as Jesus Christ the Son of



God, and King of the church, prescribed the decalogue to them, it follows, that the same law retains its force in the church, till it be abrogated again by the King of the church. We are not to think, that the church of the Old Testament, which consisted of Israelites, and that of the New, though, for the greatest part, made up of Gentiles, were a quite different people. They ought to be looked upon as one kingdom of Christ, who made *both one*, Eph. ii. 14. and who grafted us, when wild olives, into that fat olive, Rom. xi. 17. And consequently, the laws, which were once given to the church by Christ the King, are always binding on the whole church, unless Christ shall declare, that he has abrogated them by some other institution. But it is absurd to imagine, that Christ abrogated the moral law, in so far as he gave it, by the mediation of Moses, to the church of Israel, and directly confirmed the same law to the Christian church. For seeing it is the same law of the same King, in one and the same kingdom, though that kingdom is enriched with new accessions and new privileges; why should we suppose it abrogated, and ratified again almost in the same breath? Nay, many considerations persuade us to believe, that the law of the decalogue was given to the church, in order to be a perpetual rule, from the manner in which it was given.

XXXIV. For as these commandments were published before the assembly of the whole church, in the hearing of all, while the other precepts were given to Moses alone in his sacred retirement; as they were engraved on tables of stone by the finger of God, to the end that, as Calvin remarks, this doctrine might remain in perpetual force; and seeing they, and they alone, were put in the ark of the covenant, under the wings and guardianship of God himself; God plainly

shewed, by so many prerogatives, that the reason of those precepts was far different from that of the others, which were only imposed on the church for a time.

XXXV. From these things the rashness of a late catechist appears, who maintains, that the ten commandments were written on tables of stone, to shew, that they were to continue in force while those tables lasted; but that when the tables were lost, the law, that was written upon them, was to be abrogated; and that they were laid up in the ark of the covenant, to signify, that they were of the same nature with that ark, and that covenant, that is, of a fading or perishing nature. But if this was true, it will follow, that the Israelites, from the destruction of the first temple, when the ark with the tables of the law was lost, were set free from the binding power of the decalogue; and that there was no difference between the decalogue and the other ceremonies, the ark being, as it were, the centre of the ceremonies; nay that the decalogue was in this respect inferior to the other ceremonies, as the latter continued to the coming of Christ, but the decalogue was abrogated by the Babylonish captivity. All which notions are so false, and so distant from all sound divinity, that they have almost an air of impiety.

XXXVI. We may add, that Christ has declared, *he was not come to destroy, but to fulfil the law*, Matth. v. 17. To *destroy*, signifies there, to abrogate, and to free men from the obligation of it, as appears from ver. 19. But that Christ speaks of the law of the decalogue, we gather from what follows, where he explains the precepts of that law, and recommends them to his disciples. And when Paul, Rom. xiii. 9. and James, chap. ii. 8, 11. inculcate the precepts of the law on Christians, in the same terms in which they were delivered by Moses to Israel, they don't insist upon this

consideration, that they were agreeable to the dictates of right reason, or were ratified again by Christ, but that they were thus formerly published and written by God. Nay, Eph. vi. 2. the apostle not only insists on the promise that was annexed to the fifth commandment, but also on the order of the precepts, recommending honor or regard to parents from this argument, that this is *the first commandment with promise*. But if the decalogue, as it was formerly delivered to the church of Israel, did not concern Christians, that argument of the apostle (which be it far from us to say) would have no force with Christians.

XXXVII. Finally, if the decalogue, as it was formerly given to the church, was not now binding on the same; it must necessarily have been revoked by God, and abrogated by Christ: both which is absurd. For who will be so bold, as to suppose God to speak in this manner: "It is indeed my will, that you observe those natural precepts, which I formerly commanded the Israelites in the law, that was published with such solemnity; but, for the future, I will not have you bound to these, because of my command, but because nature requires it." And why should Christ abrogate the precepts given to the church of Israel, in order directly to give the very same precepts again to the Christian church? Not to say, that there is not the least sign of any such abrogation in the sacred writings.

XXXVIII. However, we do not refuse, that the law of the covenant of works was abolished by Christ in its *federal consideration*. 1. *As to its rigour*, which required of man himself an obedience in every part and degree perfect, as the condition of justification, and that without any promise of the Spirit and of sanctifying grace. 2. *As to the curse*, which it threatens against all who deviate from it in the least. And in this sense

Paul says, *that we are not under the law, but under grace*, Rom. vi. 14. though as to its *normal* relation, or as it is the rule of life and manners, it was not even for a moment abrogated or abolished by Christ. *Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid; yea we establish the law*, Rom. iii. 31. In that respect Christians are no less under the decalogue, than the Jews were formerly: and that not only, because the precepts of it are just and holy, but also because they are commandments, which were formerly promulgated with so much majesty and pomp: or, which is almost the very same thing, not only on account of the doctrine they contain, but also of the authority of the supreme Governor.

XXXIX. Let us now consider the use of this law in all ages of the world: and this may be considered either *absolutely and in itself*, or *relatively*, with respect to a *certain condition or state* of man. In itself, the law is, 1. A representation of true virtue, a delineation of internal and external goodness, and a copy of that holiness which is worthy of God. 2. A demonstration of the way in which a rational creature can come to have glorious communion with God: *which if a man do, he shall live in them*, Lev. xviii. 5. *The commandment which was ordained to life*, Rom. vii. 10. None attains to life but by this law, which must be fulfilled either by man himself, or a surety for him. 3. A command of the supreme Ruler, binding every one to obedience, under the threatening of eternal death, Lev. xviii. 2, 3, 4. Deut. xxvii. 26.

XL. The state of man, to which the law has its peculiar relations, is threefold; viz. his *first*, his *fallen*, and his *restored* state. In his *first* state, it was to man, 1. The rule of his nature, and of all his action; to which he willingly, and with the greatest complacency

of soul, conformed himself. 2. The most excellent beautiful ornament of man, as stamped and impressed by the creating hand of God on his mind. 3. The condition of the covenant of works, which man himself was to perform in order to obtain consummate bliss and happiness.

XLI. In *his fallen state*, it serves, 1. To discover and convince man of his sin, Rom. iii. 20. *By the law is the knowledge of sin.* And the precepts of the law do this two ways. *First*, as in a mirror, they discover to man the vileness both of his life and actions, Jam. i. 23. *Then* by its irritating power, whereby, on account of human depravity, they stir up sin, which otherwise lay dormant; so that, like one galled by a bridle, the more strictly sin is prohibited and restrained, the more vehemently it resists and makes opposition, every thing that would keep it under being offensive to it. The apostle excellently illustrates this, Rom. vii. 7, 13. 2. To denounce the curse against man; which it does by its *comminations*: *Now we know, that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law; that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God*, Rom. iii. 19. 3. To be a restraint upon men, and bring them to some external honest deportment, in order to preserve civil government, and prevent the destruction of mankind by adulteries, rapines, oppressions, and the like hainous crimes. The apostle seems particularly to intimate this office of the law, 1 Tim. i. 9. when he says, *that the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners, &c.* For he shews, that it is a curb to those prevailing lusts of the flesh, which otherwise would be immoderately extravagant. 4. To bring sinners to Christ: *For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that be-*

lieth, Rom. x. 4. *The law was our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ*, Gal. iii. 24. This is not only true of the ceremonial, but also of the law of the decalogue, which brings to Christ these two ways: first, as it really keeps an elect person; while in an unconverted state, in some measure, in the way of his duty, that he may not obstinately neglect all concern for righteousness and his soul. For where the Spirit of God does not yet bear rule, sinful lusts break forth there, in such a manner, that the soul which is obnoxious to them, is in danger of sinking into forgetfulness and contempt of God: and they would actually do this, did not the Lord put a bar thereto by this remedy of his law. But principally the law brings to Christ, as it strips man of all confidence in his own goodness and righteousness, and, by an acknowledgment of his misery, deeply humbles him, that so he may be thus prepared to endeavour after what before he thought he did not stand in need of.

**NLII.** In the state of *restoration* it teacheth believers, 1. How perfect the obedience was, which Christ performed for them, and how much they are under obligations to him, since he, who was Lord of the law, subjected himself to it for them, not only to obey its precepts, but to endure the curse, that he might redeem them from the law, Gal. iv. 4, 5. 2. At what distance they still are from that perfection of holiness, which the law requires; in order the better to bring them to humility, and to a denial of all self-righteousness, Phil. iii. 8, 9. and a longing after a blessed perfection, Rom. vii. 24. 3. What is the rule of their gratitude, and the mark at which they ought to aim, Phil. iii. 12. 1 Tim. i. 5. 4. and lastly, It bears witness to, approves and commends, the beginnings of sanctification, and comforts those as being true Israelites, who *delight in the law of God after the inward man*. The law does this,

not from its own authority, which can admit of nothing but what is perfectly holy, and condemns every thing that is stained but with the least spot ; but from the authority of the grace of Christ, to whom it is now subservient, and at whose command it commends even the imperfect works of believers, declares them to be sincere, and so far approves of them as conformable to itself ; and in that sense the righteousness of the law is fulfilled in those *who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit*, Rom. viii. 4.

XLIII. Upon these ten words or commandments God entered into a *covenant* with Israel ; *The Lord our God made a covenant with us in Horeb*, Deut. v. 2. So that the ten words are called the *words of the covenant*, Exod. xxxiv. 28. and the *covenant* itself, Deut. iv. 13. nay the tables, on which they were written, are called the *tables of the covenant*, Deut. ix. 9. The plan of this covenant is that contract which God entered into with Israel, a little before the law was given, Exod. xix. 5, 6, 8. Its solemn ratification was made by those signs which are recorded, Exod. xxiv. 3. seq.

XLIV. The *stipulation* on the part of God was published in these words, Exod. xix. 5, 6. *Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people : for all the earth is mine. And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation.* We are not to think, that God, by these words, required Israel to perform perfect obedience in all parts and degrees, as the condition of the covenant. For, in that case, the whole of this proposal would be nothing, but an intimation of an inevitable curse ; seeing it is absolutely impossible for sinful man to give such a perfect observance, even though he is regenerated and sanctified.

But a conditional proposal upon an impossible condition, is equivalent to an absolute denial. It is indeed true, that the law, considered as a rule, cannot but enjoin a holiness absolutely perfect in every respect; which we have elsewhere professedly proved: but the case is different, when something is required as the condition of a covenant. The man indeed is still bound to perfect holiness, so far that the least deviation is a sin: but yet supposing a covenant of grace, among the benefits of which is remission of sins, God stipulates with his people in this manner; *If, with sincerity of heart, you keep my precepts, and recover from your falls by renewed repentance, I will upon that give you an evidence, that I am your God.* Here therefore he requires a sincere, though not, in every respect, a perfect, observance of his commands.

XLV. Upon that condition, he promises to them not only temporal blessings, such as the possession of the land of Canaan, and a peaceable life there, abounding with all plenty of every thing desirable, Exod. xx. 12. but also spiritual and eternal, when he says, that he will be their God and they his people, in that sense which he promised the land to the pious fathers: *That he may establish thee to-day for a people unto himself, and that he may be unto thee a God, as he hath said unto thee, and as he hath sworn unto thy fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob,* Deut. xxix. 13. Compare Jer. vii. 22, 23. But that these words comprise life eternal, and the resurrection of the body, we learn from our Lord, Matth. xxiii. 32.

● XLVI. To this stipulation of God the Israelites agreed, Exod. xix. 8. *And all the people answered together, and said, All that the Lord hath spoken, we will do.* Which they repeated upon the publication of the law, Exod. xxiv. 3. *And all the people answered with*



one voice, and said, *All the words that the Lord hath said will we do.* The pious among the Israelites, conscious of their own inability and manifold infirmities, humbly promised, depending by faith on the gracious influences of divine strength, an obedience not indeed perfect (for that would be to incur the guilt of a lie) but yet sincere, and by no means feigned. The others, as they did not duly attend either to the spiritual perfection of the law, or to their own natural inability, rashly and confusedly bound themselves to the observance of all the precepts. Yet so far these words were good and acceptable to God, as by them they testified some degree of readiness of soul, Deut. v. 33, 34, 35.

XLVII. Now concerning this covenant, made upon the ten commandments, it is queried, whether it was a covenant of works, or a covenant of grace? We judge proper to premise some things, previous to the determination of this question. And, *first*, we observe, that in the ministry of Moses, there was a repetition of the doctrine concerning the law of the covenant of works. For both the very same precepts are inculcated, on which the covenant of works was founded, and which constituted the condition of that covenant; and that sentence is repeated, *which if a man do, he shall live in them*, Lev. xviii. 5. Ezek. xx. 11, 13. by which formula, the righteousness, which is of the law, is described, Rom. x. 5. And the terror of the covenant of works is increased by repeated comminations; and that voice heard, *Cursed be he that confirmeth not all the words of this law to do them*, Deut. xxvii. 26. Now the apostle declares, that this is the curse of the law, as the law is opposed to faith, or the covenant of grace, Gal. iii. 10, 12. Nay, as the requirement of obedience was rigid under the ministry of Moses, the promises of spiritual and saving grace were more rare and obscure, the mea-

sure of the Spirit granted to the Israelites scanty and short, Deut. xxix. 4. and on the contrary, the denunciation of the curse frequent and express; hence the ministry of Moses is called *the ministration of death and condemnation*, 2 Cor. iii. 7, 9. doubtless because it mentioned the condemnation of the sinner, and obliged the Israelites to subscribe to it.

XLVIII. *Secondly*, We more especially remark, that when the law was given from mount Sinai or Horeb, there was a repetition of the covenant of works. For those tremendous signs of thunders and lightnings, of an earthquake, a thick smoke and black darkness, were adapted to strike Israel with great terror. And the setting bounds and limits round about the mount, whereby the Israelites were kept at a distance from the presence of God, upbraided them with that separation, which sin had made between God and them. In a word, “Whatever we read, Exod. xix.” (says Calvin on Heb. xii. 19.) “is intended to inform the people, that God then ascended his tribunal, and manifested himself as an impartial Judge. If an innocent animal happened to approach, he commanded it to be thrust through with a dart; how much sorer punishment were sinners liable to, who were conscious of their sins, nay, and knew themselves indited by the law, as guilty of eternal death?” See the same author on Exod. xix. 1, 16. And the apostle in this matter, Heb. xii. 18.—22. sets mount Sinai in opposition to mount Zion, the terrors of the law to the sweetness of the gospel.

XLIX. *Thirdly*, We are not, however, to imagine, that the doctrine of the covenant of works was repeated, in order to set up again such a covenant with the Israelites, in which they were to seek for righteousness and salvation. For we have already proved, book i. chap. ix. sect. 20. that this could not possibly be renewed in

that manner with a sinner, on account of the justice and truth of God, and the nature of the covenant of works, which admits of no pardon of sin. See also Hornbeck. *Theol. Pract.* tom. 2. p. 10. Besides, if the Israelites were taught to seek salvation by the works of the law, then the law had been contrary to the promise made to the fathers many ages before. But now says the apostle, Gal. iii. 17. *The covenant that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect.* The Israelites were, therefore, thus put in mind of the covenant of works, in order to convince them of their sin and misery, to drive them out of themselves, to shew them the necessity of a satisfaction, and to compel them to Christ. And so their being thus brought to a remembrance of the covenant of works, tended to promote the covenant of grace.

L. *Fourthly*, There likewise accompanied this giving of the law the repetition of some things belonging to the covenant of grace. For that God should propose a covenant of friendship to sinful man, call himself his God (at least in the sense it was said to the elect in Israel) take to himself any people, separated from others, for his peculiar treasure, assign to them the land of Canaan as a pledge of heaven, promise his grace to those that love him and keep his commandments, and circumscribe the vengeance denounced against despisers within certain bounds, and the like; these things manifestly discover a covenant of grace: and without supposing the suretiship of the Messiah, it could not consistently with the divine justice and truth, be proposed to man a sinner. Judiciously says Calvin on Exod. xix. 17. "By these words we are taught, that these prodigies or signs were not given, to drive the people from

the presence of God ; nor were they struck with any terror, to exasperate their minds with a hatred of instruction ; but that the covenant of God was no less lovely, than awful. For they are commanded to go and meet God, to present themselves with a ready affection of soul to obey him. Which could not be, unless they had heard something in the law besides precepts and threatenings." See also Tilenus, *Syntagm.* p. 1. disp. 33. § 18, 19, 20, 28, 29.

LI. Having premised these observations I answer to the question : The covenant made with Israel at mount Sinai was not formally the covenant of works. 1. Because that cannot be renewed with the sinner, in such a sense as to say, If, for the future, thou shalt perfectly perform every instance of obedience, thou shalt be justified by that, according to the covenant of works. For by this the pardon of former sins would be presupposed, which the covenant of works excludes. 2. Because God did not require perfect obedience, from Israel, as a condition of this covenant, as a cause of claiming the reward ; but sincere obedience, as an evidence of reverence and gratitude. 3. Because it did not conclude Israel under the curse, in the sense peculiar to the covenant of works, where all hope of pardon was cut off, if they sinned but in the least instance.

LII. However the carnal Israelites, not adverting to God's purpose or intention, as they ought, mistook the true meaning of that covenant, embraced it as a covenant of works, and by it sought for righteousness. Paul declares this, Rom. ix. 31, 32. *But Israel which followed after the law of righteousness, hath not attained to the law of righteousness ; wherefore ? Because they sought it not by faith, but as it were by the works of the law : for they stumbled at that stumbling-stone.* To the same purpose it is, that, Gal. iv. 24, 25. he compares

to the Ishmaelites the Israelites, while they tarried in the deserts of Arabia, which was the country of the former, who are born to bondage of their mother Hagar, or the covenant of mount Sinai, and being destitute of true righteousness, shall, with Ishmael, be at length turned out of the house of their heavenly Father. For, in that place, Paul does not consider the covenant of mount Sinai as in itself, and in the intention of God, offered to the elect, but as abused by carnal and hypocritical men. Let Calvin again speak : “ The apostle declares, that, by the children of Sinai, he meant hypocrites, persons who are at length cast out of the church of God, and disinherited. What therefore is that generation unto bondage, which he there speaks of ? It is doubtless those who basely abuse the law, and conceive nothing concerning it but what is servile. The pious fathers, who lived under the Old Testament, did not so. For the servile generation of the law did not hinder them from having the spiritual Jerusalem for their mother. But they who stick to the bare law, and acknowledge not its pedagogy, by which they are brought to Christ, but rather make it an obstacle to their coming to him, these are Ishmaelites” (for thus, and I think rightly, Marlorat reads) “ born unto bondage.” The design of the apostle therefore, in that place, is not to teach us, that the covenant of mount Sinai was nothing but a covenant of works, altogether opposite to the gospel-covenant ; but only that the gross Israelites misunderstood the mind of God, and basely abused his covenant ; as all such do, who seek for righteousness by the law. See again Calvin on Rom. x. 4.

LIII. Nor was it formally a covenant of grace : because that requires not only obedience, but also promises, and bestows strength to obey. For thus the covenant of grace is made known, Jer. xxxii. 39. *And I*

will give them one heart, and one way, that they may fear me for ever. But such a promise appears not in the covenant made at mount Sinai. Nay, God, on this very account, distinguishes the new covenant of grace from the Sinaitic, Jer. xxxi. 31, 32, 33. And Moses loudly proclaims, Deut. xxix. 4. *Yet the Lord hath not given you a heart to perceive, and eyes to see, and ears to hear, unto this day.* Certainly, the chosen from among Israel had obtained this : yet not in virtue of this covenant, which stipulated obedience, but gave not power for it ; but in virtue of the covenant of grace, which also belonged to them.

LIV. What was it then ? It was a *national covenant* between God and Israel, whereby Israel promised to God a sincere obedience to all his precepts, especially to the ten words ; God, on the other hand, promised to Israel, that such an observance would be acceptable to him, nor want its reward, both in this life, and in that which is to come, both as to soul and body. This reciprocal promise supposed a covenant of grace. For, without the assistance of the covenant of grace, man cannot sincerely promise that observance ; and yet that an imperfect observance should be acceptable to God, is wholly owing to the covenant of grace. It also supposed the doctrine of the covenant of works, the terror of which being increased by those tremendous signs that attended it, they ought to have been excited to embrace that covenant of God. This agreement therefore is a consequent both of the covenant of grace and of works ; but was formally neither the one nor the other. A like agreement and renewal of the covenant between God and the pious is frequent ; both national and individual. Of the former see Josh. xxiv. 22. 2 Chron. xv. 12. 2 Kings xxiii. 3. Neh. x. 29. Of the latter, Psal. cxix. 106. It is certain, that in the pro-

stages we have named, mention is made of some covenant between God and his people. If any should ask me, of what kind, whether of works or of grace? I shall answer, it is formally neither: but a covenant of sincere piety, which supposes both.

LV. Hence the question, which is very much agitated at this day, may be decided; namely, *Whether the ten words are nothing but the form of the covenant of grace?* This, I apprehend, is by no means an accurate way of speaking. For since a covenant strictly so called consists in a mutual agreement, what is properly the form of the covenant should contain the said mutual agreement. But the ten words contain only a prescription of duty, fenced on the one hand by threatenings, taken from the covenant of works; on the other, by promises, which belong to the covenant of grace. Hence the scripture, when it speaks properly, says that a covenant was made *upon* these ten words, or, *after the tenor of those words*, Exod. xxxiv. 27. distinguishing the covenant itself, which consists in a mutual agreement, from the ten words, which contain the conditions of it. The form of the covenant is exhibited by those words, which we have already quoted from Exod. xix. 5, 6, 8. I deny not, that the ten commandments are frequently in scripture called *the covenant of God*. But, at the same time, no person can be ignorant, that the term *covenant* has various significations in the Hebrew, and often signifies nothing but a *precept*, as Jer. xxxiv. 13, 14. Thus Moses explains himself on this head, Deut. iv. 13. *And he declared unto you his covenant, which he commanded you to perform, even ten commandments.* They are therefore called a covenant by a synecdoche, because they contain those precepts, which God, when he set his covenant before

them, required the Israelites to observe, and to which the said Israelites bound themselves by covenant.

LVI. The ten words or commandments, therefore, are not *the form of a covenant properly so called*, but *the rule of duty* : much less are they *the form of the covenant of grace* ; because that covenant, in its strict signification, consists of mere promises, and, as it relates to elect persons, has the nature of a testament, or last will, rather than of a covenant strictly speaking, and depends on no condition ; as we have at large explained and proved, *book iii. chap. i. sect. 8, &c.* And Jeremiah has shewn us, that the form of the covenant of grace consists in absolute promises, chap. xxxi. 33, 34. and xxxii. 33, 39, 40. In like manner, Isaiah, chap. liv. 10.

LVII. Least of all can it be said, that the ten words are *nothing* but the form of the covenant of grace, since we may look upon them as having a relation to any covenant whatever. They may be considered in a two-fold manner. 1. *Precisely, as a law.* 2. *As an instrument of the covenant.* As a *law*, they are the rule of our nature and actions, which *he* has prescribed, who has a right to command. This they were from the beginning, this they still are, and this they will continue to be, under whatever covenant, or in whatever state man shall be. As an *instrument of the covenant*, they point out the way to eternal salvation ; or contain the condition of enjoying that salvation ; and that both under the covenant of grace and of works, but with this difference, that, under the covenant of works, this condition is required to be performed by man himself ; under the covenant of grace it is proposed as already performed, or to be performed by a Mediator. Things, which those very persons, with whom we are now disputing, will not venture to deny



## C H A P. V.

*Of the Doctrine of the Prophets.*

**T**HE plan we formerly laid down, should now require to speak a little of those things from Moses himself and the succeeding prophets, which they have published concerning the person, natures, states, offices, and blessings of the Messiah. And it would be easy to shew, that nothing remarkable did befall our Jesus, nothing great was either said or done by him, which the prophets did not foretel was to come to pass. The prophets, I say, who *prophesied of the grace that should come unto us; searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow,* 1 Pet. i. 10, 11. and who all, with one consent, *give witness to Jesus, that through his name, whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins,* Acts x. 43. The apostle Paul, who protested, *he had not shunned to declare all the counsel of God,* Acts xx. 27. at the same time protests, *he says none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come,* Acts xxvi. 22. And certainly, the body itself should exactly agree with the picture, that was long before presented to the view of the ancient church, since it became the wisdom and goodness of God, to give such an exact description of the Messiah, with all his marks or characters, that he might be known by any thoughtful and attentive mind, and distinguished from all manner of impostors, who should impiously pretend to, or counterfeit his name. But this subject has been, both formerly and lately, consid-

dered by the learned, and treated with such accuracy, that I have nothing to add. If any would have a compendious view of these things, he may consult the preface to the New Testament, drawn up, with great judgment, by our divines.

---

## CHAPTER VI.

### *Of the Types.*

**S**UCH is the inexhaustible copiousness of the holy scriptures, that not only the words are significative of things, but even the things, which are first signified by the words, do likewise represent other things, which they were appointed to prefigure long before they happened. Christ principally, and Paul have informed us of this, when they apply most of the things which happened under the old dispensation, to the Messiah, and to the œconomy of a better testament. And indeed, if the old institutions of the Deity had not their *mystical significations*, they might deservedly be accounted childish, ludicrous, and unworthy of God. These are things, which not only Christians require to be granted to them, but also were acknowledged by the ancient Jews, who, besides a *literal or plain meaning*, sought also a *mystical sense* in scripture. And it was a constant and received opinion among them, that all things were mystical in the law of Moses, and therefore may be mystically explained.

II. Their mystical signification points to Christ, in his *person, states, offices, and works*, and in his *spiritual body*, the church: for *Christ is the end of the law*, Rom. x. 4. *the body*, or substance of the ceremonial shadows,

Col. ii. 17. and the centre of the prophecies, Acts x. 43. The doctrine of Christ is *the key of knowledge*, Luke xi. 42. without which nothing can be savingly understood in Moses and the prophets. As is apparent in the Pharisees of old, and the Socinians in our day; who, being tainted with false notions concerning the Messiah, pollute, for the most part, all the testimonies concerning the common salvation by their impure interpretations. It was very well said by the ingenious Bisterfeld, that "the Lord Jesus Christ was the spirit and soul of the whole, both of the Old and New Testament." *De scripture eminentia*, § 40.

III. It is an unquestionable truth, that the Old-Testament believers, especially those who were favored with a fuller measure of the Spirit, applied themselves, with peculiar diligence, to find out the mystical meaning of the *types*: in which study they were very much assisted by the prophets and divinely-inspired priests. Thus David declared, that *he had seen God in the sanctuary*, Psal. lxxiii. 2. that is, that he had, by the figures of the Levitical service, searched, by holy meditation, into the very truth of the things. This made believers so cheerful in the acts of external worship; not that they were very much taken with those minute corporal performances, but that *they beheld in them the beauty of Jehovah, and inquired in his temple*, Psal. xxvii. 4. They were not put off with mere shadows, but were *satisfied with the goodness of God's house, even of his holy temple*; and though it was but darkly, yet they heard him *speaking terrible things in righteousness*, Psal. lxxv. 4, 5.

IV. Though Christ and the apostles, in order to illustrate and prove the truth of the gospel, argued from the types by divine inspiration and the infallible guidance of the Holy Spirit; yet they did not lay the stress of those arguments on their own bare authority, be-

cause they were inspired (for that authority was at times called in question, and upon supposing it, all reasoning would almost seem superfluous) but on the evident demonstration of the truth to the conscience, which plainly discovered to an attentive person, that it was worthy of God, to represent such a truth by such types.

V. The strength of those arguments rests on this supposition, that God was pleased to give the church at that time, in the memorable persons of the Old Testament, to whom some remarkable things happened in an extraordinary way, and in the whole of his instituted worship, a beautiful picture, and becoming the accuracy of so great an artist, in which Christ with his mystical body might be delineated. The apostle, when he argued with the Jews in his epistles to the Galatians and Hebrews, lays this down as a fundamental truth; and having laid that foundation, directly proceeds, with a kind of divine skill, to the application of the types. For when there is any thing in the antitype resembling the type, it is justly affirmed, that God, who knows all things from the beginning, ordered the type in such a manner, that it might signify beforehand that truth, which was in the antitype. Unless we would rather maintain, that the likeness of an ingenious picture to the original, was rather the effect of chance, than of the intention of the artist; which is contrary to all reason.

VI. It is not only lawful, but the incumbent duty of teachers, even though not inspired, to tread in this very path, and to explain, in the same method, the types of the Old Testament. For we must not think, either that an infallible authority is necessary to explain the types, or that all the types of the Old Testament are explained in the New. Not the former; for why should an infallible authority be required in interpreting the

types, rather than in interpreting the prophecies and other dark expressions in scripture? since it is manifest, that it was the will of God to instruct the church by types; and the explication of the types is now oftentimes far more easy, on account of the distinct knowledge of the antitype, than of many prophecies, which it is far more difficult to determine to what they refer. Not the *latter*; for why should we believe, that all the types of Christ were explained rather than all the prophecies concerning him? especially, as the apostle affirms, that he has not spoken particularly of them all, Heb. ix. 5. We are therefore to maintain, that the inspired teachers have pointed out to us the way and method, in which we ought to proceed in explaining the types, and given us a key to open those mysteries which are contained in them.

VII. Now we shall proceed in that way with safety.

1. When we accurately consider the original, even the Lord Jesus, who is now presented to our view without a veil, and from thence turn the eye of our mind to the type; then the greater, the fuller, and the more especial agreement we observe and discover between both; the greater glory we ascribe to the wisdom and truth of God, who made the type so exactly to correspond with him who is figured by it. For when we read the scriptures, we are to judge beforehand, that then only we understand them, when we discover in them a wisdom unsearchable and worthy of God.

VIII. 2. In every thing we are to proceed with caution, *fear and trembling*, lest we devise mysteries out of our own imagination, and obstinately pervert to one purpose what belongs to another. We do injury to God and his word, when we would have it owing to our fanciful inventions, that God seems to have spoke or done any thing wisely. However, though there is a

measure in all things, I should think the mistake more tolerable in one, who imagines he sees Christ, where perhaps he does not discover himself, than of another, who refuses to see him, where he presents himself with sufficient evidence. For the one is an indication of a soul that loves Christ, and is very much taken up with the thoughts of him, when the very least, or perhaps no occasion is given him : the other argues an indolent soul, and slow to believe ; such as discovers itself in the Socinians, and in Grotius, in other respects a great man, who generally so pervert very many passages, that they make them appear to have no manner of regard to Christ.

IX. 5. Whenever it is evident, that any person or thing is a type of Christ, we are not to imagine, that every circumstance in that person or thing is typical. For it may be that, in the same context, some things are peculiar only to the type, others only to the antitype, and others common to both : for instance, 2 Sam. vii. Solomon is proposed as a type of Christ. But it agrees to Solomon, and not to Christ, *If he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men, and with the stripes of the children of men*, ver. 14. To Christ, and not to Solomon in its full signification, *I will stablish the throne of his kingdom for ever*, ver. 13. For the kingdom of Israel became extinct in the posterity of Solomon by the Babylonish captivity. And it is applicable to both, *He shall build an house for my name*, ib. We may consider other instances in the same manner.

X. 4. Sometimes it is sufficient, that there be a very faint resemblance in the type of something most excellent, in a most eminent manner, in the antitype. Nay, the more noble and divine the thing signified is, the resemblance of it must of necessity be the more slender, because of the immense distance there is between Christ

and the *poor creature*. For example : there being no mention in scripture either of the beginning of the days, or the end of Melchizedek's life, that was sufficient to prefigure the eternity of Christ, Heb. vii. 3. And this, once for all, should be a fixed principle in our minds, That when the same things are asserted both of the type and the antitype, they are in a more excellent manner true in the latter than in the former, so that the truth of the thing, in its full import, is only to be found in the antitype. Thus we are to explain that of the apostle, Heb. i. 5. *To which of the angels said he at any time, Thou art my Son—I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son?* when it is evident, the same was said concerning Solomon, but in such a diminutive sense with respect to Solomon, that when his whole dignity, honor and grandeur, are compared with Christ, it is plainly of no avail : but it is true in Christ, in such a large and extensive sense, that his dignity and honor exceeds that of all the angels, and cannot be communicated to any creature.

XI. Finally, The learned have likewise observed, that a certain variation sometimes takes place with regard to the signification of the type, insomuch that in some respects it may be applied to Christ, and in others to the church, which is his mystical body. Let Abraham's offering up his Son be an instance of this. Isaac, in carrying the wood, in being bound by his father, and ready to suffer death in obedience to his father and to God, was a type of Christ, in his carrying his cross, being bound, and in obeying his Father even unto death. But when the ram was offered in the room of Isaac, the figure was changed, and that *ram* represented Christ, and Isaac the church, which is delivered from death by the death of Christ. These things I thought proper to

premise in general, because they cast light on the whole of typical divinity, and will be of use to us in the subsequent observations.

XXII. Moreover, the types are not all of one kind ; but may very properly be divided into three classes : so that some are *natural*, some *historical*, and others *legal*. We shall, out of a great number, give a few instances of each of these, according to the three periods of time formerly mentioned.

XIII. By a *natural* type I understand the creation of this visible world, as Moses has given us the history of it ; which was a type of the new creation of believers, and of the constitution of the church. Hence *the new man* is said *to be after God created*, Eph. iv. 24. and believers are said to be *God's workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works*, Eph. ii. 10. and the whole mystical body of Christ is called a *new creature* or creation, 2 Cor. v. 17. Nay the whole method of our restoration is expressed in phrases and similitudes, for the most part, taken from the first creation. Though Adam in his innocent state could have no thoughts of that, nothing having been made known to him, either concerning his fall or his recovery ; yet God so wisely ordered his works in the first creation, that they might be, as it were, an exemplar of the second ; and it is manifest to any attentive person, that they are so ; which will evidently appear, by particularly comparing the one with the other.

XIV. The first creation of the world was out of nothing ; so nothing was prepared for the second, no good, no virtue, no previous dispositions in the subject : yea something indeed was in being, which had no place in the old, but that was only rebellion and enmity making vehement opposition to the almighty grace of God.—The first was performed at the command and will of



God, the second in like manner. *Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth, that we should be a kind of first-fruits of his creatures*, Jam. i. 18.—The rudiments of the first were an indigested mass. *The earth was without form and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep*, Gen. i. 2. In like manner, all things lie in base confusion in the soul, when it is to be adorned by the new creation; and depraved lusts are violently agitated every where, without any order. Those things which should possess the upper place, are depressed to the lowest. There is also a surprising emptiness of every thing that is good, Rom. vii. 18. Neither are all things only surrounded with the gross darkness of ignorance, but the whole soul is nothing but darkness itself, Eph. v. 8. When God was pleased to adorn the world he had created, he began with the production of light, and he takes the same method in this other creation. *God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ*, 2 Cor. iv. 6.—After the light, God made the expanse or firmament, to divide the waters from the waters, or the waters under the firmament from those above it. He divided also the waters from the dry land. So also he brings every thing, by degrees, into order in our souls. He places reason, which was formerly depressed by the affections, on the chief throne, and commands the affections to stand at the footstool of reason; but then in such a manner, that the same Spirit, which of old moved on the face of the waters, has the management of all here likewise.—When the dry land discovered itself from the waters, immediately flowers, herbs, and trees, with their fruit, were produced: so, after every thing is properly arranged in the new man, fruits meet for faith and repentance appear.

and the church of God is\* *a paradise of pomegranates*, Cant. iv. 13. When the *rain is over and gone, the flowers appear on the earth, the fig-tree putteth forth her green figs, and the vines with the tender grape give a good smell*, Cant. ii. 11, 12, 13.—But as God was pleased to divide the huge mass of light into unequal parcels, in order to distinguish years and days in their seasons, and the more commodiously to cherish all things by a certain proportion of light and heat; so he likewise dispenses his light in the church in different degrees. She has the stars of the prophecies twinkling in the midst of darkness; also the brighter day-star of the gospel, the joyful harbinger of the perfect day, 3 Pet. i. 19. She is as the moon in the heavens of this universe, and the more abundant rays she receives from Jesus, who is her sun, the brighter she is, Cant. vi. 10. Lastly, in proportion to the approach or removal of her sun, she enjoys the mystical revolutions of day and night, of summer and winter, Cant. iv. 6. and ii. 11. While the heavens are spangled with so many stars, the inferior parts of the creation are replete with various creatures, the air with birds, the waters with fish, the earth with animals, as well reptile, as those that walk with feet. In the same manner, the grace of the Spirit of God quickens the soul by his holy emotions; some souls seem to live, as it were, in the waters of pious tears; others again, suiting themselves to meaner attainments, creep on the ground; others, like lions, hold on a steady pace: while others, in fine, like eagles, soar aloft, and waft themselves on nimble pinions above all heavens.

XV. But the creation of man, which succeeded the former displays again new mysteries. The whole Tri-

\* Our version renders it an orchard, but the Septuagint and several other versions render it paradise

nity addressed themselves to this by mutual consultation; and manifest themselves in a singular manner in the work of the new creation. The Father from eternity laid the plan of that work in his Son. The Son, in our nature, purchased our transformation into the likeness of God. The Holy Spirit executes the counsel of the Father, and applies the merits of the Son to his chosen people, in that new creation. *We are God's workmanship, created in Christ Jesus, Eph. ii. 10. and born of the Spirit, John iii. 5.*—In the first creation, man was adorned with the beautiful image of God: the same is restored to him in the second: at first indeed, still this image is soiled with some stains; however, it cannot be lost, but shall gradually be perfected to the full likeness of God.—While Adam was asleep, out of one of his ribs Eve was formed, whom he acknowledged to be flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bone. The death-sleep of Christ gives life to his beloved spouse. *This mystery of Adam and Eve is great, regarding Christ and the church, Eph. v. 32.*—The first man had dominion given him over all things, which is restored to him far more glorious by grace, 1 Cor. iii. 22. And if perhaps this world, as being subject to vanity, might seem unworthy of his dominion, God has framed another for his sake, in which dwelleth righteousness, 2 Pet. iii. 13.

XVI. When God had thus created all things for man, man for himself, and formed Eve for Adam, while he was asleep, he then rested from all his work, and took pleasure in it as good, and adapted to display the glory of his perfections. In this manner God still proceeds in the work of grace, till his Eve, his church, shall be perfectly adorned for our heavenly Adam, and the whole body of the elect gathered together into one: and then, having finished all his work, he will enter up-

on his most blessed rest, and most sweetly delight himself in the new world of glory. And as on that day on which God rested, man, at the same time, entered into the rest of God; so, in this other rest of God, the church having happily gone through all her toils, shall for ever enjoy, in like manner, a most holy and delightful rest. This is *that* (sabbatism) *rest which remaineth for the people of God, that they may enter into God's rest, and cease from their works, as God did from his,* Heb. iv. 9, 10. And this shall suffice concerning the natural types.

XVII. Let us now illustrate two *historical* types, in the *first age* of the world. And we have *Abel* among the first, who was slain by his envious brother Cain, Gen. iv. 1. Abel in Hebrew signifies *vanity and emptiness*; and he was called by that name, though he was a son dear to his parents, a servant dear to God, and indeed the first of all mankind, whom we read of, that was honored with the glory of heaven. Thus also Jesus, though he thought it no robbery to be equal with God, *was to empty* himself, upon assuming the nature of man, who is *like unto vanity*, Psal. lxxii. 9. nay suffering himself to\* be treated like a *worm*, which is inferior to a man. 2. Abel was a shepherd: so the Messiah is that good Shepherd by way of eminence, John x. 14. 3. The religious service of Abel was acceptable to God; and Christ *does always those things that please him*, John viii. 29. 4. Abel offered the choice of what he had to God; of the firstlings of his flock and of their fat. Christ, having nothing better, through the eternal Spirit offered *himself* without spot to God, Heb. ix. 10. 5. God graciously looked upon Abel's offering: the offering of Christ was for a sweet-smelling savour to

\* The author refers to Psal. cxvii. 6. where the royal prophet, as a type of the Messiah, says, *But I was a worm, and no man.*

God, Eph. v. 2. 6. Cain, though a full brother, burnt with ungovernable envy against Abel. With the same fury the Jews were instigated against Christ, though they were his brethren on many accounts. 7. Cain conversed with Abel, with a design to entangle him in his words. How often did the Pharisees lay snares and traps for Christ by their deceitful conferences? 8. Abel at last was slain by his brother, and, by a bloody death, cut off in the very flower of his age. Nor did the Jews cease, till they had cut off Christ by an accursed death, nailing him to the cross. 9. The parricide Cain was accursed, and banished from the presence of the Lord. The deicide Jews are still under the same curse, being banished both from heaven, and their native soil: and the blood of Christ which they shed, calls aloud for the vengeance, which they, with mad fury, imprecated on themselves and their posterity: though in other respects the blood of Christ speaks better things than that of Abel, Heb. xii. 24.

XVIII. As Abel typically represented Christ in his state of *humiliation*; so Enoch was a type of his *glorification*. 1. *Enoch* signifies\* *instructed, devoted*, being one who was consecrated to God, and, from his early years, instructed in the doctrine of godliness. Compare Prov. xxii. 6. *Train up, initiate (instruct) a child in the way he should go*, instil into him the first principles of heavenly wisdom. If ever any one, surely Christ was consecrated and devoted to God; and when he was scarce twelve years of age, he appeared as a doctor amidst the greatest doctors in Israel. 2. Enoch walked with God, that is, according to the apostle. Heb. xi. 5. *pleased God*. This also Christ perfectly did. *in whom the Father was well pleased*. 3. Enoch pro-

\* Ainsworth says, it is in the Hebrew *Chanoch*, that is, *dedicated or catechised*.

phesied of the glorious coming of the Lord, with ten thousands of his saints, Jude ver. 14. Christ often and very expressly foretold this, and that even when he was charged with blasphemy, and stood before the tribunal, Matth. xxvi. 64. 4. Enoch, after he had walked with God, and declared the counsel of God to the men of his generation, was taken up alive to heaven, in soul and body, without seeing death, Heb. xi. 5. for he was not to conquer it for the salvation of others. But Christ having suffered death for the elect, and purged away our sins by himself, was made higher than the heavens, and sat down at the right hand of the Majesty in the highest. 5. Enoch was the seventh from Adam; Christ the seventieth from Enoch, as appears from his genealogy in Luke. 6. Enoch was the third person, that we read of, who departed this world: Christ the\* third of those who ascended to heaven. 7. As in Abel we have an instance of a violent death, in Adam of a natural; so in Enoch, an example of that supernatural change, which those of the elect shall undergo, who shall be alive at the last day. 8. And lastly, God was pleased, before the law, to give the world in Enoch an instance of an ascension to heaven; under the law, in the person of Elias, under the gospel, in Christ; to shew, that believers, in every period, become partakers of the same salvation.

**XIX.** Let us next, under the *second period*, explain two types of the same kind. The first is Noah; the second Isaac. Peter declares, 1 Pet. iii. 20, 21. that Noah the patriarch of the new world, the ark, which he built, and the waters of the deluge, had all their mystical signification; where he teacheth us, that baptism is the antitype of those things which happened un-

\* Enoch himself was the first, Elijah the second, and so Christ was the third.

der, and by the direction of Noah. *Antitype* there denotes a type corresponding in the same signification to some other type. For order's sake, we will distinctly consider three things. I. Noah himself. II. The ark. III. The deluge.

XX. As to Noah. 1. His name signifies *rest*. And as that was not altogether expected in vain, so he could not bestow it fully, and in a manner that was proper to answer the import of that name. But Christ freely bestows this on all those, who, being burthened with the load of sin, betake themselves to him, Matth. xi. 29. and having calmed the storm of divine wrath, that was hanging over our guilty heads, he brings his church, amidst the storms and tempests of adversities, to the wished for haven of rest. 2. Noah was *a just man in his generation*; Christ was *holy, harmless, undefiled*, and separate from sinners, knew no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth; nay, he is Jehovah our righteousness. 3. Noah was a *preacher of righteousness*; Christ preached this much more distinctly, both that righteousness by which we must be justified before God, and that which we should endeavour after as a testimony of our gratitude. 4. Noah, in building the ark, prepared a safe retreat for his family against the impending waters of the deluge. Concerning Christ it is said, Is. xxxii. 2. *And a man shall be as an hiding-place from the wind, and a covert from the tempest.* 5. Noah preserved his family, which consisted only of eight souls. Christ preserves the children, whom God has given him; who, in comparison of the great number of those that perish, are but a little flock. 6. As Noah was the prince of the second world; so Christ is the Head of that new world, which was formed by means of the ruin and destruction of the former. For as what-

ever belonged to the former world was destroyed in the time of Noah ; so whatever takes its rise from the first Adam, ought to be abolished, in order to give place to the new creature, which is from Christ. 7. Noah offered to God a sacrifice of a sweet savour ; Christ offers that sacrifice of a sweet-smelling savour, by virtue of which God is reconciled to the world. 8. After God had smelled a sweet savour from the sacrifice which Noah offered, he promised, that he would no more destroy the world by a new deluge ; but only collect that quantity of vapours in the air, which being beautifully painted with the solar rays, might form in the heavens the variegated rainbow. By the efficacy of the sacrifice which Christ offered, God was reconciled to his elect, and promised, that he would never punish them in his anger ; but only chastise them with slighter paternal stripes, amidst which the rays of his grace would shine.

**XXI.** The ark, which Noah built, signified both Christ and the church of Christ. It was a type of Christ. For, 1. As the ark secured all who entered into it, from the descending rains, and from the waters of the great abyss, as they broke out from beneath ; so Christ gives a secure refuge to all who fly to him, both against the wrath of God, which is revealed from heaven, and against the rage of their infernal enemies. 2. As it appeared ridiculous to the ungodly world, who were hardened to their own destruction, that the seeds of a new universe should be preserved in such an ark ; so the glad tidings of salvation which we are to seek for only in Christ, are to the Jews a stumbling-block, and to the Greeks foolishness. 3. As the ark had its just dimensions of length, breadth, and depth, and in a word, was so large as to be able to contain so many animals together with their food : so, in like manner



there is in Jesus Christ that length, breadth, depth, and height of delightful love, which is abundantly sufficient for saving all the elect for ever. 4. That pitch, with which, according to God's appointment, the joints of the ark were pitched over, within and without, to prevent all ingress of the water, is called in Hebrew *Cophir*, which likewise signifies *expiation* and *a price of redemption*. Was not this an elegant and fine representation of the expiation and redemption of Christ, to which alone we are indebted, for our being secured from the deluge of divine vengeance?

XXII. But this same ark was also a figure of the church. 1. As the ark contained all the hope of the second world; so, in like manner, the church contains that assembly of the first-born, who are to be the heirs of the new world. 2. As the profane Ham also entered into the ark with the godly, and many unclean beasts with the clean; so many impure hypocrites creep into the external communion of the church. 3. As the ark remained unhurt and unshattered amidst all the shocks of storms and tempests, the tops of houses and craggy cliffs of mountains and rocks; so neither shall the gates of hell prevail against the church. 4. As the ark floated securely on the waters, without sails, oars, or rudder, by the providence of God alone, even when Noah was asleep; so the church, when destitute of all human aid, and while they, to whose care she is committed, are often asleep, is guided by the watchful eye of Christ, and at last happily brought into the haven of salvation. 5. As the ark, upon the retiring of the waters again into their abyss, rested upon the mountains of Ararat, where Noah, when he debarked and set his feet on dry land, offered sacrifices of thanksgiving to God; so, in like manner, the church, after it has passed through the trials, dangers, and oppositions of this pre-

sent world, shall rest in the heavenly Zion, where, with uninterrupted thanksgivings, she will sing the praises of her great God and Saviour.

XXIII. Again, the waters of the deluge have a reference both to Christ and the church. 1. As the waters, which descended from heaven, and violently issued out from beneath, covered the ark, and encompassed it on every side; so Christ was also to grapple with the wrath of his heavenly Father, with the bands of hell let loose upon him, and with the unrelenting cruelty of malicious men. In short, *the sorrows of death compassed him, and the floods of (Belial) ungodly men made him afraid*, Psal. xviii. 4. 2. As those waters did indeed cover, but did not sink, the ark; nay the deeper they were, the more they lifted it up on high, and brought it nearer to heaven; so Christ, in like manner, *was put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit*, 1 Pet. iii. 18. And the more grievous his sufferings were, to the higher pitch of glory did God exalt him, 2 Pet. ii. 9. 3. As the waters of the deluge destroyed the world of the ungodly, but preserved the ark, 1 Pet. iii. 20. which being lifted up on high was placed above the tops of houses and turrets, against which it might be dashed, while, in the mean time, all the devices and instruments of art were overthrown; so the afflictions, which are sent by God, are indeed to consume the ungodly, and drive them headlong into hell; but appointed to purge and prepare the godly for salvation, that they may not perish with the world, 1 Cor. xi. 32. 4. As the waters of the deluge, by drowning sinners, washed out the crimes of the old world; that the church, being delivered from these notorious crimes, might, with greater purity, serve God (by which the same thing is set forth as by the water of baptism, 1 Pet. iii. 21.) so, by the blood and Spirit of Christ, our sins are washed

away, the old man mortified, that the new man may, with the greater alacrity, be employed for God.

XXIV. Lastly, It is not for nothing, that notice is taken of the dove, which Noah sent out, and which returned in the evening with an olive-leaf plucked off. For, 1. As Noah was a type of Christ, so *that dove* was a type of the Holy Spirit which descended upon Christ, when he was baptized at Jordan. 2. As that dove brought the olive-branch to those who were in the ark, from which they might infer, that the waters were now dried up; so, in like manner, the Holy Spirit assures those that are in the church, of the peace of God, the symbol of which was the olive-branch. 3. As the dove carried that olive-leaf in her mouth; so the Holy Spirit publishes that mystical, or spiritual peace by the mouth of the prophets, apostles, and evangelists. 4. As the dove came to the ark in the evening; so, in the evening of the world, the gifts of the Holy Spirit are more plentiful and abundant.

XXV. Omitting, for the present, the illustrious type of Melchizedek, which Paul has accurately explained, Heb. vii. we shall take a short view of the history of Isaac, who was a type of Christ. I. In his person. II. In his offering. III. In his deliverance, and the glorious consequence thereof.

XXVI. As to his person. 1. He is called *Isaac* from *laughing*, because he was a son of joy and exultation to his parents, Gen. xxi. 6. But Christ is the joy of the whole world, and at his birth the angels proclaimed to the shepherds good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people, Luke ii. 16. 2. Isaac was the *son of the promise*, being descended in a miraculous manner from Abraham, who was old, and from Sarah, who was barren and past bearing, by the alone efficacy of the word of God, whereby *he calls things that are*

*not, as if they were, Rom. iv. 17.* So Christ, not according to the order of nature, nor by virtue of the general blessing, *Increase and multiply*, but by the efficacy of a gracious promise, was born of a virgin-mother, by a strange and surprising miracle. 3. Isaac was the *only son of Abraham, Gen. xxii. 2.* by a lawful and free wife, and in whom *his seed was to be called, Gen. xxi. 12.* though he likewise had Ishmael, and afterwards begat sons of Keturah; so Christ is the only-begotten Son of the Father, *John iii. 16.* though he also has brethren, but of a far more inferior order and condition, *Rom. viii. 29.* 4. Isaac was the head of Abraham's family, and, in his measure, that is, typically, the origin of the blessing. Christ is the head of God's family; *of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named, Eph. iii. 15.* And *in him we are blessed with all spiritual blessings, Eph. i. 3.*

XXVII. In the *offering* of Isaac the analogy is in the following particulars. 1. Abraham could not possibly have given a more illustrious instance of his love to God, than by offering to the death his son, his only son Isaac, whom he loved, in whom all his hopes were placed. Nor was it possible for God to give a more illustrious display of his love to men, than by delivering up for them his beloved and only-begotten Son to the most dreadful tortures of many deaths in one, *John iii. 16.* 2. It was an extraordinary instance of Isaac's obedience, to submit to his father in such a dreadful case, without a repining murmur. And who can, as it justly deserves, relate, with what cheerfulness Christ obeyed his Father unto the death, even the death of the cross? *Phil. ii. 8.* 3. As Isaac went out of his father's house to the place which God had appointed; so Christ went out of Jerusalem, in order to suffer without the gate, *Heb. xiii. 11.* 4. Isaac carried the wood; and Christ

carried his cross. 5. Isaac's hands were tied ; in like manner were Christ's. 6. Isaac was laid on the wood ; and Christ was nailed to the cross. 7. Isaac was offered on mount Moriah, which was either the same with, or at least near to Calvary, where our Lord was crucified.

XXVIII. We are further to observe these coincidences in his deliverance. 1. Isaac was already dead in his father's opinion, and Abraham received him from the dead in a figure, Heb. xi. 19. So Christ, being truly dead was restored to life. 2. Isaac was dead in his father's intention, from the moment he received the command to offer him up, until the third day on which he was forbid to lay hands on the lad. On the third day also Christ arose. 3. When Isaac was restored to Abraham, he dwelt with his father, and became the parent of a numerous seed. So, when Christ rose from the dead, he entered into his Father's house, and saw his seed, Is. liii. 10.

XXIX. When a ram was substituted for Isaac, who was otherwise to have been offered ; by inverting the figure, Isaac represents the *church*, and the ram is a figure of Christ. 1. Isaac was, by the command of God, brought to be offered, which was near put in execution by Abraham. Thus the severity of the divine judgment against sin was shadowed forth ; whereby, unless the satisfaction of Christ had interposed, all mankind must have perished. 2. That ram was not of Abraham's fold, but was suddenly at hand, and got ready for that purpose, by a remarkable dispensation of divine providence. Thus also Christ was given by a peculiar gift of God to us, who could never have found, among any thing belonging to us, a sacrifice fit for an expiation. 3. That ram's being caught by the horns in the thicket, seems to be a representation of all those cala-

mities, in which Christ was involved, through the whole course of his life : and why may we not here call to mind that crown of thorns, which was put round his head? 4. Abraham did not see the ram before he was called upon by God. None sees Christ by faith but by the efficacy of the gospel-call. 5. After the ram was offered, Isaac was set at liberty. Christ having died for the elect, they also shall live for ever.

XXX. Under the Mosaic *period*, no persons were more illustrious than Moses himself, and Aaron his brother. But Moses sustains a twofold character or relation. 1. That of a lawgiver, whose office it was strictly to inculcate the law with its appendages. 2. Of an interpreter and *teacher of the promises* made to the fathers concerning a Saviour and salvation. In the former respect he is opposed to Christ, and is a type of the law. In the latter, he remarkably represents Christ.

XXXI. To the former relation belong the following particulars. 1. His slow speech and stammering tongue, Exod. iv. 10. signified, that the doctrine of the law is disagreeable and harsh to the sinful man (quite the reverse of the doctrine of grace, which Christ declares, whose mouth is therefore said to be *most sweet*; Cant. v. 16.) and can by no means justify him, but rather condemns him, that *every mouth may be stopped*, Rom. iii. 19. 2. That the people being forbid to draw near to the holy mount, on pain of death, and their being secluded from familiar converse with God, while he himself alone was allowed a nearer approach to the Deity, represented, that his legal ministry could by no means unite sinners to God, but was rather an evidence of that separation which is between God and man. 3. When, being actuated by a holy zeal, he broke the tables of the covenant, and stirred up the treacherous

Israelites to mutual slaughter, he actually shewed, that his ministry was the *ministration of death and condemnation*, 2 Cor. iii. 7, 9. 4. That his covering his face with a veil, when he was to speak to the children of Israel, was a figure, that the glorious doctrine of grace was not a little obscured among a carnal people by the covering of his ceremonies ; for being wholly intent on the veil, they did not penetrate into the glory that was concealed behind it. 5. Though, among the many miracles he performed, a variety of judgments were indeed inflicted upon his enemies, by which they were destroyed, but not so much as one was raised from the dead : is not this a confirmation of what we just said, that the law is a *killing letter*, 2 Cor. iii. 6. in contradistinction to the *law of the spirit of life, which is in Jesus Christ* ? Rom. viii. 2. 6. and lastly, That he himself died in the wilderness, without being able to bring the people into the promised land, but was obliged to leave that work to Jesus (Joshua) the son of Nun : is not this a plain proof, that salvation is not of the law ? but is only to be looked for from our Jesus, who is also the end of the law, which was published by Moses, and whom Moses recommended to the people to hear, preferably to Joshua.

XXXII. But as in that respect Moses was opposed to Christ, so in another he clearly prefigured him, both in his *person* and *offices*. As to his person. 1. The birth both of Moses and of Christ was rendered famous by the tyrannical slaughter of infants. 2. Both of them having undergone, immediately on their birth, a cruel persecution from their enemies, did not escape but by a miracle of the singular providence of God. 3. Moses, when he might have enjoyed the pleasures of the Egyptian court, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's

daughter, chusing rather to partake in the reproach of his brethren. In like manner, though Christ thought it no robbery to be equal with God, yet, vailing his majesty, he chose contempt and poverty, in order to honor and enrich his people. 4. Moses had not his equal among men, for meekness, Numb. xii. 3. So Christ left an example of the most perfect meekness to his people, Matth. xi. 29. 5. When Moses came from conversing with God in the holy mount, he dazzled the eyes of the spectators, with a kind of radiancy issuing from his face. Christ is the *brightness of the Father's glory*, Heb. i. 3. *And we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father*, John i. 14. And when he was transfigured before his disciples, *his face did shine as the sun*, Matth. xvii. 2.

XXXIII. Moses sustained a threefold *office*. I. That of a deliverer. II. Of a mediator. III. Of a prophet. In each he was a type of Christ. He is called LUTROTES, a deliverer (redeemer) Acts vii. 35. For, by the power of God, he delivered the people from Egyptian bondage, by destroying the first-born of Egypt, by preserving the Israelites by the blood of the paschal lamb, by enriching them with the spoils of their enemies, and, in fine, by drowning Pharaoh and all his host. In like manner, Christ redeems (delivers) his elect from the tyranny of the devil, overthrows all the power which opposes the liberty of his brethren, taking such a vengeance on his enemies, as contains an express charge of guilt: with his own blood he sprinkles the hearts of the elect, and screens them from the destroying angel, brings into the church the glory and honor of the nations, Rev. xxi. 26. and in a word, having spoiled principalities and powers, he makes a shew of them openly, triumphing over them, Col. ii. 15.



XXXIV. Moses himself declares, that he was a mediator, Deut. v. 5. *I stood between Jehovah and you at that time* : and he acted as a mediator in a twofold respect. 1. As the messenger of the covenant, proposing the commandments and promises of God to the people, and bringing the words of the people back to God, Exod. xix. 7, 8. and in a solemn manner ratifying the covenant in the name of both parties, Exod. xxiv. 8. 2. As interceding for the people with God, praying, that, if divine justice could not otherwise be satisfied, himself might rather be blotted out of the book of God, and the people spared, Exod. xxxii. 32. In all these things, he represents Christ, who, in a far more excellent manner, is the Mediator between God and man : not only the Angel of the covenant, and the Messenger of the everlasting testament, but also the Sponsor and Surety of a better covenant, than that of Moses, Heb. vii. 22. not only in the name of God undertaking with men for their salvation, and all things appertaining thereto, but also in our name, undertaking with God, to cancel, by his death, to the utmost farthing all our debts ; and being admitted by God to the discharge of that office, he by his death and intercession became the procurer of an everlasting peace.

XXXV. Lastly, as Moses was the greatest prophet of God's people, whose equal no age produced, Deut. xxxiv. 10. so Christ in this also was like to Moses, Deut. xviii. 28. nay, so much greater than Moses, as a son is greater than a servant, and *he who hath builded the house, than the house*, Heb. iii. 3, 5, 6. More especially, 1. Whereas God made himself known unto the other prophets *in a vision or a dream*, with Moses *he spoke mouth to mouth*, and gave him to behold *the similitude of the Lord*, Numb. xii. 6, 7, 8. But who did ever more clearly see God, than his only-begotten

Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, and was therefore only qualified to declare the Father unto us? John i. 8. 2. None of the prophets were so famous for miracles and wonders as Moses. And yet Christ, by his miracles, struck every one with astonishment, and obliged even the most refractory Jews, to confess, that nothing like or even equal to them was ever seen in Israel, Matth. ix. 33. 3. Moses made great alterations in the external polity or form of worship, and, at God's command, made many additions to it. Christ again, by the same will of God, having abrogated the former institutions, made the church appear in a more excellent form, and delivered those words, which God had reserved to be spoken in the last days. 4. *Moses was faithful in all the house of God, for a testimony of those things which were to be spoken after*, Heb. iii. 5. proposing all these things briefly and obscurely, which were to be spoken and taught through the whole house of God, in every period of time. But Christ with his apostles spoke those things clearly, to which Moses bore witness as to things afterwards to be spoken, John v. 46. Acts xxvi. 22.

XXXVI. To Moses let us join Aaron, whose typical relation we cannot here, however, explain without intermixing some things from the legal types. 1. He, being born before Moses, was sanctified, at God's command, to be the high priest of the people in things pertaining to God, Exod. xxviii. 1. and xxix. 1. Heb. v. 1. In like manner, Christ the first-born among many brethren, and the only-begotten Son of God, is the *High Priest of our profession*, Heb. iii. 1. *who glorified not himself to be made an high priest: but he that said unto him, Thou art my Son, to-day have I begotten thee*, Heb. v. 5. 2. When Aaron was to be installed in his office, he was anointed with the most fragrant oil, even

with that which was appointed for the most sacred uses, Exod. xxix. 7. and xxx. 31, 32. This was so plentifully poured on his head, that it run down upon his beard, and to the skirts of his garments, Psal. cxxxiii. 2. In like manner, *God anointed Christ with the Holy Ghost and with power*, Acts x. 38. *not by measure*, John iii. 34. and his gifts descended plentifully upon all his chosen people, 1 John ii. 20. Whence *his name is as ointment poured forth*, Cant. i. 3. but the elect only partake of it; for the profane world *receiveth not this Spirit*, John xiv. 17.

XXXVII. 3. Aaron was likewise clothed with *holy garments*. 1. He had a mitre of the finest linen on his head, to which was fastened, on a blue lace, a plate of pure gold, having engraven upon it HOLINESS TO JEHOVAH, Exod. xxviii. 36, 37. And by this was signified the most unspotted holiness of Christ, both as to his divine and human nature, Heb. vii. 29. And likewise that Christ was the person, who *bears the iniquity of the holy things*, ver. 38. that is, expiates the sins, with which our most holy actions are otherwise polluted. 2. He was also clothed with a *blue robe*, upon the hem of which were pomegranates and golden bells interchangeably, quite round, Exod. xxviii. 31, 33. That represented the *robe of righteousness*, with which Christ was himself clothed, and with which he clothes his people, Is. lxi. 10. as also the most acceptable sound of the gospel, to be preached by him, whithersoever he should come, together with the most sweet and fragrant fruits thereof. 3. He also had on the\* *ephod*, or short cloak

\* There was a common ephod, which was not peculiar to the high priests, but to other priests also. We read that Doeg the Edomite slew eighty-five persons who did wear a linen ephod, 1 Sam. xxii. 18. but our author here speaks of the sacred ephod, which none but the high priest was to wear, and none were to make any like it.

of most curious workmanship, on the shoulders of which were joined two onyx-stones with the names of the children of Israel, *Exod. xxviii. 6, 9.* By which was signified, that his chosen people would be very dear to Christ our High Priest, whom he was to carry, as it were, on his shoulders into the heavenly sanctuary, *Is. xl. 11.* nay and to carry them with care, as a precious stone, *segullah*, a peculiar treasure, and as his own inheritance. 4. There was likewise the holy *breast-plate of judgment*, with twelve precious stones set therein, on each of which was a name of a tribe of Israel, *Exod. xxviii. 15, 17.* Many are pleased to call this the Urim and Thummim, *Lev. viii. 8.* This signified, that Christ is he, *whose is the judgment, Ezek. xxi. 27.* to whom *the Father hath given authority to execute judgment, John v. 27.* with whom is the light of the most perfect wisdom, and the perfections of the most consummate holiness, and who bears his chosen people on his heart, and presents them by name, by his intercession with his Father. Nor has it without reason been observed by the learned, that when under the New Testament we likewise read of twelve precious stones; the *jasper*, which had the last place in the Old, has the first in the New, *Rev. xxi. 19.* as if it was the band or connection of both Testaments, intimating to us, that both have the same scope, namely Christ, whose cherishing and never-failing grace is elegantly represented by the greenness of the jasper. 5. And lastly, to omit other particulars, Aaron's ephod, which otherwise hung loose, was bound close with a girdle of gold, blue, &c. interwove with fine linen, in a most curious manner, *ver. 8.* Which signified with what alacrity and readiness, together with the most considerable prudence, Jesus undertook his office.

XXXVIII. 4. The authority of Aaron's priesthood was ratified by the miraculous buds, blossoms, and fruits of the rod, which was cut from the almond-tree, which was the only one of all the other rods that suddenly budded, Numb. xvii. That rod signifies Christ, who not only *came forth out of the cut stem of Jesse*, Is. xi. 1. but was also *cut off out of the land of the living*, Is. liii. 8. yet budded again immediately after his death, and became a tree of life, having at the same time buds, blossoms, and fruit, yielding new fruit every month, Rev. xxii. 2. It also represents the perpetual fresh and flourishing efficacy of Christ's priesthood, who is a Priest *after the power of an endless life*, Heb. vii. 16.

XXXIX. 5. Aaron, by the legal sacrifices, expiated the sins of the people, and by his prayers interceded for them, Numb. xvi. 43. especially on the solemn day of expiation, when, with the blood of the slain sacrifice, he entered into the holy of holies. So Christ in like manner, *through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, and entered not into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us; nor with the blood of others, but with his own, he obtained eternal redemption*, Heb. ix. 14, 24, 25.

XL. These are a few instances, from among many, of the *historical types*. To which we shall subjoin two of the *legal types*, from a great number of others. And in the first place let us consider the mystery of the *ark of the covenant*, which is, as it were, the centre and compendium of all the ceremonies. The construction of this ark is described, Exod. xxv. 10. It was made of *shittim* wood, or, as is generally thought, of the most excellent cedar. That wood, when made into the form of an ark, was overlaid within and without, with the purest gold. The ark had a crown or cornice of gold

around it. Four rings of gold were put in the sides ; and into these two staves made of cedar-wood, but overlaid with gold, to carry the ark by ; and were never to be taken out of the rings, even while it remained in its place. In the ark the tables of the testimony were put : but the covering mercy-seat, of pure gold, was placed above on the ark. And two cherubims of gold, made of one piece with the mercy-seat, covered it with their wings, having their faces so turned towards each other, as, at the same time, to look downwards to the mercy-seat. The figure of these cherubims is a matter of much dispute among writers. The description which Josephus gives of them is not amiss, *Antiq.* lib. iii. c. 6. when he says, that they were *winged animals, resembling nothing that was ever seen by men.* That they came the nearest to the shape of an ox, may be gathered from Ezek. i. 10. compared with Ezek. x. 14. For in the latter place what is called the *face of a cherub*, is in the former called the *face of an ox.* Further CHARAB, whence the name *cherubim* is derived, signifies in the Chaldee, Syriac, and Arabic, to *plough*, for which oxen were formerly much employed. On the mercy-seat, between the two cherubims, was the throne of the divine majesty, from whence answers were given to the inquirers. The ordinary place of the ark was within the veil, in the holy of holies, *Exod.* xxvi. 33. but in such a manner, that the ends of the staves were seen from the holy place, towards the front of the holy of holies, *1 Kings* viii. 8. While the tabernacle stood, the ark was taken out of it, when the Israelites were to march, that it might search out a resting-place for them, *Numb.* x. 33. and be to them as the symbol of the divine presence, for their comfort ; but a terror to their enemies, ver. 34, 35. But after it was once brought into the temple, it was not taken from thence, till that

was destroyed, Psal. cxxxii. 13, 14. 2 Chron. v. 9. Now let us inquire into the meaning of all this.

XLI. This ark principally signified, or was a type of Christ. 1. Its *matter*, being partly of wood, and partly of gold, was proper to represent the two natures of Christ; the wood might denote his human nature, according to which he is *the fruit of the earth*, Is. iv. 2. and that it was incorrupted, free from all putrefaction, even when it was dead and laid in the grave, Psal. xvi. 10. as Pliny ascribes *eternity to cedar*, lib. xiii. c. 5. Gold was accounted a symbol of divinity, in respect of solidity, purity, brightness, and value; and so that represented the eternity, holiness, and glory of Christ; and at the same time shewed us, how valuable he ought to be in our eyes; even of such value, as *to count all things else but loss and dung*, in comparison of him, Phil. iii. 8. But as the gold only was conspicuous, and not the wood, which was within and without overlaid with gold; did not this signify, that Christ was not then manifested in the flesh, but his manifestation, which had hitherto been wrapped up in the most precious promises of God, was reserved for a happier period? 2. The *form* of the ark, by which it was capable to contain a great treasure, denoted that Christ was the person, in *whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge*, and of all manner of happiness; from *whose fulness* the elect may receive *grace for grace*. 3. *The cornice or crown of gold*, which encompassed the ark, seems to be a type of the crown and kingdom of Christ. 4. The tables of the covenant, which were put into the ark, signified, that Christ was to have the law of God in the midst of his bowels, or within his heart, and to fulfil all the righteousness of it for his chosen people.

XIII. 5. But the propitiatory covering, or the *mercy-seat*, in an especial manner, signified Christ, as taking away the guilt of our sins. For *God is in Christ, reconciling the world to himself*, 2 Cor. v. 19. Formerly that propitiatory or mercy-seat, being placed in the holy of holies of the tabernacle, or temple, behind the veil, was concealed from the eyes of all, because the expiation was not yet made : but God has now *set forth* Christ, exposed him before the eyes of all believers, and openly exhibited him to their view, as *a propitiation in his blood*, Rom. iii. 25. The mercy-seat being of pure gold, but laid upon the ark of wood, teacheth us, what it was that added worth and value to the obedience and sufferings of the man Christ ; namely, the infinite dignity of his Godhead. The tables of the law were covered by the mercy-seat : which the men of Bethshemesh venturing to look into, when the cover was but a very little removed, brought a fearful destruction upon themselves, 1 Sam. vi. 19. By Christ's propitiation all our sins are covered, Psal. xxxii. 1. ; but should we venture to view the law without this, we should find nothing there but the sentence of eternal condemnation. On the mercy-seat God displayed the presence of his majesty, and from thence gave gracious answers to his people. In Christ a throne of grace is erected, to which every believer may approach with boldness ; and be assured, that if he pray according to the will of God, he shall not pray in vain, but there *find grace to help in time of need*, Heb. iv. 16. There God dwelt *in the cloud*, Lev. xvi. 2. ; amidst the darkness of which, the rays of divine effulgence shone forth : which indwelling the Hebrew doctors have expressed by the famous term *Shechinah* ; and what else does this signify, but the fulness of the Godhead, that was to dwell bodily in the man Christ, and through Christ graciously in us ?



Col. ii. 9. *The Word was made flesh, and ESKENOSEN, tabernacled, or dwelt as in a tabernacle (observe the elegant allusion to the Hebrew word) EN HEMIN, in, among us, John i. 14.*

XLIII. 6. The cherubim over the propitiatory or mercy-seat represented the holy angels, who descended upon Christ to minister unto him, while in this world, John i. 51. and with myriads of whom he is now surrounded, while sitting on a throne of glory, Dan. vii. 10. Is. vi. 2. Ps. lxxiii. 17. They were of the same piece with the mercy-seat, because Christ, by his propitiation, has brought about a coalition of the elect, from among men, into one heavenly society with the angels. For, by his means, *we are come unto the heavenly Jerusalem, and to (myriads) an innumerable company of angels, Heb. xii. 22.* The cherubim viewed the ark with their faces downward, *desiring to look into the mysteries of our redemption, 1 Pet. i. 12.* They were two in number, with their faces towards each other, nevertheless each might also view the ark. This their position represented the duty of believers, both of the Old and New Testament, who, with eyes of a like precious faith and mutual love, view one another; but they jointly fix their eyes upon Christ. For the angels are often proposed to us as examples.

XLIV. I dare not affirm with some, that the cherubim were directly an emblem of believers; it being certain, that by them in scripture angels are represented. God committed the guarding of paradise to the cherubim, Gen. iii. 24. Riding upon a cherub he flies, Psal. xviii. 10. But I have not yet seen any scripture-testimony, to prove that believers are called cherubim. The only one produced, with any shew of probability, is that from Rev. v. 8, 9, 10. where it is thought, that the same song is ascribed to the four living creatures,

which are the cherubim, together with the four and twenty elders, in which they proclaim their being redeemed by the blood of the Lamb out of every kindred: which is not true of angels, but of believers. But I answer, 1. If, by the four living creatures, believers are here to be understood, I could wish it was shewn, why these living creatures are generally placed before the four and twenty elders, who are the patriarchs and predecessors of the universal church; nay, and who lead and go before them in their sacred songs, as may be seen, Rev. iv. 9, 10. As every reason would persuade, that the patriarchs of the universal church should have the precedency before the promiscuous assembly in celebrating the divine praises. Also, how the church of believers should introduce John to the vision and knowledge of things to come, which certainly knew nothing about them but by means of John: and yet they are said to have done this, Rev. vi. 1, 3, 5, 7. Certainly, angels, and not men, usually perform that office to the prophets. 2. The former clause of ver. 8. namely, *The four living creatures, and the four and twenty elders, fell down before the Lamb*, is affirmed of both conjointly. But we need not understand what follows, *having every one of them harps, &c.* ver. 9. *And they sung a new song, &c.* of any other, but the four and twenty elders. I will not now say, with a very learned person, that this appears from the Greek construction; because, as ΕΗΘΝΕΣ ΕΚΑΣΤΟΣ, *having every one*, is of the masculine gender, it cannot be referred to ΖΟΑ, *living creatures*, which is neuter; for I know that is of little weight: but I shall confirm this exposition by some passages altogether similar. Neh. xiii. 1, 2. it is said, *Therein was found written, that the Ammonite and the Moabite should not come into the congregation of God for ever: because they met not the children of Israel with bread and with*

water, but hired Balaam against them, &c. The first thing asserted, viz. That they met not Israel, is common both to the Moabites and Ammonites: but the latter, about hiring Balaam, is applicable only to the Moabites, as appears from Numb. xxii. 2. In like manner, Jer. xlii. 7. *I will deliver Zedekiah king of Judah, and his servants, and the people, &c. into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon, &c. who shall smite them with the edge of the sword.* What is said in the former clause about delivering Zedekiah, and his servants, and the people into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar, is true of all: but what is afterwards added, who will smite them with the edge of the sword, must be understood of the servants and people of Zedekiah, not of himself, who died a natural death, Jer. lii. 11. So in like manner here, it is true, that both the living creatures and the elders fell down before Christ, whom angels as well as men adore. But the harps, and vials full of odours, and the song, belong to the elders, not to\* the living creatures. At least it cannot be proved from this place. But let us return to the ark.

\* There are many and various opinions concerning these *living creatures*. Several think, that they represent the angels: but such things are said of them, that seem to be inconsistent with this. None of the angels could say, that Christ had redeemed them by his blood, and made them kings and priests unto God. Besides, chap. vii. 11, 12. it is said, that all the angels stood round about the throne, and about the elders and the *four living creatures*, which are consequently distinguished from the angels. Others therefore, with greater probability, think, that the living creatures were the representatives of the ministers of the gospel, and the four and twenty elders, the representatives of the whole church, both of the Old and New Testament; and this may account for the placing the living creatures before the elders. Had our author therefore taken things in this view, he would have at once confuted the opinion he opposes; though, upon his own principles, his reply is judicious and ingenious.

XLV. The staves, which were put into four rings of gold for carrying, the ark signified, that Christ with all his grace and glory should be, as it were, carried by the preaching of the gospel to the four quarters of the world. The faithful preachers of the gospel may justly be called **CHRISTOPHOROI**,\* *bearers of Christ*. These staves were never to be taken out of the rings, even while the ark rested, after it was set up in its place. The sound of the gospel has never been altogether suppressed: and no country can be assured, that Christ with his gospel may not depart from it. The place in which the ark rested, was the holy of holies within the vail. The place of Christ's rest is in the sanctuary not made with hands, Heb. ix. 21. after he entered into that within the vail, Heb. vi. 19, 20. But the ends of the staves being seen in the holy place, signified, that though Christ indeed is in heaven out of the reach of our bodily eyes; yet he reveals himself to the eyes of our faith by a manifestation of his manifold grace. That, during the standing of the tabernacle, the ark was carried sometimes to one place, and sometimes to another, but was not removed from the temple, till the destruction of it; might not this signify to believers, that Christ should afterwards come forth from the sanctuary of the divine decrees and promises, and so from heaven itself, and while he passed through the country of Israel, was seen sometimes in one place and sometimes in another; but after he was again received into heaven, he should continue there until the time, *in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, 2 Pet. iii. 10. Whom the heavens must receive, until the times of the restitution of all things, Acts III. 21.*

\* Thus the Lord said in vision to Ananias, that Paul was to bear Christ's name before the Gentiles, and King, and children of Israel.

XLVI. It was not without a display of divine wisdom, that there was to be a time, when the ark was not in the house of God; namely, under the second temple; as Jeremiah foretold should happen; *They shall say no more, The ark of the covenant of Jehovah: neither shall it come to mind*, Jer. iii. 16. For by this they might be admonished, to expect another, and indeed a far more noble habitation for God; another mercy-seat, far more excellent, to which the former was commanded to give place, as the shadow to the body. However, it is not without a mystery, that John saw again *the temple of God opened in heaven*, and that *there was seen in his temple the ark of his testament*, Rev. xi. 19. and that, at the time in which the kingdoms of the world were become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ, ver. 15. John saw these things *in heaven*, because heaven was the place where he was favored with these visions, Rev. iv. 1. Not that every thing he saw was to be in heaven. For surely that war, which he describes, Rev. xii. 7, 8. was not to be there, but in the church on earth. But what did he now see? *The temple opened*. This, if I mistake not, signifies a free, open, and unobstructed entrance for all into the church of Christ: into which the nations of the world, or, as Paul speaks, Rom. xi. 25. *the fulness of the Gentiles had come in*; and whose doors now stood open even for the Jews, against whom they had been shut for a great while. In that temple he sees again the *ark*, which was a symbol of the covenant formerly entered into with the Jews: by which is signified a new habitation for Christ among the Jewish nation, not by an external symbol, but by internal and spiritual grace; and as they shall enjoy this, they will readily and with gladness be without an external symbol. See what Jonas le Buy, whom Bochart, *Hieroz.* lib. iii. c. 9. calls

“an excellent person, and highly skilled in these matters,” has wrote on this place.

XLVII. Near the ark was laid up the *pot of manna*, and Aaron's rod, which budded, Numb. xvii. 25. to represent the incredible and permanent sweetness of that spiritual food, which Christ bestows on his people, and which himself prefers, on so many accounts, to the manna given by Moses, John vi. 43. &c. and which, by an evident allusion to what was contained in this pot, is called the *hidden manna*, Rev. ii. 17. and, at the same time, to shew the perpetual verdure and eternal efficacy of Christ's priesthood, by virtue of which our buds also may come to blow, and humble shrubs to sweet balsam. So much shall suffice concerning the ark of the covenant.

XLVIII. Let us now consider the things which the high priest was to perform on the solemn day of expiation, in order to give another instance of a legal type, the ceremonies of which are described Lev. xvi. Aaron was to put on the linen garments, appropriated for that day, and only during those ministrations, which were to be performed within the second vail, ver. 4. And after he was ordered to make an atonement for himself and his house by offering a young bullock, he was commanded to take from the congregation of the children of Israel two kids of the goats for a sin-offering, and a ram for a burnt-offering, ver. 5. These kids were to be procured at the common expence of all, out of the treasury appointed for defraying the charges of the sacrifices, and other things necessary for the worship of God. Both, instead of one offering, belonged to one sacrifice for sin. Both were an expiatory sacrifice, in the room of Israel-sinners, bearing their sin. These goats were to be presented to God before Jehovah, at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation; they

were sacred to God, and devoted to his worship, ver. 7. Lots were to be cast upon both; one lot for Jehovah, and the other for\* Azazel, ver. 8. This, according to the Jews, was done in this manner. The high priest stood before the goats between the sagan, or the priest next the high priest, and the head or chief person of the principal family; then out of a box he drew the lots, which were at first of wood; and under the second temple of gold: on one of these was inscribed, *for Jehovah*, on the other, *for Azazel*: the lot drawn out with the right hand, was put on the head of the goat opposite to that hand; and that drawn with the left, placed on the head of that opposite to the left. See Ainsworth and Alvingius. That which fell to Jehovah, was to be prepared for a sin offering; which was directly done, not by killing immediately, but by declaration. For, the lot being laid upon it, the high priest called it the *sin for the Lord*, that is, appointed to be a sacrifice for sin; and he offered it, that is, put it in the place of slaughter, at the north side of the altar. But what fell to Azazel was again presented alive before Jehovah, to make an atonement over it, by confession and imposition of sins, ver. 9, 10. Then that which was Jehovah's was to be killed for the sins of the people, and its blood carried within the vail, with which blood the high priest was to sprinkle both the mercy-seat, and before the mercy-seat. Thus an atonement was to be made for the holy place, and for the tabernacle of the congregation, because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel, ver. 15, 16. Then again the live-goat, which by lot fell to Azazel, was to be brought forth: and the high priest laid both his hands on his head, and confessed over it the iniquities of the children of Israel;

\* Or, as our translation renders it, for the *scape-goat*.

generally in this form, according to the Jews: "Lord, I beseech thee, thy people, the house of Israel, have transgressed, been rebellious, and have sinned before thee. Lord, I beseech thee, forgive now the trespasses, and rebellions, and sins, which thy people, the house of Israel, have trespassed, and in which they have been rebellious; as it is written in the law of Moses thy servant, because on this day he will make atonement for you, to cleanse you from all your sins," *Joma*, c. 6. And the priests and people, who stood in the porch, upon hearing the name *Jehovah* pronounced by the high priest, kneeled, with their faces downward, adored, and said, *Blessed be the Lord, and let the glory of his kingdom be for ever.* In this manner all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their trespasses of what kind soever, greater and smaller, sins against knowledge, or sins of ignorance, were laid upon the goat, which was sent away *by the hand of a fit man* into the wilderness, bearing the iniquities of the children of Israel, *into a land not inhabited*, ver. 21, 22. But the bullock which Aaron offered for himself, and the goat which he offered for the people, were to be carried without the camp, that their skins, and their flesh, and their dung might be burnt, ver. 27. Before we inquire into the mystery of these things, some difficulties are first to be cleared up.

XLIX. And, *first*, it is indeed very obscure, what we are to understand by Azazel. I have chiefly met with four opinions of the learned concerning this word. The *first* is, that by Azazel we are to understand the very goat, which was sent forth into the wilderness. And they suppose, this may be gathered from the etymology of the word, which is said to be compounded of a *goat*, and *went away*. And according to them, the words of Moses are thus to be understood: One lot for



Jehovah, that is, for the goat to be offered to Jehovah ; the other for Azazel, that is, for the goat that was to go into the wilderness. But though the Hebrew word may signify a goat going away, yet it cannot thence be concluded, that by that name the goat itself was signified : as it is possible, that, on occasion of the goat's going away, the place, to which it was led, might be so called, which Kimchi in *Radicibus* contends for : " That place was so called," says he, " because the goat went thither." But the main thing is, that this explication of the lots is very perplexed : whereas the words of Moses are clear, that the lots were cast for the goats, to know which of them should fall to Jehovah, and which to Azazel. Nor does it appear that one of the goats could be called Azazel, unless we suppose, the other goat was called Jehovah, which is absurd.

L. Those of the *second* opinion will have it, that Azazel was a steep and rugged mountain in the wilderness. Thus Jonathan, Saadiah, Gaon, Jarchi, Kimchi, and most of the Jews. But it has been well observed by others, 1. That Moses nowhere mentions mount Azazel, as he mentions the mountains of Ararat, mount Abarim, mount Ebal, mount Gerizzim, &c. 2. That it does not seem probable, that, in a country so often travelled over, and so exactly described, none should ever make mention of mount Azazel, and point out its situation. For what a certain anonymous author mentions in Aben Ezra, that it was mount Sinai, will never have weight with those, who know, what vast deserts lay between Jerusalem and Sinai : whereas a goat was yearly led from that city to Azazel.

LI. The *third* opinion is of those, who contend, that Azazel is the devil : and they would have one of the goats to have fallen to the devil, not as if it was offered to the devil (for it was devoted to God, and brought

before him to the tabernacle) but that, at the will of God, it was exposed to be tormented by the devil. This sentiment is supported by such arguments as these.

1. It is the received opinion of the Jews, that Azazel is one of the names of the devil, just as Samael, Azael, and Machazael. In like manner a Christian poet thus sings against Marcus the disciple of Valentinus, who was thought to deceive the spectators by his juggling tricks.

HA SOI CHOREGEI SOS PATER SATAN AIEI,  
DI' ANGELIKES DUNAMEOS AZAZEL POIEIN.

*Hæc tu ille Satanæ fretus auxilio patris  
Azazelique mira designas ope.*

“Which thy father Satan ever enables thee to perform by the angelic power of Azazel.” These verses are cited by Epiphanius, *Hæres.* 34, 11. The etymology favors this. FOR NGASASEL is *the goat which went away*; that is, the creature which kept not its first estate, but revolted from God. Elsewhere in scripture the devils are called *goats*, as Lev. xvii. 7. 2 Chron. xi. 15. Kimchi in his Lexicon gives the reason of it: “They are called goats,” says he, “because they appear in the shape of goats to their votaries.” Maimonides in *more Nevochim*, lib. iii. c. 46. speaks much to the same purpose. To this may be referred the ancient mythology concerning Pan, Faunus, and the Satyrs, who were likewise called goats. Since then devils have indisputably been called goats elsewhere, why may not the devil here likewise be emblematically signified by Azazel, that is, *the goat which went away?* or, as Ben Nachman speaks, *the prince who rules in desert places?*

LII. The *fourth* opinion is that of Bochart, who, though he owns he can advance nothing certain on the head, yet offers his conjecture, which is thus: The

Arabic verb *azala* signifies *to remove* and *separate*. Which he proves by many instances. And he thinks that Azazel is derived from that, and signifies *separation* and *secession*. The goat, therefore, whose lot is to Azazel, to *secession*, was that which by lot was appointed for retreat, in order to be led into a separate place of the wilderness, which, ver. 22. is called, *a land cut off, or separated*.

LIII. But leaving every one to judge for himself, the third opinion pleases me not a little, because it seems to rest on the firmest grounds, and gives us a discovery of a great mystery; and I scarce see, what can be objected to it, unless this one thing, which Bochart advances; namely, that NGEZ and ASAL agree not in gender, the former being feminine, the latter masculine: and therefore, says he, the word could not be made up of both. But that reason is of no great weight: for, 1. In compound names, grammatical analogy is not always regarded: for instance, in the word SAMUEL, which at full should be SAULMEEL, *asked of God*, the letters ALEPH and VAU and LAMED are struck out, and MEM is joined with EL by a *schewec*, whereas analogically it ought to be joined by a *tzere*. Instances to this purpose are numerous. 2. A change of genders is common among the Hebrews. We have a similar instance in Gen. xxx. 38. HATZON VATECHAMNAH, in the feminine; and ver. 39. VATECHELMU HATZON, in the masculine. Buxtorf has collected a great many examples to this purpose in his syntax. 3. Though NGEZ be feminine in signification, yet it is masculine in termination, as also the plural NGIZIM; and therefore it is no wonder it be joined with a word of a masculine termination; which is also done, Lev. xxii. 27. NGEZKI JIVALER VEHAIAH, where a double masculine is joined to the word NGEZ. But neither

is Spenser's observation to be overlooked, that *NGASASEL* may be explained by, *the strong one going away*. For *NGAZ* signifies *strong*. And as the true God is said, Psal. xxiv. 8. to be *strong and mighty*; so also the devil was called *Azizos* by the Phœnicians; in the gospel, Luke xi. 21. *the strong man*.

LIV. 2. It is worth inquiring, what might be signified by Aaron's laying his hands on the head of the goat: which was not done here only, but also upon other occasions, Lev. i. 4. Lev. iii. 2. and Lev. iv. 4. and Herodotus says, this was likewise in use among the Egyptians, lib. ii. c. 39. See Outram, *de sacrif.* lib. i. c. 15. § 18. and c. 22. § 5. seq. Bochart, if I mistake not, has given us the best explication of the reasons of this. 1. The offerer, by this rite, delivered up the victim to God, and, as it were, manumitted or released it, professing, he gave up all the right he had in that animal, exempted it from his own dominion, and devoted it to the service of God. Just as the Romans formerly held in their hand the slave they were to set at liberty, uttering these words, *I will, that this man be free*. 2. By this very ceremony, the sinner deprecated the wrath of God, and prayed, that it might fall on the head of that victim, which he put in his own stead. By this ceremony, therefore, the sins of all Israel were laid on this goat, in order typically to bear them, and carry them away far from Israel.

LV. 3. Let us inquire, what is *ÆRATZ GESERAH*, *the land of excision* or separation, into which that goat was to be carried. I don't think, that any particular place was precisely signified: for it is not credible, when the sacred services were performed at Jerusalem, that the goat was carried to the same place, to which it was carried, when Aaron performed that ceremony for the first time in the wilderness. In general, therefore,

it signifies a place remote from the resort of men ; AT-HAR TZEDU, *a desolate place*, says Jonathan ; JETHI-BAH ER.ETZLO, *an uninhabited land*, according to Orkelos. The Greeks call it GEN ABATON, *wayless* or *inaccessible*. Abarbanel explains it, *a land of the decree*, meaning that country, concerning which a decree was made, that the captive Israelites should be sent away thither.

LVI. 4. We may inquire who is that ISH NGETTI, *fit man*, who was to carry away the goat ? We meet with the Hebrew word NGETTI no where else. The Greeks render it ETOIMOS, *ready*. NGETH certainly signifies *time*, the same that the Chaldee SEMAN. Hence they inferred, that NGETTI with the Hebrews, is the same with the SEMIN of the Chaldees, *ready, furnished*. It would not be improperly rendered KARIOS or EUKAIROS, *seasonable, oportune*. Abarbanel will have it to be ISH GADOL BESEMINI VENGETTI, *a man of great dignity in his age and time*, at least in the application of the type. Whatever be in this, it is very plain, that God appointed no particular order of men for this office. The Rabbins tell us, that any one was fit for it, if he was appointed by the high priest ; and that formerly scarce any, but a stranger, was employed in this service.

LVII. *Lastly*, We are to inquire what became of that goat at last. The Jewish doctors have a constant tradition, that the priest fastened a piece of scarlet cloth in the shape of a tongue, weighing two sheckles, to the head of the scape-goat, which the conductor of the goat, when he was come to the place appointed, divided in two, and fastening one part to the rock, to which he had driven the goat, and the other to the horns of the goat, he pushed the goat down from behind ; which falling headlong, was crushed to pieces.

Before it reached half-way down the precipice. But Jonathan insists, it was pushed down by some divine power. Moreover, if this scarlet tongue turned white, which they say was generally the case, they looked upon that as a happy omen; and thence conjectured, their sins were forgiven; according to that, Is. i. 18. *Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow.* But these things are either false, or doubtless uncertain, which borders upon falsehood. Others therefore are of opinion, that it was let loose in the wilderness, to feed where it listed: and Bochart proves, that both the ancient Greeks and Romans had animals consecrated to God, which were called *APHETA ZOA*, *animals let loose*: and the words of the text favor this, ver. 22. *And he shall let go the goat in the wilderness.*

LVIII. Let us now search into the mystical meaning of all this. That solemn day represents to us Christ's death, resurrection, and ascension into heaven; and principally, our reconciliation with God, in virtue of his satisfaction and intercession. Aaron, we see, performed these sacred rites in linen garments, of less value indeed, yet white and very pure. This was to represent Christ's humiliation, which was never lower, than when he was most engaged in making atonement for our sins; and likewise shewed his most holy purity, unstained with the spot of the least sin. In this respect, our Lord is certainly greater than Aaron, and all the other high priests: because he stood in need of no offering for his own sins, for he had no sins, on account of which an offering was necessary, Heb. vii. 26, 27. When the Israelites saw Aaron first offering for his own sins, they might thence easily conclude *the weakness and unprofitableness* of that earthly priesthood. For what real good could that priest do the people, who, by a solemn expiation, publicly declared, that he himself, together

with the people, was in the number of the guilty? But our Lord Jesus, having no occasion to offer for himself, gave himself, as is evident, out of pure love, for his people.

LIX. Christ, who is frequently in other places called the lamb, is represented here by the emblem of a *goat*. For as, on account of his meekness, patience, and holiness, he merits to be called the lamb; so on account of our sins, which, as Surety, he undertook for, and of his coming in the likeness of sinful flesh, Rom. viii. 3. he is typified by the symbol of a vile and wanton goat. That goat was given to Aaron by the people: Christ was given to men by God: yet what he offered, namely, his human nature, he took from men, being raised up by God *from the midst of his brethren*, Deut. xviii. 15. Christ was bought with thirty pieces of silver, which were taken from the treasury, in order, it seems, to be an expiation for the whole people. Both the goats were presented to the Lord at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation. Christ willingly presented himself to God, saying, *Lo! I come: I delight to do thy will, O my God*, Psal. xl. 7, 8. and his offering was made in the view of the whole church, and at the instigation of those who were the principal men of the tabernacle. The goat, which by lot fell to Jehovah, was slain. But as divine providence alone undoubtedly orders the disposal of the lot, Prov. xvi. 33. so Christ also was delivered to death, by the *determinate counsel of God*, Acts ii. 23. Acts iv. 28. The slain goat was burnt in the sacred fire. Christ, in like manner, was scorched and burnt, both by the fire of the divine wrath, kindled against our sins, for which he undertook to suffer, and by the flames of his own love for us, and of his zeal for the glory of God. The burning of the flesh

and skin of this goat was performed without the camp : Christ also suffered without the gate ; and we are likewise to go out to him without the camp, bearing his reproach, Heb. xiii. 11, 12, 13. namely, we are courageously to bear it, if, for the sake of Christ, we are exposed to lose the advantages of this world. Thus Christ's *humiliation* was typified by this *goat*.

LX. But let us also take a view of a type of his *exaltation*. Aaron entered into the sanctuary with the blood of the goat, which was given by and for the people. Christ having made an offering for our sins, entered into heaven, and *sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high*, Heb. i. 3. Aaron entered within the veil with the censer and incense. Christ ascended into heaven, *to appear and intercede there in the presence of God for us*, Heb. ix. 24. And there was no entrance possible for Aaron without the blood of the expiatory sacrifice : neither did Christ enter into the holy place without blood ; blood, I say, not of goats or bulls, but his own, whereby he obtained eternal redemption for us, Heb. ix. 12. Nor is there any other way, by which we can enter into the sanctuary, but by the blood of Christ, whereby he hath consecrated for us a new and living way thereto, Heb. x. 19, 20. The veil, which gave way to the priest, who was to represent the atonement made, returned to its former place and use, when he went out again ; because an expiation was made for sin, not in reality, but in figure only, Heb. x. 4. But when Christ was to enter into the heavenly sanctuary, the veil not only yielded to him for a time, but was rent by the hand of God, Matth. xxvii. 50, 51. having obtained a redemption of eternal efficacy and value. The blood of the goat was to be sprinkled on and before the mercy-seat ; and so that blood remained in the holy of holies. Christ appears always in heaven with his blood,



which is the *blood of sprinkling, speaking better things than that of Abel*, Heb. xii. 24. Hence it is, that John saw before the throne a *Lamb standing, as if it had been slain*, Rev. v. 6. For though Christ was once dead and liveth for evermore, Rev. i. 18. yet he is represented in heaven as slain, on account of the virtue and efficacy of his death, which is ever fresh. Nor is the intercession of Christ any thing else, but a continual representation of his merits and death before his Father. But that an expiation was to be made by blood for the holy place itself, and for the tabernacle of the congregation, signifies, that God's indwelling in the sinner man cannot be in a holy manner, without the sacrifice and blood of Christ; and that heaven itself would be polluted, if, which is impossible, sinners were to be admitted there without an expiation. Thus Paul affirms, Heb. ix. 23. *the heavenly things are purified with better sacrifices*. Not that there is any impurity in heaven, but that it is not consistent with the divine holiness to admit sinners, unexpiated by the blood of Christ, into the communion or participation of his glory, nor for him to dwell in them. These things concerning the first goat are sufficiently evident.

LXI. There is greater difficulty about the mystery of the scape-goat: concerning which we may modestly propose, what we imagine comes nearest the truth, without prejudice to any. And here I find two different opinions among divines, that deserve our consideration. For it is not worth while to trouble ourselves, in refuting the opinion of those who, by the scape-goat, understand Barabbas or Antichrist; though Cornelius a Lapide ridiculously says, that such *speak more distinctly and pertinently* than others, concerning this *figurative representation*. But some learned men think, that,

by the scape-goat, the rebellious Jews were prefigured : others will have it to be a type of Christ.

LXII. The former speak to this purpose. Whereas the sending the goat away into the wilderness, was done after the purification of the tabernacle, and it did not fall unto the Lord by lot ; so the disobedient people, and not the Mediator of the testament, seems to be set forth by the banished goat. For the wicked are called goats, Matth. xxv. 43. They controverted Christ's right of *access to God*. The determination between both was made by a divine lot. Christ, by his blood, was introduced into the heavenly sanctuary : over the others hung that curse in Deut. xxix. 21. *And Jehovah shall separate him unto evil out of all the tribes of Israel.* Are not also the Jews sent away and dispersed among the nations ? They are given up to Azazel, or, according to the ancient Rabbins, they are fallen as a portion to Sammael (for the serpent may eat the *dust*, Gen. iii. 14.) In a word, they are given up to the power of the devil. *And how justly are the vessels of wrath said to bear the sins of the faithful people, is evident. For though there is no procuring cause of justification in them, yet in them the severity of God is seen ; thus all the blood shed from the beginning of the world, and so every sin, at any time committed, is avenged.* For they who refuse to confess their own sins, *in order to submit to the justice of God, make the sins of all others their own.* What is said of the goat to be sent away, namely, its being to be *presented before the Lord to make an atonement*, signifies, that they also, as sanctified in the root, *are presented to God by Christ the Priest*, that even from them may arise a *holy seed*, Is. vi. 13. and children of the promise. In a word, that the time shall come, when all Israel shall be saved, and at last be expiated by Christ the Priest, Rom. xi. 26, 27.

LXIII. It always did, and still does appear strange to me, after the closest and most solicitous meditation, that learned men could seriously give into such idle imaginations; than which, I apprehend, nothing could be spoken more foreign to the mystery of this ceremony; because it is altogether inconsistent with the end and sacred intention of this day. For who can think it probable, that, on the solemn day of propitiation, which was set apart for making an atonement for all the sins of the whole people, the rejection of the same people should be so solemnly inculcated by an anniversary symbol? The whole people fast, afflict their souls, confess their sins, pray for the forgiveness of them: the high priest is wholly taken up in procuring an expiation: God promises to *the whole congregation of Israel, Ye shall be cleansed from all your sins before Jehovah.* Can we believe, that, at the same time, and by the very same sacred rites, the high priest, and the believers among the people, should be commanded to lay their sins by direful ceremonies on the goat, representing the far greatest part of their brethren according to the flesh, in order to be punished in them, by a most severe instance of a divine curse; the like to which was never afterwards seen among men? I allow, that the punishment of the rebellious Israelites was foretold in awful prophecies: nor would I deny, that there were some Mosaic institutions, which prefigured that punishment. But at that time when the typical expiation of all Israel from all their sins was to be procured by those rites, it appears to me of all things the most improbable, that at the same time, and by the very same ceremonies, the dreadful curse of God for the sins of all, which could not be separated from the imposition of sin, was represented as resting on the greatest part of Israel, and that according to the imprecation of the expiating priest.

and of believers who prayed for expiation. I know, it is said, that "the godly, who were mixed with the ungodly among this people, might have the consolation of beholding, on this day, a sign or token of their happier lot beyond the disobedient." But none, I imagine, will deny, that even this consideration must have yielded the greatest grief, which would have been an exceeding damp to the joy they had conceived from the pardon of their sins; and that the pious would rather intercede in behalf of the perishing, than lay their own sins upon them with an imprecation. Certainly, Jesus himself deplored, with bitter tears, the impending destruction of the most abandoned city. And Paul calls not only his conscience, but also Christ and the Holy Spirit to witness, that he had great grief and continual anguish of heart, whenever he reflected on the deplorable state of his brethren according to the flesh; and was so far from wishing to make them a curse for himself, by the imposition of his sins, that he rather wished himself separated from Christ, to become a curse for them, Rom. ix. 1, 2, 3.

LXIV. Moreover, as the interpretation we are now examining, is foreign to the end and intention of that day, so almost all the ceremonies that were then used, strongly dissuade us from it. 1. Aaron was commanded to receive both goats from the congregation of the children of Israel, and that *for sin*, that is, to expiate and take away sin, ver. 5. "But the goat, which was given by the people, shews that what was from them, is offered for them;" as these learned men themselves speak very justly. If that be true of the one goat, why may it not be said of the other, even that it represented its being from the people, in order to take away sin? for so far both are on a level. Both being from the people; both bought at the common expence; both of

them for sin ; thus far there was no distinction in the types. What can then constrain us to imagine, there was so great a difference in the signification ? Is it consonant to reason, that what was appointed to represent their eternal curse, was bought at their expence ; that *is*, with their consent and approbation ? And was the rebellious nation of the Jews given to the rest, *for sin*, that, in this respect, they might be joined together with the Lord Christ ? Be it far, says the learned person, they should thus be joined along with Christ, “ for whose honor we are too much concerned, to speak so impertinently.” We are thankful to God, that he speaks so far piously. But he denies, that one of the goats was taken for sin. He says, “ that is asserted of both which is true only of one. Before the lot distinguished them, that could be affirmed collectively of both, which after the lot was to be the case only of one.” But I think, we are by no means to depart from the plain meaning of the words ; nor to understand only of one, what is affirmed of both. Though we are to understand, with some difference, what the following words of the law intimate : namely, both goats were for sin, which the law expressly affirms ; yet with this difference, the one was sin, because it was slain for sin ; the other, because by bearing the sins of the people, it took them away. To sum up all in a word, the whole of this sacred expiation consisted of *two* parts : first, the slaying the one goat, whose blood was shed to expiate the sins of the people : and then the sending away the other goat, which took away the sins which were laid upon it, by virtue of the sacrifice just offered. Both therefore concurred, in their place and order, to the solemn atonement.

LXV. 2. Aaron was commanded to present both before Jehovah at the door of the tabernacle of the con-

gregation, ver. 7. By which both were declared to be equally devoted to God. Without a controversy Aaron is here a figure of Christ as Priest; the goat to be slain, signified Christ as the sacrifice. For he presented himself to God, when *he went up to Jerusalem, that all things that are written by the prophets, concerning the Son of man, might be accomplished*, Luke xviii. 31. But how did our High Priest, when he was about to make an atonement, at the same time present before God the rebellious Jews, who were to be given up to the devil? To say, that they were presented before God, so far as they were sanctified in the root, and were to be the fathers of the sons of the promise, is quite from the purpose. For the rebellious Jews, consigned to the devil, are to be wholly distinguished from the holy root, from which those degenerate branches took their rise, and from the children of the promise, who were to descend from them, in their appointed time. *These*, certainly, the priest daily presented to God in the names of the twelve tribes, which he wore on his breast: the very same he also now presented to God, though without that symbol. But it cannot be explained, how the high priest, when making atonement, could present *those* to God, if by this goat they were represented as the portion of the serpent.

LXVI. 3. After both the goats, which were purchased for God at the common expence of the whole people, were consecrated to God, by bringing them before Jehovah, to the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, Aaron was commanded to find out by lot, which was for *Jehovah*, and which for *Azazel*, because this was unknown both to the people, and the priest, till the lot determined it. But it scarce admits of a favorable meaning, if that which fell to *Azazel*, was the figure of the rebellious Jews. For that sortition, or

decision by lot, must be referred either to the figure, or to the thing represented. That it cannot be referred to the thing represented, is plain. For the Israelites neither ought, nor could have any doubt, which should fall to the devil, Christ or the rebellious Jews, so there was no need to make a trial of it by lot. What pious ears would not be offended, to hear any person assert, that the high priest, at the command of God, cast lots between Christ and the rebellious Jews, whether he or they should be offered to the Lord? I imagine none will contend with me on this point. Though the wicked Jews had a controversy with Christ concerning the priesthood, yet it was not proper for that to be decided by lot, but, as was really done, by a demonstration from the sacred writings. It therefore follows that the casting of lots here regarded the goats themselves, since it was unknown what each of them was to prefigure. Moreover, as both were purchased at the common expence, for the benefit of the whole people of Israel, and consecrated to the service of God; neither the one nor the other seems adapted symbolically to represent those who were to be given up to the devil. For though the goat fell by lot to Azazel, yet it ceased not to be the Lord's. The very learned Frismuthus speaks to the purpose, *de hircu emiss. dissert. 2. § 14.* "We must not think, that the former goat alone was consecrated to God. For as both were usually presented before him, it is evident, that the goat on which the lot fell for Azazel, was also the Lord's, as even R. Nachman has granted. *But that the one on which the lot fell for the Lord, did peculiarly and by special right become the Lord's, was because it was slain upon the altar. Such a sacrifice offered in honor of God is called, in the Hebrew phraseology, the bread of God, Lev. xxi. 6. Which ap-*

*pellation could not be given to the other, that was to be sent to Azazel, it being appointed to be separated from the flock, and carried to remote places, to be exposed, perhaps, to the teeth of wild beasts."* The goat therefore, which is, and in the whole ceremony remains consecrated to God, seems not adapted to be allotted for a symbol of those, who on all accounts were to be the slaves of the devil.

LXVII. 4. A strong argument may be taken likewise from the imposition of the hands of the priest, and of the sins of Israel, with those prayers of the high priest and applause of the people, we mentioned *sect. 43.* which are very easily applied to Christ, when he bore, according to his own and his Father's will, and the wishes of all the godly, the sins of the whole mystical Israel. And if any thing was to be represented to the Jews on the day of expiation, certainly this was the thing, which is the alone foundation of a true expiation. But very difficultly, nay indeed, in my judgment, on no account, can that which is signified, in the sacred ceremonies, by the imposition of hands and of sins, be referred to the rebellious Jews, whom the faithful Israelites never constituted to stand in their room and stead. Do they, the most abandoned of mankind, *who please not God, and are contrary to all men,* 1 Thess. i. 15. bear the iniquities of all Israel, laid upon them by the priest, into an uninhabited land, carrying them far away from Israel? Why do we yield so much to that most pestilent sect the Socinians, as to go to overturn an argument for the satisfaction of Christ, hitherto happily defended from this rite, by this extravagant fiction?

LXVIII. In fine, who can digest so hard a saying, *it appears, how justly the vessels of wrath may be said to bear the sins of the faithful?* Which of the prophets or apostles ever said so? Is this to speak with the scrip-



tures? Who has to this day ever heard, that *those make all the sins of all men their own, who refuse to confess their own?* or, that *all the sins ever committed, are avenged on the rebellious Jews?* This is an imputation of sin altogether new and unknown in the schools of divines. Certainly, our modesty forbids us to dispute against that right of God, whereby he punishes the sins of parents in their children, and posterity, which he himself, such is his clemency, usually confines to the third and fourth generation of those that hate him. Nor is it lawful for us to deny, that the severity of God's anger may at times burn to a farther degree, if the sins are above measure atrocious; and posterity shall, for a long series, not only equal, but even exceed their ancestors in wickedness. God was pleased to give us an example of this in the wicked Jews, according to that threatening prophecy of Christ, Matth. xxiii. 35. Luke xi. 50. "So that from this instance his wrath might be seen, burning from the beginning of the world against hypocrites, enemies of righteousness, and murderers;" as the learned person very well speaks elsewhere. But that "all the sins of all men are punished in some one person or people," I don't remember that I ever read or heard till now: neither that "the wicked bear the sins of the faithful." I know that, when God in pathetic language, Is. xliii. 3, 4. commends his love towards Israel, he declares, that he gave the Egyptians, Ethiopians, and Sabeans for their ransom, and *other men and people for their life.* But, as our Calvin judiciously observes, the prophet borrowed that way of speaking from the common method of men, as if he had said, "The Egyptians, Ethiopians, and Sabeans have been substituted for thee, and, as it were, by way of exchange, forced to undergo that destruction, which was hanging over thee: for, that I might save thee, I

have destroyed them; and turned against them the power of the enemy, that was ready to fall upon thee." Or, to return to the learned person's own words: "The meaning of that passage is; Such is my esteem for thee, that I am to bring to nought the greatest and most flourishing empires of the world, in order to relieve and comfort thee." This, certainly, is quite different from bearing the sins of the faithful, as was typically done by the goat.

LXIX. It is with joy we learn from Paul, that the time will come, when all Israel shall be saved, after the fulness of the Gentiles is come in. But we think, this cannot be inferred from these words, *The scape-goat shall be presented alive before Jehovah to make an atonement with it.* The learned persons themselves teach us that NGAL sometimes signifies an *instrument*, as Gen. xxvii. 40. Deut. xiii. 8. And why not here? that the meaning should be, *to make an atonement with or by it.* We shall presently shew, how this is done by the live goat.

LXX. Others therefore, and, if I can form any judgment, to better purpose, affirm, that this scape-goat, no less than that which was killed, was a type of Christ. But these again run into different sentiments. Some maintain, that here are represented the two natures of Christ, the human, to be exposed to misery and torment; the other, the divine, as being impassible, to remain free and to live for ever; which Cornelius a Lapide relates, was the opinion of Theodoret, Isychius, and Cyril. Others say, that the twofold state of Christ, before and after his resurrection, was here set forth. Thus the slain goat was the type of Christ lifted upon the cross; but that sent away alive, of the same Christ raised from the dead, and living for evermore. Of this opinion, after Augustine and Procopius, were Bochart

and other celebrated divines. Yet two things seem very much to oppose this sentiment: 1. That the sins of Israel were laid upon the live goat: but Christ rose from the dead, and entered into glory *without sin*, Heb. ix. 28. 2. That the same goat, as loaded with sin, was accounted unclean, so that the person who conveyed it into the wilderness, stood in need of cleansing, ver. 26. But no uncleanness can so much as be conceived to be in Christ after his resurrection.

LXXI. Others therefore, to whom I readily yield, imagine that a twofold relation of Christ the Mediator is signified; the one to God the Judge, to whom satisfaction was to be made by the merit of his death; the other, to the devil his enemy, with whom he was to encounter by the efficacy of his life. With respect to the former, the goat to be slain, fell to God: in the latter respect, the live goat fell to Azazel. Let us add, that, in the slain goat, a true expiation of sin was represented, which is performed by shedding of blood and undergoing punishment: but in the other, the effect of this expiation; namely, the removing and taking away of sin, by the bearing it away so far as never to come into the sight of God against us. And this seems to be the reason of the order, why, after slaying the former goat, sins were laid on the other, to be carried a great way off. Because there could be no taking away of sin *without shedding of blood*. Both indeed was done in the ordinary sacrifices: but, because the latter was not so evident in the other sacrifices, God was pleased to set it forth by a peculiar symbol in this solemn festival, for the greater consolation of his people. And thus the riches of the divine goodness and wisdom manifestly appear, when he laid before the eyes of his people, by different types, all the relations of Christ the Redeemer,

which could not be distinctly exhibited in one single piece or picture.

LXXII. But let us more particularly illustrate the analogy. 1. The sins of Israel were laid on this goat, that he might bear them. Christ truly bears, and by bearing takes away the sins of the whole world. And as Aaron laid both his hands on the head of the goat, so the hand of God lay very heavy and grievous on our Surety. 2. This goat was appointed by lot for Azazel: not that this brute creature, which was consecrated to God, might be offered to the evil spirit, but exposed to be tormented by the devil, who very much resides in solitary places, *Matth. xii. 43.* Now the first promise shews, that Christ also, by the divine will, was to be given up to the serpent, who deceived Eve, *Gen. iii. 15. Thou shalt bruise his heel.* And Christ himself says, *John xiv. 30, 31. The prince of this world cometh and hath nothing in me: but that the world may know, that I love the Father; and as the Father give me commandment, even so I do.* That is, "The devil, indeed, has no right in me, who am, and as I am, perfectly holy, nor can he ever prevail against me: yet he is come out to combat with me, to vex, and even to slay me, because I have interposed in the room of those who deserve death. But I go out cheerfully to meet him; to the end my obedience and love to my Father may appear to all the world." 3. The goat was to be sent to a wilderness, and a land not inhabited: and such was the whole world, such above all was Judea, when Christ came to suffer there. Scarce any harvest of faith, truth, and piety was to be found there; nothing but unfruitfulness, every where the thistle and prickly thorn arose. And why may we not apply to this, what *Matthew* relates concerning Christ, when he was carried by the Spirit into the wilderness, there to be tempted

by the devil? Matth. iv. 1. For the wilderness, into which the goat was driven, could not less typify the wilderness in which Christ was tempted, than the wood on which the serpent was raised, typified the wood on which Christ was lifted up. 4. The hand of a fit man, by which the goat was sent away (which, by a constant tradition of the Jews, might be done as well by a stranger as by an Israelite) seems to denote the power of those who rose up against Christ, namely, *the Gentiles and people of Israel*, Acts iv. 27. and above all, Pilate, who had caused Christ to be carried without the gate, loaded with the cross, the symbol of a curse, when he was to encounter with the devil for the last time.

LXXIII. I acknowledge I have learned these things, partly from \* Turretine, partly from Cocceius himself. The former explains this opinion in a large discourse, and with cogency and success defends the argument deduced from it, for the satisfaction of Christ, against the Socinians, *de verit. satisfact. Christi*, p. 3. § 22, 23. But the words of the latter in *Comment. ad Heb. c. 9. § 25. seq.* as far at least as they are to our purpose, very well deserve to be inserted here. He says, “ It is evident from Ezek. xx. 35. that Christ was to come to Israel, when Israel was, as it were, *in the wilderness* ;

\* Turretine concludes § 3. with these words. But, as I formerly said, it seems to be more simple, that the two goats signify nothing, but the perfect expiation which Christ made ; who not only bore our sins in his death, but took them away by his resurrection ; not only satisfied by the offering of himself, but demonstrated the perfection and truth of his satisfaction by his discharge, whereby we are assured that our sins, being translated from us and laid upon him, are carried away, so that there is now no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus, Rom. viii. 1. and that of Paul is fulfilled, that he was delivered for our offences, and raised again for *our justification*, Rom. iv. 25.

but that was when Judea was a Roman province, and had a Roman governor: for then it was a part of the *wilderness of the people*. And it is plain enough that, by the dragon, Rev. xii. is represented the Roman people. He made himself ready to devour Christ, as soon as he was born. Moreover, *the first promise declares*, Gen. iii. 17. that Christ was to be given up into the hands of the devil, who deceived Eve, under the appearance of a serpent. The Jews ascribe this to Samael. As therefore the slaying of the one goat represents the death of Christ, and the shedding of his blood; so the sending away of the other goat into a place uncultivated and desert, denotes the delivering of Christ into the hands of the devil, who has the power of death, in order to vex and disquiet him; *and that by the hands of sinners, and of such men, to whom the land was subject, like the rest of the wilderness of the people, and a part thereof. That this was done by the appointment and will of God, Christ himself declares*, John xiv. 30, 31. *As if he should say, The Prince of this world, who has nothing in me, is come to exercise his cruelty upon me; which will happen, to the end that my obedience may appear to the world. We have therefore a figure of a twofold delivering up of Christ. First, of that, by which he delivered up himself, as Priest. Secondly, of that by which he was given up into the hands of sinners, or the Gentiles.*" Thus far Cocceius. To the like purpose, the very learned Momma, *Oecon. Temp. tom. i. lib. ii. c. xi. § 36. seq.* where, after explaining the same opinion with neatness and elegance, and proving it from scripture, he then subjoins: "We might rest contented with these things, and proceed to others." Let therefore none be offended, that being satisfied with these things, which exhibit a doctrine sound and cer-

tain, I pass over other things, in which I find neither that soundness nor that certainty.

LXXIV. Very lately were published the *Taria Sacra* of the very famous John Vander Waeyen, in which are two dissertations concerning the goat Azazel; the former of which is principally levelled at me. But I would neither have my reader, nor the illustrious author ignorant, how much I have profited by the perusal of that dissertation. By it I was really brought under a kind of necessity, to consider more accurately the whole of this subject. Which I have also endeavoured to do with a mind so free from, and divested of all prejudices, as if I had never written any thing on the point before. Nor do I conceal, that from thence I had an opportunity to explain some things more clearly, others also more distinctly, and to set a keener edge on my arguments, than I had done in the former editions of this book. On that account therefore, if he will accept of it, I return him my thanks. But then he must suffer me to say, that I have not found reasons cogent enough in his dissertation to render his opinion more probable, or mine less so. While he opposes my sentiment, and seems to charge it with many inconveniences, he opposes what Dr. Cocceius himself has dexterously explained, and confirmed by scripture-testimonies, and, as far as I know, never condemned or disapproved; though he superadded another opinion. But I could never yet think it probable, that one and the same ceremony should signify things so very remote from one another. As for my particular, I leave the entire decision of this controversy with the equitable reader; who, if he is not wiser than us both, may profit by our writings. But as to the manner in which the illustrious person manages the dispute, I imagine, I have very weighty

grounds of complaint. Whoever happens to enter the lists with him, contend indeed on unequal terms. While he thinks, he may say what he will against others, he gives no quarter to any expression of his opponent, if it has but the least appearance of harshness in it; and assuming to himself what is the prerogative of God alone, canvasses not only the heart and inmost principles of the thoughts, but also boldly pronounces what sentence upon them he thinks proper. Indeed I should appear ridiculous, was I seriously to ward off from myself the grudge conceived against Cocceius, as the origin and the cause of this dissension. Every page in my book shews my esteem for that celebrated person. And though I cannot assent to him in every particular with an implicit faith, yet I never once dreamed of charging him with heresy: much less in this controversy, where the dispute is not so much about a doctrinal point, as about the mystical signification of some Mosaic institutions, without any detriment to our common faith. In which kind of subjects if I may not be allowed, for John Vander Waeyen, the liberty to dissent, in what pray shall I be allowed it? But I will suffer no mortal ever to deprive me of this liberty. But, good Sir, whenever I am to dispute, I desire my method of writing may be as different from yours as possible. While your language breathes nothing but harshness, mine shall be all mildness. As in this dispute I have struck out every word, that had but the least tendency to harshness, and substituted softer. And let this suffice, by way of specimen, concerning the types.



## C H A P. VII.

*Of the Sacraments of Grace down to Abraham.*

**W**E have explained with what wisdom and condescension God saw it proper to confirm and seal the promises of his covenants by certain sacred symbols. As he did this under the covenant of works, so especially he was likewise pleased to do the same upon introducing the covenant of grace. To which, under whatever œconomy it stood, he apprehended, as it were, certain peculiar signs and seals, which the church has, now for many ages past, been accustomed to call sacraments. In some of the types, which we have already explained, and in others of the like nature, there was also indeed something sacramental; as they prefigured the Messiah, and the spiritual benefits he was to procure for his people: yet more especially we call by the name of sacraments, those things which were given by God to man, to be seals of his covenant, or earnest and pledges of his favor.

II. And these again were, indeed, very different; consisting either in things natural, on which God inscribed that character in order to be vouchers and seals of his testaments. To which Calvin refers Noah's ark, *Instit. lib. iv. c. 14. § 18.* or in things miraculous; such as the manna, which was rained down from heaven, and the water issuing out of the rock, which constituted the miraculous meat and drink of the Israelites in the wilderness: or in certain ceremonies, and sacred rites, instituted by God to represent spiritual things. Some were also *extraordinary*, in favor of some certain persons, and but of a short continuance. Others *ordina-*

ry, given for the use of the whole church, and not to cease but with that particular œconomy of the covenant. And hence it is, that, in reckoning up the sacraments of the Old Testament, divines are not agreed; for some take the term in a larger extent, and others in a more restricted sense. We are not inclined to confine ourselves within too narrow bounds; but shall freely and calmly consider, according to our capacity, what has any relation to a sacrament, in every period of time.

III. Some would have the first sacrament of the covenant of grace to be the *ejection of man out of paradise*, and blocking up his access to the tree of life, lest he should put forth his hand and eat of it, thinking that he should thereby obtain eternal life. For man being deprived of this sacrament of works, was, at the same time, given to know, that righteousness was to be sought for from another covenant; and thus he was led by the hand from the covenant of works to the covenant of grace. But we cannot be satisfied with these things.

1. Because man's ejection out of paradise, and exclusion from the tree of life, were the effects of the divine wrath and vengeance against his sin, as appears from that truly-holy, but stinging irony: *Behold the man is become as one of us*. But the institution of a sacrament is an act of the highest goodness and mercy. We deny not, that man was already received into favor, and had the hopes of eternal life: nevertheless some things were inflicted upon him because of his transgression, that he might, by his loss, experience the direful nature of sin, and God's hatred of it. Among these was this ignominious ejection out of paradise. It was an instance of grace and favor, that God placed him in paradise immediately upon his creation, but of wrath, that he turned him out when he had sinned. 2. This ejection doubt-

less declared, that man could not now obtain salvation by the covenant of works, and that he who was deprived of the thing signified, was unworthy to use and enjoy the sign; and that it was in vain, and to no purpose, for him to please himself with the thoughts of it. But it by no means shewed, that there was another covenant, by which righteousness could either be sought for, or obtained. Adam was to know, and he did know this elsewhere. 3. Every thing, upon the supposition of the promise of the covenant of grace, that, by convincing man of his own impotency, leads him to that covenant, is not to be esteemed a sacrament of it. For then every demonstration of God's wrath from heaven against sinners, and every sign which is proper to give us an intimation of the curse of the covenant of works, in a word, every chastisement, as all these are appointed to bring the elect to Christ, should be called sacraments of the covenant of grace.

IV. According to my judgment, the learned have much more probably ranged them in this manner: That God first of all dealt with fallen Adam about sacraments; that is, when the aprons of fig-leaves, which man sewed together, were not at all sufficient to cover the shame of his nakedness, he himself clothed Adam and his wife with coats of skins, Gen. iii. 21. And it is very probable, these were the skins of those beasts which were slain for sacrifices. But it is a vain controversy, which some make about the matter of those garments: since the Hebrew word *xeor* is never used in scripture to signify any thing, but the outward skin of animals. And as this is the most simple and plain, so it is the most ancient kind of clothing. See Job xxxi. 20. Prov. xxvii. 26. Hence the ancient heroes among the Greeks were clothed with the skins of a wild boar, or a tyger, or a lion, or the skin of the Lybian bear, or

the skin worn by the Bacchæ, or female priests of Bacchus, which was that of a fox. And who now is ignorant, that the progenitors of the Romans were clothed with skins, and were of a rude disposition of mind? See Vossius, *de idololatria*, lib. iii. cap. 70. It is a curious observation of Mr. Cloppenburgh, *Schola Sacrificiorum*, p. 12. Here we may see the original of that law in Lev. vii. 8. by which the skin of any man's burnt-offering is appropriated to the priest, who offers it. And who will deny, that God's clothing our first parents was a symbolical act? Do not Christ's own words very clearly allude to this? Rev. iii. 18. *I counsel thee to buy of me white raiment, that thou mayst be clothed, and that the shame of thy nakedness do not appear.* Compare Joh. Henrici Ursini *Analecta*, lib. vi. cap. 15.

V. The mystical similitude of these things is this.

1. That clothing which man contrived for himself, could not cover him, so as to appear before the eyes of God. In like manner, nothing, that a sinner can work or toil by his own industry, or wisdom falsely so called, can produce any thing, that can procure him a just and well-grounded confidence, by which he may appear before the tribunal of God. *Their webs, which are spiders webs, shall not become garments, neither shall they cover themselves with their works*, Is. lix. 5, 6.
2. Proper garments for men were the gift of God's mercy; and so that righteousness, by which our sins are covered, is of God, Phil. iii. 9. contrived by God, perfected by Christ, who is God, and applied to us by the Spirit of God through faith.
3. The bodies of our first parents were covered with the spoils of mortality, and the skins of slain animals. The garment of grace, whereby the body of sin is covered, is owing to the very death of Christ, without which that righteousness, which makes us acceptable to God, could not have been performed.
- 4.

That simple clothing of the first man was, in its appointed time, to be changed for one more convenient and fine. And this garment, which we have from God, while we are under the cross and partakers of the death of Christ, and which in external appearance is mean and despicable, shall afterwards be changed. For since we shall be partakers of Christ's resurrection, no longer in hope, but in reality; so the garment, which now appears to be mean and contemptible, shall be then most neat and beautiful, and worthy to be accounted the nuptial robe. See Peter Martyr and Musculus.

VI. The other sacrament of that first period were the sacrifices, which were slain at God's command, after the very first promulgation of the covenant of grace; as appears, 1. Because Abel *offered by faith*, Heb. xi. 4. that is, he knew, that himself and his sacrifice were acceptable to God, and in his offering he looked by faith to the future offering of the Messiah. But such a faith plainly presupposes the divine institution of sacrifices, and a revelation about their signification. 2. Because God gave that testimony to the sacrifices of the ancient patriarchs, whereby he declared they were acceptable to him, *ibid.* But, in the matters of religion, nothing pleases him, but what himself has commanded. All will-worship is condemned, Col. ii. 23. 3. Because there was a distinction between clean and unclean animals before the deluge, which was not from nature, but from the mere good pleasure of God, and has a particular respect to sacrifices. And it is probable, that this was the case of every kind of sacrifices, even of those that were of a propitiatory nature, by which the promises of the covenant of grace were more clearly and distinctly ratified, than by all the others. For while Moses shews, that the patriarchs offered such sacrifices as he himself offered, and that they were adapted to

signify the same things, it is not for us to restrict what is said in general, to certain particular kinds, in exclusion of others. Certainly, Job offered burnt-offerings for the sins of his children and friends, Job i. 6. and Job xlii. 8. which doubtless were propitiatory.

VII. But these sacrifices were seals of God's covenant. For though there is a difference between sacrifices and sacraments formally considered; because sacraments are given by God to men, but sacrifices are offered by men to God: nevertheless there is no reason, why the consideration of a sacrament and sacrifice may not, in different respects, concur in one and the same thing. For even sacrifices are given by God to men, that is, are instituted by divine authority; that, by these ceremonies, the coming of the Son of God in the flesh, and his bloody death, and the remission of sins thereby, might be signified and sealed. And believers, in the use of them, declared for that worship and veneration that is due to God. Augustine, *de civit Dei*, lib. 10. c. 5. says, "The visible sacrifice is a sacrament, that is, a sacred sign of an invisible sacrifice." To make this more evident, let us distinctly consider, I. The priest offering. II. The animal offered. III. The ceremony of offering. IV. The empyrism, or burning it by fire from heaven. V. The expiation, which is the consequent of the sacrifice. VI. The sacred feast annexed to sacrifices.

VIII. The priests were, in a manner, typical sureties, in so far as they approached to God in the name of the people; being *ordained for men in things pertaining to God*, Heb. v. 1. And they became sureties, whenever they took upon them to offer sacrifices for sin. For, by that offering, they performed what God, at that time, required for the expiation of sins, Lev. i. 4. and Lev. iv. 26, &c. and Lev. xvi. 34. And thus be-

lievers were assured, that Christ is the Surety of an eternal testament ; who, immediately on man's first sin, undertook to fulfil the whole will of God, at the appointed time, and to offer a sacrifice, which should be the cause not of a typical, as formerly, but of a true and saving expiation. By which will of God and of Christ *we are sanctified*, Heb. x. 10.

IX. In the *animal*, which is offered, we should consider, 1. That it was to be clean, without spot or blemish : that it might signify that most unspotted purity of Christ, *as of a lamb without blemish and without spot*, 1 Pet. i. 19. 2. That it was to be such as was given to man for food, by the use of which food man continues to be what he is. And therefore such an animal might be substituted for man himself, and, in the typical signification, be a sponsor, partaking of the same flesh and blood with us. 3. That it was to be such as men set a great value upon : *The goats are the price of the field*, Prov. xxvii. 26. Of old, flocks and herds were the only or principal riches. Accordingly Columella, *in præfat.* lib. 7. conjectures, that the names *pecunia* (money) and *peculium* (private property) seem to be derived from *pecus* (a beast) which not only the ancients possessed, but are, at this day among some nations, reputed the only kind of riches. By this was represented, that Christ was to be offered for men ; and as he is the choice and beloved of his Father, and his blood infinitely more precious than gold and silver ; so he should also *be most precious* to us, *who believe*, 1 Pet. ii. 4, 6, 7. 4. That it be an animal, dumb before its shearers and slayer, in order to be an hieroglyphic of that unspeakable patience which was illustrious in Christ. 5. That the firstlings were most acceptable to God ; which therefore Abel offered ; and God afterwards required under

the law, Exod. xiii. 12. By this emblem we may discern that pre-eminence of Christ, whereby he is the first born among many brethren, both as to inheritance and dignity. For none comes to the inheritance but by Christ, nor to any other inheritance but what was his before.

X. These following particulars belong to the rite of offering. 1. The priest laid upon the propitiatory sacrifices the sins of those for whom they were to be offered; which is plain from the names, *sin*, *guilt*, by which the sacrifices themselves are usually called, and the thing itself shews it. For as in reality none but the guilty are punished; so in the type also, that which is appointed to die for sin, is typically under the guilt of sin. And thus far the priests represented God, as laying sin upon Christ; and the sacrifices were a figure of Christ, as suffering for sin. 2. The blood of the sacrifices was shed, when they were slain, to be a symbol of Christ shedding his blood, when he was put to death. 3. The slain sacrifices were burnt on the altar. This represented, that Christ was to be consumed by the flames of his love for his Father and his elect, and at the same time by the flames of the divine wrath against sin, which he had undertaken to bear. 4. Together with the flames and smoke, there was a sweet-smelling savour that ascended up to heaven; on which account, sacrifices are said to be acceptable to God; nay, also the food of God. This shadowed forth that most grateful fragranciness of Christ's sacrifice, by the efficacy of which all the severity of the divine vengeance is changed into the most tender love for the elect.

XI. The *accension*, or miraculous consuming the sacrifices by fire, seems to be contemporary with sacrifices themselves: and the opinion of some excellent divines is very probable, that God had such a regard to Abel's



gift, as in this manner to set it on fire ; while Cain's was neglected. For at the time when sacrifices were in use, God generally testified, by fire from heaven, that they were acceptable to him, when offered in faith ; *A burning lamp passed between the pieces*, Gen. xv. 17. See also Lev. ix. 24. Judg. vi. 21. 2 Chron. vii. 1. And this burning of the sacrifices by fire from heaven, being the most certain token of the divine acceptance, was prayed for, Psal. xx. 3. *Remember all thy offerings, and accept (reduce to ashes) thy burnt-sacrifice.* This fire from heaven signified the Holy Spirit, by whose flames whatever is not set on fire, cannot be an acceptable sacrifice to God ; and by which Christ also offered himself to God without spot ; by which, in fine, he baptizes his people, that both they and their actions may be pleasing to God. We may see, what John the Baptist says ; *He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire*, Matth. iii. 11. For this burning of the sacrifices we are now speaking of, was, in all respects, a typical baptism of fire, that came suddenly from heaven, after the other typical baptism of water, wherein the hands and feet of those who approached the altar, were washed, Exod. xl. 20, 31, 32. as Cloppenburg has ingeniously observed, *Schol. sacrific.* p. 65.

XII. When the sacrifice was duly performed, the *expiation* followed ; which consisted in this, that God was satisfied with the sacrifice, which he graciously accepted, and that when the guilt of the sin, laid on the sacrifice, was, together with the sacrifice, typically abolished, the wrath of God was appeased, the raging plague stayed, and God gave tokens of his favor to the sinner. For this reason, the atonement for the soul is ascribed to the sacrifices, Lev. xvii. 11. namely, a typical and sacramental one. See what we advanced sect. 3. *Sacramental*, I say, because that typical ex-

piation was a sacrament or sign of the true expiation, which all believers obtain in Christ. And those types prefigured, that God, from the very first notification of the gospel, acquiesced in Christ's undertaking to make satisfaction for sins, in the fulness of time, by which they might be truly expiated. And in this sense, Paul declares, that the blood of Christ purges the conscience from dead works; as the blood of bulls and of goats sanctified formerly to the purifying of the flesh, Heb. ix. 12, 13. For this last prefigured and sealed the former on supposition of the faith of the offerers.

XIII. There was, last of all, a sacred *feast* kept before Jehovah, upon the offered gifts and sacrifices, which were not entirely consumed by fire: this, under the Mosaic law, was the case especially with those sacrifices, which were called *peace-offerings*, Lev. vii. 15. Which word the Greeks have rendered ΕΙΡΕΝΙΚΑ; the Latins, *pacifica*: others prefer, ΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΤΙΚΑ. But *confession*, or *thanksgiving*, is one of the kinds of this sort of sacrifices, Lev. vii. 12. and these were also *propitiatory*; as appears from the imposition of hands, which denotes the imposition of sins, Lev. iii. 2, 8, 13. And therefore it has not been improperly observed by a learned person, that the reason and notation of the name seems to be; that, in this sacrifice, there was in some measure a *perfection*, a *consummation*. For burnt-offerings were entirely consumed, and no body eat of them: of the others the priest eat; of the last, even any private person, whose sacrifice it was, Deut. xii. 6, 7. To which the apostle has an eye, 1 Cor. x. 18. *Are not they which eat of the sacrifices, partakers of the altar?* This was a sacrament of communion, which they who approach to God, have with the altar and the true priest: and a symbol of that communion, which all believers have among themselves in Christ; whereby

Christ and all his benefits, and all the gifts of every believer in particular, are the gifts of all, as belonging to the same body. Paul intimates, that to this feast the holy supper answers, as an antitype, 1 Cor. x. 16, 17, 18. In this manner the grace of God and the benefits of Christ were signified and sealed to believers in the sacrifices.

XIV. But there was in them no less a *reminding of the duty* which believers owe to God, and to which they bound themselves by the use of the sacrifices. 1. There was in sacrifices a confession of sin and guilt. For there were no sacrifices before the fall. And the animals, which the offerers substituted for themselves, as oxen, sheep, goats, &c. signified some fault. For the ox is an emblem of ignorance, Is. i. 3. the sheep, of wandering, Is. liii. 6. the goat, of petulance and mischievousness, Matth. xxv. 33. And the slaying and burning the sacrifices extorted from man a confession, that he deserved eternal death, and to be scorched in the flames of divine justice.

XV. 2. There was likewise in sacrifices an excitement to the practice of holiness and real goodness. 1. It was not lawful to offer any thing to God, but from among clean animals, which were given to man for food. Thus, *pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father, is this, to keep himself unspotted from the world*, Jam. i. 27. 2. Nothing was to be offered, but what was sound, without blemish, or defect in any part; not the blind, the deaf, the maimed, the lame, the languid and the sick, Mal. i. 13. Thus, which will also be a thing acceptable to God, we ought to serve him with all our faculties, with all attention and intention, with a right judgment, a *sound heart*, a cheerful will, and to consecrate all our members to him; because God requires *perfection*, Matth. v. 48. 3. The animals appointed for

sacrifice, had something peculiarly adapted to represent those virtues, which ought to be in those that approach to God. Oxen are both patient in labour, and obstinately resist what is hurtful to them : sheep and goats know their shepherd, and hear his voice, without listening to that of a stranger, John x. 4, 6. Polybius, *lib.* 12. not far from the beginning, relates a remarkable story concerning goats, with respect to this particular. And then they are led to the slaughter without murmur or noise, Is. liii. 7. All these things should in a spiritual sense be in those who are devoted to God.

XVI. 3. By the offering of the sacrifice is signified, 1. That our old man, with all his lusts, should be slain to the honor of God. 2. That it is equal and just, that the whole man, who endeavours to please God, should present himself before him in the exercise of faith and love, and with his heart inflamed, or a desire to have it inflamed with zeal, as *a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God*, Rom. xii. 1. 3. As sacrifices consumed with strange fire, were displeasing to God ; so is every act of worship, that has not the Spirit of God for its author, or does not proceed from heavenly love. They who *kindle a fire, and compass themselves about with sparks, shall go into the fire, and the sparks they have kindled*, Is. i. 11. *Though one should give his body to be burned, and has not charity, it profiteth nothing*, 1 Cor. xiii. 3. 4. That we ought to consecrate to God not only ourselves, but also our all : for, as we hinted above, riches formerly consisted chiefly in herds and flocks ; and Paul tells us, that the *doing good and communicating are sacrifices, with which God is well pleased*, Heb. xiii. 16. 5. That our very lives ought not to be dear to us ; but when God calls us to it, we are willingly to lay them down for his glory, Phil. ii. 17. *Yea, and if I be offered*

*upon the sacrifice and service of your faith, I joy and rejoice with you all.*

XVII. We are next to speak of the RAINBOW, which was given for a sign of the covenant made with Noah, Gen. ix. 12.—16. And here we are, first, to consider, what covenant it was : and then, how the rainbow was a sign of the covenant.

XVIII. Concerning the *covenant*, we observe the following things. 1. That it was not formally and precisely the covenant of grace. For here there is no mention of a spiritual and saving benefit ; and then the promises of this covenant are not only made to Noah and his elect seed, but to all men, to every living creature without exception, fowl, cattle and every beast of the earth ; an universality this not to be found in the covenant of grace. God indeed says, when he speaks of the covenant of grace made with the church, Is. liv. 9. *For this is as the waters of Noah unto me, &c.* nevertheless, by these words, God does not declare, that the covenant made with the church was, in every respect, of the same nature with that universal covenant, which secured the world from being destroyed by a deluge. He only runs the parallel between both, with respect to permanency and stability : just in the same manner, that he compares his covenant made with Israel, with the covenant concerning day and night, Jer. xxxiii. 25.

XIX. 2. However, it would not be consistent with the divine perfections, to make such a covenant with every living creature, but on supposition of a covenant of grace, and with a respect to it. For all the patience of God, in the preservation of the world, which was stained with so many crimes, and of men, who more than deserved an avenging deluge, was ordained for the elect, whose salvation God intended, and for whose sake all other things are preserved, to be subservient to

the promoting their salvation, 2 Pet. iii. 9. "It is a question," says Pareus, "whether it is a different covenant from the former in Gen. vi. 18. and from the covenant of grace?" *Ans.* "Certainly it is another with respect to the earthly promise, which is common to men, beasts, and the earth, and as to its peculiar sign. Yet it is the same as to origin and grace; for God would not have adopted the sons of Noah into that covenant, unless he had first received them into the covenant of grace. It is therefore an appendage of the covenant of grace with regard to an earthly promise."

XX. 3. Nay, in this covenant there is a confirmation and a typical representation of the covenant of grace. I shall here use the words of Peter Martyr. "This we are carefully to remark; though, in this covenant, God promised to deliver men, as to their bodily life, that they should not perish in the waters; yet in this there was a shadow or type of the deliverance from eternal death; namely, they should not be overwhelmed with eternal damnation. And besides, as this is held forth by a shadow, believers may also form an argument to this purpose: If God thus provides for those that trust in him, as to give them assurance, without doubting, of their deliverance from the waters; how much more will he deliver their souls, their better part, not from a momentary, but from an eternal death? If he is so careful in these things of less moment, how much more, about what concerns the sum of our happiness?" See Owen's *Theologumena*, lib. iii. c. 1. And since we should observe, that, previous to this, there was a symbol of the covenant of grace, whose antitype was baptism, 1 Pet. iii. 21. in the deluge and the ark of Noah, which contained, as it were, the universal seeds of the whole world; why should we not take notice of a con-

firmation of the covenant of grace in the promise, that no deluge should any more come upon the earth?

XXI. Concerning the *rainbow* we remark these following things. 1. As that covenant, of which the rainbow was given to be a sign, was not precisely and formally the covenant of grace, so the rainbow should not be accounted a sacrament, strictly and properly so called: and it is also very impertinent to call it a third sacrament of the New Testament. However, the signs of the covenant of grace, in a way of proportion, bear the very same relation, that the rainbow bore in sealing or ratifying this covenant: and therefore our writers effectually argue from this topic against Bellarmine, who obstinately denies, that the promises of the covenant are sealed or ratified by the sacraments.

XXII. 2. But then, as this covenant presupposed, and, in its universality, implied the covenant of grace, we are not to deny, but the promises of it were also sealed to believers by the rainbow. Hence John mentions a rainbow, Rev. iv. 3. and Rev. x. 1. which he saw *round about the throne and the head of Christ*: “that we may acknowledge,” says Rivet, *Exercit.* 60. *in Genesis*, “That Christ’s throne is encompassed with mercy, and that he shews it on his countenance, whenever he manifests himself. But especially, that in his face we have that rainbow, by which we are assured, not only that the waters shall no more overflow the whole earth; but especially, that we are not to be afraid of the deluge of divine wrath, seeing Christ has reconciled the Father, so that while God beholds him, he remembers his mercy and his promises, which in him are Yea and Amen. Christ therefore appears crowned with a rainbow, as the messenger of grace and

peace: for he is *the Prince of peace, and our peace*, Is. ix. 6. Eph. ii. 14."

XXIII. 3. Every sign should have some analogy with the thing signified. This, in such sacred signs, which, by divine institution, represent such and such things, doubtless chiefly depends on the good pleasure of the institutor. However some natural coincidence or agreement with the spiritual thing signified is generally supposed, as appears from an induction of all the ordinary sacraments. What is natural to the rainbow, was likewise so\* before the flood; but its virtue of signifying and sealing the promises was superadded to it by divine institution. We are therefore to take notice of such things in the rainbow, as are proper to represent the patience and grace of God: and they are either *general or more special*.

XXIV. Musculus has judiciously taken notice of the general analogies. 1. God would have this to be an *everlasting covenant*, to continue to the end of the world: and therefore appointed a sign, which not only Noah and his family might view at that time, but also his posterity have before their eyes, while the covenant itself endured. 2. That covenant has the nature of a

\* Some have thought, that there was no rainbow before the flood, because it had been small comfort and assurance to the new world, to see that which had been seen before; but, according to others, it is not likely, that, in the space of sixteen centuries, which were expired before the deluge, the sun should never have darted his rays upon the water in the clouds, in such manner as was necessary to produce a rainbow. Besides, it is not essential to an arbitrary sign, that the matter of it did not subsist before its establishment; it is enough, if it did not subsist as a sign. The rainbow therefore might have often appeared before the flood, but God had never joined to it that idea, which he communicated to Noah, viz. that it was appointed, for the future, to seal the covenant he had made with him, and in his person with all mankind.



testament and last will, is absolute, without depending on any condition of our righteousness and piety. And therefore he hath also added such a sign to it, which we can neither make nor repeat, but can only be produced in the course of the seasons, and, being formed by himself, he proposed to the view of our eyes only, and the meditation of our minds. 3. We are also to consider, *where* he placed the *bow*, the sign of his covenant; and *when* he produces it. For he placed it, where it may be seen by all; namely, *in the heavens*: not in any place of the heavens whatever, but *in the clouds*; he does not produce it but only in time of rain, when thick clouds hang over the earth, and either threaten or actually pour down their showers. Here we must be obliged to acknowledge the singular providence of God; whose goodness calls aloud to every one from those very watery clouds; “Be from henceforth not afraid of them; behold in those very clouds the rainbow, the symbol of my favor, and the sign of the covenant between me and all flesh: what was formerly the instrument of my vengeance, shall now present you with a token of my perpetual grace.”

XXV. But Peter Martyr assigns a more especial analogy from the Jewish doctors, as well in the *figure* as in the *colours*. The bow, says he, is a military instrument. Upon making leagues and concluding a peace, neither arrows nor the string bent are to be seen; but the soldiers carry it, with its horns or extremities down to the earth; but it is otherwise in the time of battle: then they draw its horns together towards their face, that, aiming with the eye, they may throw their arrows at the enemy. In like manner, God being reconciled, has taken out the string, removed the arrows, and turned its horns down to the earth; thereby assuring us, that his anger is appeased.

XXVI. Concerning the *colours* he goes on as follows. From the matter, which is water, and from the nature of the colours, which represent both the light and darkness of water, it appears to be a suitable symbol. For, by this, God has promised, that, for the future, he would so order the waters, that they should not destroy all things : but what represses or restrains waters more than heat, both contained in and signified by light ? This sign, which is mixed with water, has something to give it a check, I mean the light of heaven, whereby God restrains its violence. Grotius observes, that the three colours of the rainbow represent the severity, mercy, and goodness of God. Another learned person thinks, that the colours of the rainbow, red, fiery, and green, signify a mixture of holiness and mercy by means of blood ; that both these, being manifested by the shedding of blood, may render God venerable and lovely in our eyes on account of these perfections of his nature. The same person elsewhere would have us behold in the rainbow the colour of fire, blood, and green grass, and in them to reflect on the zeal of God, the blood of Christ, and on mercy and life : the zeal of God is unto life, by the blood of Christ. Another likewise has observed, that the rainbow, with which John saw the throne of God encompassed, was only of one colour, *in sight like unto an emerald*, Rev. iv. 3. to set forth, that God's gracious covenant with the church is different from the general covenant made with all mankind after the flood. For in this covenant, God, indeed, promised, he would no more cover the whole earth with water ; yet, at times, he hath reduced whole countries to ashes by avenging flame : and therefore the symbol of this covenant was painted out in various colours, the red or fiery colour flashing out between the bright and green. But the sign of the covenant of grace made

with the church is of one colour only, namely, green or emerald; to represent, that this covenant was always one, and always yielding joy to those who are truly in covenant. For in the kingdom of God there is nothing but peace and joy in the Holy Ghost, Rom. xiv. 17. These observations of learned men are curious and judicious, and may be matter of pious meditation: but I doubt whether they will meet with the assent of those of a difficult and nice taste. It is enough, that we have related them. Let the prudent and pious reader judge for himself.

---

## CHAP. VIII.

### *Of Circumcision.*

**L**ET us now speak of *circumcision*. Concerning which we shall take notice of the following things. I. The outward ceremony. II. The divine institution. III. The subject of it. IV. The necessity. V. The minister. VI. The time. VII. The spiritual signification. VIII. Its abrogation.

II. The *rite* of circumcision was, according to God's appointment, as follows. The extreme cuticle or thin skin of the *glans* was cut off with a sharp knife. This, from its natural use, was called NGARLAH by the Hebrews, Gen. xxxiv. 14. from the verb NGARAL, to *close* or *stop up*. The Greek interpreters of the Old Testament, and the writers of the New, express it by an elegant term AKBOBUSTIA, because TO AKRON TES BALAINOU, *it covers the extremity of the glans*. Gomarus, *ad Luc.* ii. 21. has made many learned remarks on this word. The Latins call it *præputium*, a

word of uncertain derivation. On account of circumcision, the Jews were, by way of contempt, and in derision, called *apellæ* and *recutiti*, because they had not that pellicle or skin. But it pleased God, in order to confound all the wisdom of the flesh, and to try the faith and obedience of his people, to give them for a sign of his covenant a rite, so much to be blushed at, and almost ashamed of; just as he also laid the ground-work of all our salvation in what appears no less shameful to flesh, namely, the cross of Christ.

III. The *instrument* of circumcision was any knife they could procure, made of any matter, that was fit to take an edge; namely, of stone, glass, or wood. Yet Buxtorf, in *Synagoga Judaica*, says, that it was generally one of iron, and that very sharp, as surgeons instruments usually are. Some think that knives of stone were formerly used, because the instrument of circumcision, mentioned Exod. iv. 25. is called *razor*, which in Ezek. iii. 9. denotes a *stone*: and in Josh. v. 2. the knives of circumcision are called *swords of stone*. But that inference is not so certain. For *razor*, signifies not only a stone, but also an edge; as is manifest from Ps. lxxxix. 43. *Thou hast turned the edge of his sword*: nor formerly did they fight with swords of stone. Hence the Chaldee paraphrase translates Josh. v. 2. *sharp knives*.

IV. The first *institution* of circumcision, Gen. xvii. 11. was in the house and family of Abraham, about the year of the world\* two thousand. Circumcision was not immediately given to be a public and universal sacrament to the whole church in those times, but was confined to Abraham's family. The remnant of the an-

\* According to the chronology of the learned Archbishop Usher, circumcision was instituted in the year of the world 2197, and before Christ 1897.

cient fathers, satisfied with their sacrificial sacraments, could exercise their faith, and please God, in uncircumcision, without being obliged to submit to this rite. But, after the expiration of about four centuries, when the visible churches without Abraham's family gradually apostatised to Heathenism, the godly remnant being removed to the heavenly assembly; and when the republic of Israel, in the mean time, wonderfully increased, and the measure of iniquity among the nations being now full, the church was confined to Israel, and the rest of the world was rejected; and all that feared God, were bound to join themselves in communion with them, by a participation of the same rites. Well says Maimonides *in Issure Bia*, c. 13. "Whenever any Gentile would betake himself to the Israelitish covenant, and put himself under the wings of the Divine Majesty, and take upon him the yoke of the law, there were required circumcision, baptism, and a voluntary offering." From that time, circumcision became an universal sacrament of the church. Thus the Lord Jesus distinguishes it, as it was *of the fathers*, to them it was a family-institution, and as *given by Moses*, an universal sacrament of the church, that was to be constituted or set up, John vii. 22.

V. Moreover, circumcision was not only enjoined upon Abraham and Isaac, but also on all the descendants of Abraham, whether by Sarah, Hagar, or Keturah, and even on all his domestics bought with his money, and strangers, Gen. xvii. 25, 26, 27. For though, even at that time, God had determined to form a peculiar people to himself from the posterity of Isaac alone, not indeed from all of them; nevertheless the time was not yet come, when he would have his church confined to one particular people. Nor are we to doubt, but he had his chosen people among the other sons and de-

scendents of Abraham. And nothing is more certain, than that, within the compass of these four centuries, circumcision, and, with it, the visible church, was propagated among all those eastern people, who derived their origin from Ishmael, from the sons of Keturah, from Esau, and the proselytes who were circumcised in Abraham's family. But I would observe by the way, that most of the Jewish Rabbins will have it, that Keturah was Hagar herself, while others of them sometimes deny it, and at other times call it in question; as may be seen in Selden, *de synedr.* lib. 2. c. 3. Those churches therefore, which, from among Abraham's posterity, had the sign of circumcision, as well as the uncircumcised churches, from the pious remnant of the other fathers, together with the Israelites, whom God began to claim to himself by a nearer relation, made up the universal church of those times. Nor should they, in the mean time, be accounted strangers from the covenant of God, confirmed with Abraham in *Gen.* but rather brethren, and fellow-professors of the same religion. To this purpose we may apply Deut. xxii. 7. *Thou shalt not abhor an Edomite, for he is thy brother.* And as circumcision was at first enjoined even on strangers in Abraham's family, this ought afterwards to have put the Israelites in mind of the future calling of the Gentiles.

VI. Mean while, among the nations that descended from Abraham, the use of circumcision continued much longer than the true religion. For, while they revolted by degrees from the God of their fathers, so they polluted themselves with horrible idolatries, and were rejected by God, and banished from his covenant: but still they retained circumcision. Accordingly authors of every kind speak of many circumcised nations, besides the Israelites. Grotius has drawn up a catalogue of them,

*in notis ad lib. 1. de veritates relig. Christianæ.* And Seldén, in a place already quoted, has much to this purpose.

VII. It is then certain, that other nations, besides the descendants of Abraham, were circumcised ; as Herodotus in Euterpe testifies of the Egyptians, the Ethiopians, and the inhabitants of Colchis. Grotius indeed says, that the Ethiopians were descended from the posterity of Keturah ; and that the Colchians and neighbouring people are the descendents of the ten tribes, which were carried away by Salmanassar. But Bochart, *Geograph. Sacr. lib. iv. c. 26. & 31.* has made it appear, by cogent arguments, that both the Ethiopians and Colchians owe their origin to the Egyptians. And Diodorus Siculus, whose fidelity on this point Grotius vainly attempts to weaken, relates, that the rite of circumcision passed from the Egyptians to their colonies, and *ancient offspring*, as Ammianus, *lib. ii.* calls the Colchians. The same thing we are to believe concerning the Colchians. What Ambrose *de patriarcha Abrahamo, lib. ii. c. 11.* relates of the Egyptians, is both remarkable and surprising. “ The Egyptians,” says he, “ circumcise their males at fourteen years, and at the same years their females ; namely, because, at those years, the passions of the male begin to rage, and the monthly courses of the females to take their rise.” But Gomarus, *ad Luc. ii. 21.* has justly observed, that we may very well doubt of the truth of that narration (unless he probably speaks of his own time) on account of its disagreement with ancient history. Besides, we can scarcely allow the least doubt, that the Egyptians had learned circumcision from the Israelites, when they dwelt among them, and were acceptable guests at first.

VIII. Here it seems proper to say something concerning the circumcision of the Ethiopians, which they still retain notwithstanding their having embraced Christianity. Zaga Zabo, an Ethiopian bishop, and ambassador from his prince at the court of Portugal, ascribes the first rise of it to the Queen Maqueda. He will have her to be the same who, the sacred writings tell us, came to Solomon, being excited thereto by the fame of his wisdom. He says, that being with child by Solomon, she brought forth a son, called *Meilech*. When he was grown up, she sent him to Jerusalem to his father, to be instructed in the law of God. After Solomon had carefully performed this, he solemnly anointed this his son, before the ark, king of Ethiopia, changing his former name to that of David. After his return to his own country, with a great retinue, among which was Azarias the son of Zadok (who, preparing himself for the journey, stole out of the ark, and, for the sake of the new king, carried away with him the two tables of the law, and perfidiously placed false ones in their room) the gynococracy, or government of women, was entirely abolished, and it was ordained, that the male descendants alone, in a right line from this David, should sway the sceptre; that circumcision should be introduced, that of the women being added by the Queen Maqueda. But they protest, they retain it, not from any religious view, but as an hereditary and political symbol of their nobility.

IX. But who does not see that these are foolish and trifling stories? Not to mention other things, the absurdity and gross falsehood of which lie open to the view of every one. They arrogantly brag that it was their queen who went to Solomon, when it can be easily proved, that it was the queen of Arabia Felix. 1. She is called in scripture the queen of Sheba, 1 Kings



x. 1. But Philostorgius says, that this “ was the name which the Greeks gave to Arabia the Great and Happy.” It is otherwise called *Homeritis* from an Arabic word. The Nubian geographer relates, that this queen reigned there, whom he calls *Belkis*, and the wife of Solomon. 2. Christ calls her *the queen of the south*. But Sheba, or Arabia Felix, is not only south of the land of Israel, but is also in Arabic called *Aljeman*, that is, the *southward*, as Drusius *ad Mat.* xii. 42. has observed from Judæus Salmanticensis and Aben Ezra. And Benjamin, in his *Itinerary*, p. 73. says Sheba is Aljeman. When Christ therefore called her queen of the south, which, in Syriac, is queen of Timena, he spoke after the vulgar, so that he might easily be understood by any one. 3. Christ adds that this queen *came from the uttermost parts of the earth*; which much better agrees to the Sabeans, than to the Ethiopians; for the most extensive countries lie beyond Meroe, the metropolis of Ethiopia; whereas the Sabeans occupy, on the ocean, the utmost parts of Arabia towards the sea, consequently of the earth. 4. There is much greater plenty of gold and spices, with which this queen is said to have loaded her camels, 1 Kings x. 2. in Arabia, than in the country of the Ethiopians, and therefore called by the Greeks *AROMATOPHOROS*, *spice-yielding*. 5. What Josephus says, *Antiq.* lib. viii. c. 2. concerning the queen of the Ethiopians, and her royal city, formerly called *Saba*, afterwards *Meroe*, is not only uncertain, but also bewrays very great ignorance in history, as Bochart, who may be consulted on this head, has invincibly shewn, *Geograph. Sacr.* lib. ii. c. 24. As therefore the queen of the south is not the queen of the Ethiopians, the modern Ethiopians vainly boast, that they received circumcision, and therewith Judaism, on occasion of that queen. It is much more

probable, they received it long before that time, from the Egyptians, whose descendants they are : but it is more likely, the Sabeans, who, according to Philostorgius, were circumcised the eighth day, were taught it by their queen, who visited Solomon.

X. It is intolerable, by whomsoever introduced, that some attempted, out of a human device, to obtrude a kind of circumcision, or something analogous thereto, on women ; as we just heard concerning Maqueda, that fictitious queen of the Ethiopians, and the Egyptians. For God enjoined circumcision expressly to the males only : women are accounted in the men, and in and with them reckoned to be in covenant. Nor was this without its mystery. 1. Thus they were taught, that salvation depends not on circumcision. 2. It signified the imperfection of that œconomy, which was afterwards to give place to one more perfect, in which persons were to be initiated by a more easy and common sacrament, of which women themselves were also to partake.

XI. But in all other nations, who were strangers to the true worship of God, circumcision was nothing but a mere superstitious practice, and a wretched imitation of a sacrament given by God to his covenant-people. But he would have those in covenant with himself, strictly to be bound by this tie, Gen. xvii. 14. *And the uncircumcised man-child, whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that soul shall be cut off from his people, he hath broken my covenant.* I am not now inclined to transcribe what the learned have long ago observed on *the cutting off a soul from his people.* Among many others may be seen Targius *ad Exod.* xii. 15 : Amama *in Antibarbaro*, lib. iii. towards the end ; Seldenus *de synedriis*, lib. 1. c. 4 *et de jure naturali*, lib. viii. c. 9 ; L'Empereur *in notis ad Bertramum de republ. Hebræor.*

lib. i. c. 2; and Hen. Ainsworth *ad Num.* xv. 30, 31; Hottingerus *ad juris Hebraic. preceptum* 227; Owen *in proleg. ad Hebr.* p. 289; and very lately John a Mark, *Exercit. Juvenil. disp.* 1 & 2. I don't think it improbable, that the cutting off a soul from the people signified a seclusion, or separation, from the church, and from the solemnities and prerogatives of the people of God, to which is opposed *to enter into the congregation, or church, of Jehovah*, Deut. xxiii. 2. To this purpose is Exod. xii. 19. *Even that soul shall be cut off from the congregation of Israel*, that is, shall be removed from the fellowship of the saints. Ezek. xiii. 9. *They shall not be in the council, or mystical assembly, of my people, neither shall they be written in the writing of the house of Israel: namely, he who has broken my covenant, which I made, with him, shall be cut off from among this covenant-people, and shall not partake of their privileges.* Besides this ecclesiastical death, there sometimes was added to it death by the sentence of the judge, Lev. xx. 6. compared with ver. 27. sometimes by the immediate hand of God, and other great calamities inflicted by him, see Exod. iv. 24, 25. sometimes a being childless, Lev. xviii. 29. compared with Lev. xx. 20, 21. and at last, unless the sinner repented, the eternal destruction of his soul. Abarbanel does not speak amiss, as his words are quoted by L'Empereur: "The soul shall be cut off from that supreme bundle of life, and shall not obtain the splendor of the divinity, that is, the pleasure and reward of a soul." And why may we not include all these in this general expression? But, by this threatening, God would guard the command of circumcision, lest a sacrament, in other respects full of shame and pain, should be either slighted or neglected. It was his will, that his covenant should be in such esteem, that his yoke, though hard, might be

cheerfully submitted to. Aben Ezra has observed, that, in the whole sacred scripture, he finds twenty-three places, where God threatens *extermination* to those who transgress the negative precepts; but with respect to the positive he only found that word with regard to the precepts of circumcision, and the due solemnizing the passover. From which it is evident, it was the will of God to bind his people to these sacraments by the strictest tie.

XII. But yet we are, on no account, so to understand these things, as if all infants, dying uncircumcised after the eighth day, were consigned to condemnation; which, after some Popish writers, I wonder that Chamierus should have adopted, lib. iii. *de sacram. c. 2.* “But the meaning is,” as Perkins has well observed, *Tract. de sacram. baptismi*, “whoever has not been circumcised in his infancy, and being come to years of discretion and knowledge, shall then refuse circumcision, his soul shall be cut off from his people.” And therefore this is said of adults, not of infants, who cannot break the covenant. There are the following reasons for this explication: 1. Because the words of the original text are active, *He who shall not have circumcised the flesh of his foreskin.* Where אֶתְּחִי, the sign of the accusative, shews, that the word יִמּוֹל is not here of the form *niph'al*, from מוּל, but of the form *Kal*, from נָמַל. Whence I conclude, these words are not addressed to him, who, in the act of his circumcision, unknowingly suffers any thing; but to him who can procure his own circumcision, and yet deliberately neglects it. 2. Because it is added, *he hath broken my covenant.* In which words he is charged with a culpable action, who only before could be charged with a culpable deficiency. But an infant, who is without circumcision, not through his own default, does not

thereby render the covenant of God of no effect. 3. The occasion and end of this sanction lead to this: namely, circumcision was enjoined to Abraham, when ninety-nine years old, to his servants and domestics, when grown up, to Ishmael, a lad thirteen years old. But as it would have been difficult to persuade grown persons to that act of cutting away, or of mutilation, conjoined with so much shame and pain; for this reason that threatening was added, that, for fear of a greater evil, they might obsequiously submit to the command. As this could only be seriously considered by grown-up persons, so it regards them only. 4. We may add this inconvenience; if infants dying uncircumcised after the eighth day, are, on that account, consigned to condemnation, as covenant-breakers; there can be no reason, why the same thing may not be said concerning the infants of Christians, who die before baptism; because baptism, no less than circumcision, is a sign of the covenant. And that this was also the constant opinion of the Jews, see in *Selden de synedriis*, lib. i. c. 6.

XIII. The *minister* of circumcision was every master of a family, Gen. xvii. 23. or any other person, qualified for that office, and substituted in the master's place. Nor does it appear, that Zacharias, though a priest, circumcised his son John with his own hands, Luke i. 59. At least, it appears not, that God confined the administration of this ordinance to any particular order of men. But yet that women were not called to do it, may be gathered from the example of Zipporah, Exod. iv. 24, 25. Because, amidst the confusion, arising from a present danger, neither she nor Moses seem sufficiently to have attended, by whom circumcision was to be administered, if it was only done. And it is plain, that

God really approved that circumcision; but it does not appear, that he approved the manner of it.

XIV. The DAY appointed for circumcision was the eighth from the birth. Though the principal reason of this is the will of him who commands; yet other reasons are likewise probably added. 1. That thus a regard might be had to the tender state of infants, who, before the eighth day, are scarce able to bear the pains of circumcision, under which grown persons themselves almost sink, Gen. xxxiv. 25. 2. Because infants just born are, with their mother, accounted unclean till the eighth day. This reason R. Simeon, the son of Jachi, gives in *Pesikta, fol. xvi. col. 3.* "Why has the law appointed circumcision on the eighth day? Circumcision is put off, till the woman in childbed be cleansed from her uncleanness." Lightfoot *ad Luc. ii. 21.* And this reason seems to be grounded on Lev. xii. 2, 3. Certainly the infant was initiated by circumcision, and offered up, as it were, to God by the shedding of his blood. And it was after the seventh day, before God admitted of any sacrifices from among brute animals, Exod. xxi. 30. Lev. xxiii. 27. 3. This was so appointed, that we might not imagine salvation depended on an external sign; for otherwise a good and gracious God would not have deferred it till the eighth day, before which time many must needs have died. Upon this account also Abraham himself was justified in uncircumcision, Rom. iv. 10.

XV. I will not say with some (who yet, I own, can defend themselves by the authority of Cyprian and sixty-six bishops assembled by him in a council. See Cyprian's epistles, *lib. iii. epist. 8.* which in Pamel's edition is the 59th) that this mystery prefigured the day of Christ's resurrection, which in the order of the days is the eighth, and on which the true circumcision and our

salvation were entirely completed and perfected. 1. Because Christ is no where said to have risen on the eighth day, but either on the third from his death, or on the first day of the week. But this day, with respect to circumcision, is no more the eighth than any other day. Nor is it usually called the eighth from the first day of the preceding week, as the week is closed with the seventh day; from which the first of the new week is reckoned. 2. Because circumcision was not a type so much of the resurrection, as of the sufferings and death of Christ; as we shall directly shew. 3. Neither does it seem an accurate way of speaking, to say that the true circumcision, and our salvation, were entirely completed and perfected on the day of Christ's resurrection. For, as to the impetration or purchase of our salvation, that indeed was perfected by the death of Christ. The complete application of the purchased salvation not only requires the resurrection of Christ from the dead; but his ascension into heaven, and waits for his return to the general judgment. There is therefore no reason, why these days ought not, as much as the day of his resurrection, to be prefigured. We are carefully to be on our guard, not to run into extremes in allegorizing.

XVI. The spiritual *signification* of circumcision is as excellent, as the sign itself seems mean and almost shameful. In general it was a *sign of the covenant of God with Abraham*, Gen. xvii. 11. And therefore, by a sacramental phrase, it is called the *covenant* itself, ver. 10, 13. Nay it was not only a sign, but also a *seal*: for not only Paul has declared this, Rom. iv. 11. but also the Jewish masters, Lightfoot *ad Mat.* xxviii. 19. Whose words, from the Jerusalem Talmud, *Tract. Berachot*, are as follows: "Blessed be he, who sanctified the beloved from the womb, and put a sign in his flesh."

and *sealed* his sons with the *sign* of the holy covenant." God promised to give the Messiah, and with him all manner of blessings, earthly, spiritual, heavenly, to Abraham and his seed, and that all these should come from his seed. God required of Abraham by covenant, that he should walk before him. Circumcision was the sign and seal of this covenant; so that all who duly submitted to this, according to God's prescription, were solemnly declared by God himself to be partakers of the promises made to Abraham: and at the same time openly avowed, that, by a lively faith, they received the promised Messiah, and expected from him blessings of every kind. And thus circumcision became to them a seal of the righteousness of faith, Rom. iv. 11. And the circumcised person was said *to enter, and to have a safe station, under the wings of the Divine Majesty.* And, by the same act, they also bound themselves to the sincere observance of the whole of religion, and consequently of all the precepts of God, as became those in covenant with the Supreme Being. It is not to be doubted, but from the remains of ancient piety is that prayer, which the Jews, at this day, still use in the circumcision of their young infants, Buxtorf. *Synag. Jud.* c. 2. "As thou hast made this young child to enter, or hast received him, into the covenant of Abraham our father; so make him enter into the law of Moses, into the state of matrimony," (which Selden, *de jure nat.* lib. ii. c. 2. renders, *into protection or safeguard*) "and into good works."

XVII. More especially these three principal heads of the whole of our religion are held forth by the figure of circumcision: namely, our *misery*, our *redemption*, and our *returns of gratitude*.

XVIII. Man's *misery* consists partly in *sin*, partly in the *punishment* of sin. Both these are signified by cir-



cumcision. For the foreskin, that is, the extreme pellicle of the generative member, which was to be cut off by circumcision, denotes that viciousness or corruption of the whole man, inherent in him from his very first origin, and frequently in scripture is called the foreskin of the heart, or an uncircumcised heart, Deut. x. 16. Jer. iv. 4. Lev. xxvi. 41. Jer. ix. 26. And the painful cutting away of that fleshy part signified, that the whole man deserved to be separated for ever from the communion of God and all his saints, with exquisite and intolerable torments both of soul and body.

XIX. Here the *Redeemer* and the *redemption* of men are no less clearly discovered. For this sacrament signified and sealed, 1. That from Abraham, now circumcised, was to arise Isaac, Gen. xvii. 16. the father of that blessed seed, or of the Messiah, who was to take upon himself, and to expiate, all our sin and all our guilt. 2. That this Messiah was to shed his blood for men, without which the covenant of grace could never be sealed, and to commence his sufferings from the very beginning of his life. 3. That he was to partake of the same flesh and blood with us, Heb. ii. 14. to be cut off from the land of the living, Is. liii. 8. in order to the preservation of his body, the church, Eph. v. 23. as in the carnal circumcision a part of the body was to be cut away, that the whole man might not be cut off from his people. 4. That he would freely enable us to cut away and to put off the sins of the flesh, by regeneration and sanctification, which are perfected in glory, Col. ii. 11. This, I imagine, was the meaning of the ancient Jewish doctors when they said, that, "whenever one becomes a proselyte, he is like a new-born child." This being so very common in the mouths of their masters, Christ justly replied to Nicodemus, when he so impudently inquired about being born again, *Art thou a*

*master of Israel, and knowest not these things?* John iii. 10. They taught, that a new soul, which came under the wings of the Divine Majesty, and was received into the embraces of the Supreme Being, dropt down from some heavenly palace on him, who was circumcised. By such dark and mysterious expressions it is probable the ancient Jewish doctors described spiritual regeneration, which, not being understood by the more modern, was by them changed into mere empty sound. See Selden, *de jure nat.* lib. ii. c. 11.

XX. Lastly, by the use of this sacrament, they were put in mind of the duties of a becoming *gratitude*. 1. That they were to apply themselves to internal, secret, and spiritual piety, just as circumcision was performed on a secret member of the body, which is to be veiled, Rom. ii. 28, 29. 2. To mortify their members, which are upon the earth, Col. iii. 5. that is, to renounce their lusts, even those that formerly were most dear to them, and beloved by them. 3. To have no longer any intimate friendship with the world, which lieth in wickedness; as the descendants of Abraham were separated by circumcision from other nations, and renounced their friendship; as appears from the open declaration of the sons of Jacob, Gen. xxxiv. 14, 15. Though, indeed, they spoke this from an evil intention, yet what they said, was right: compare Acts x. 28. A circumcised person, say the Jews, “has withdrawn himself from the whole body of the nations.” And, indeed, circumcision was a great part, and, as it were, the foundation of the middle wall of partition. 4. They were cheerfully and willingly, at the command of God, and for his glory, to submit to every thing, however difficult, grievous, and painful, and however improper, foolish, and ridiculous, in the eyes of the world; not to account

their reputation, nor even their life, dear, in comparison thereof.

XXI. God has determined the DURATION of circumcision in these words, Gen. xvii. 13. *And my covenant shall be in your flesh, for an everlasting covenant.* This is not to be understood of a perpetual duration even to the end of the world. The distinction is well known of *this age*, as they spoke formerly, which comprised the whole œconomy of the Old Testament, and of *the age to come*; which by the apostle, Heb. ii. 5. is called *HO MELLON AIOU*, *the age to come*, or *HE GIKOUMENE MELLOUSA*, *the world to come*, to which age belong *the days of the Messiah*. But the prophecies constantly say, that what was instituted for the covenant of the former age, must not be extended to the latter age, whose face, or state and œconomy, were to be quite different.

XXII. Moreover, that circumcision was to be abrogated in the days of the more joyful dispensation of the covenant, may thus appear. 1. Because it is a part of those shadows, which, because they prefigured the body that was to come, ought now to give place to it, since it is come, Col. ii. 17. 2. Because it was a great part of that middle wall of partition, which separated the Jews from the Gentiles, and whose inclosure was to be broken down by the death of Christ, *having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments, contained in ordinances; for to make in himself, of twain, one new man, so making peace*, Eph. ii. 15. It was certainly foretold of old time, that the Gentiles were to be fellow-heirs, and of the same body with Israel, and partakers of the same promise, Eph. iii. 6. see Deut. xxxii. 43. Is. xix. 24, 25. and Is. lx. 3, &c. But this *concorperation*, or being of the same body, was not to be brought about by inclosing the Gentiles with Is-

rael, within the same inclosure of rites and ceremonies (for that inclosure was appointed to establish a separation and enmity) but by destroying the same: *for in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but faith which worketh by love*, Gal. v. 6. *They which are of faith, whether circumcised or not, the same are the children of Abraham*, Gal. iii. 7. 3. Because circumcision plainly shewed, that the blood of the New Testament was not yet shed, that the Messiah was not yet born of the seed of Abraham, or at least not yet cut off for the salvation of his mystical body. But when the world was made to know, by the preaching of the gospel, that these things were done; it was necessary, that what testified they were not yet done, should be abrogated; lest any institution of God should be found to bear witness against the truth. To this purpose is that of Paul, Gal. v. 2, 3, 4. *Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing; for I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law.* The meaning is, Whoever submits to circumcision, as a necessary part of God's instituted worship, or as a mean of justification, thereby renounces Christ. 1. Because he would have that sign to be still necessary, which testifieth, that every thing is not yet accomplished by Christ. 2. Because, as circumcision cannot be separated from the rest of the ceremonial law, to which it was as the porch, so he who submits to circumcision, thereby binds himself to the observance of the whole ceremonial law. But that is in effect to deny the coming of Christ, and the time of reformation and liberty. 3. Because, as the righteousness of man before God must either depend wholly on his own works, or wholly upon Christ, and these two cannot be conjoined, Gal. ii. 21. and iii. 12, 18. whoever seeks for righte-

ousness in circumcision, as his own work, is fallen from the righteousness of Christ; and so, if he would obtain salvation, it is necessary, that he keep the whole law: which being impossible for him to do, he knows, he is cut off from all hopes of salvation.

XXIII. But the abrogation of this rite of circumcision had its several degrees. It was first in a languishing state, then it was dead, and at last became pernicious. 1. It began to languish at the circumcision of Christ, who, by submitting himself to the law for the elect, and solemnly testifying that subjection by taking upon him the symbol of circumcision, made it appear, that he was that singular seed of Abraham, whose future nativity circumcision was originally appointed to prefigure. From the time, therefore, that he appeared, circumcision, which signified that he was to come, lost a great part of its signification. 2. It was further weakened, after Christ had, in the thirtieth year of his age, manifested himself to Israel, and was pointed out by John, as the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world, and was publicly owned by the Father as his beloved Son, whom all were to hear and obey. For then the gospel of liberty, and of the kingdom, began to be preached, and baptism, a sign opposed to circumcision, was used, as a sacrament of initiation into a better covenant, whereby circumcision came to lose much of its dignity. 3. It began to die at the death of Christ. For when he was cut off from among his people, for the salvation of the whole mystical body, and had sealed the New Testament by his blood, every thing relating to the future Messiah, which circumcision prefigured, and to which Christ by his own circumcision bound himself, was fulfilled. And thus the hand-writing, which was against Christ the Surety, and against believers, was torn asunder in his cross,

Col. ii. 14. 4. It came to be quite dead, after Christ, by his resurrection from the dead, had received from the Father a discharge, in witness that the fullest payment was made, and exhibited it to the view, as it were, of the whole world. Yet believers had so little knowledge of the liberty purchased for, and offered to them, that Peter himself wanted to be taught it by a heavenly vision, Acts x. 28, 34, 35, 47. 5. It was not yet destructive, but so long as the church was not sufficiently instructed in her liberty, it might at times, to avoid giving offence to the weak, be prudently, yet freely used; not from a principle of conscience, but from the dictates of charity and prudence; lest the Jews, who were too tenacious of their peculiar and paternal rites, should be alienated from the Christian religion: just as Timothy was circumcised, being the son of a Jewess, Acts xvi. 1, 3. 6. But after the nation of the Jews, on rejecting the gospel, were cast off by God, and continued obstinately to insist on circumcision, as a necessary part of religion, nay of righteousness, and the church was sufficiently instructed in her own liberty, circumcision came to be destructive, as being a character of superstition, and a badge of Jewish infidelity, and a renunciation of Christian liberty, as we have shewn from Gal. v. 2, 3.

XXIV. 'Tis not now difficult to determine that question, namely, whether the nation of the Jews, when they shall in the last times be fully converted to Christ, will religiously retain the circumcision of infants? Without any hesitation, I think, we are to answer this question in the negative, for the reasons just given. As they are such as vince that not only the Gentiles, but also the Jews, were made free, under the liberty of the New Testament, from circumcision, which is the band of the whole yoke. And in every respect the rea-

son of both ought to be altogether the same. Though the *pre-eminence of the Jew* was formerly great, yet now he has none at all. None under Christ has wherein to glory : Paul accounted it as loss and dung, Phil. iii. 7, 8. In Christ there is no difference of Jew and Greek, of circumcision and uncircumcision : but Christ himself is all in all, Col. iii. 11. all pre-eminence of whatever nation being totally removed. *Henceforth*, saith the apostle, 2 Cor. v. 16. *know we no man after the flesh*, that is, we have no greater esteem for him on account of his pedigree from the holy fathers : *yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh*, that is, though we have looked upon our carnal relation to Christ, as any prerogative ; *yet now henceforth know we him no more* ; we now place all our happiness (not in that, but) in our spiritual union with him by faith. And since God is now in no sense *a respecter of persons*, Acts x. 34. we can never be allowed *to have the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory, with respect of persons*, Jam. ii. 1. or, in the kingdom of Christ, to put a greater value on the descendants of Abraham, as such, than on Barbarians, or Scythians, *who have obtained like precious faith with us*, 2 Pet. i. 1. In a word, the circumcision of the believing Israelites, in the last times, would be either a future privilege, or a burden and yoke. But it can be neither : not the latter ; because that would be repugnant to the liberty purchased by Christ, which, as is meet, should be exceeding glorious in that happy period : not the former ; because the gospel of the kingdom hath removed all pre-eminence of one above another, *hath made both one*, Eph. ii. 14.

XXV. Yet I have heard of two arguments against this, which have the appearance of strength, and but the appearance only. The one is taken from the New

Testament, the other from the Old. From the New, that speech of James and the elders to Paul, Acts xxi. 21. has been proposed to my consideration by a learned person: *And they are informed of thee, that thou teachest all the Jews, which are among the Gentiles, saying, that they ought not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs.* But when this made a great commotion among those who were zealous of the law, and yet believed in Christ, James authorised Paul to do such things, from which all might know, *that those things, whereof they were informed concerning him, were nothing, but that Paul himself also walked orderly, and kept the law,* ver. 24. Paul complied with this advice. From this it might be concluded, that the true sense of Paul's doctrine was, that though the Gentiles were not indeed bound to circumcision, and the other ceremonies, yet the Jews, even after they embraced the faith of Christ, were to circumcise their children, and to walk after the customs; because Paul, at the persuasion of James, by this compliance removes from himself the suspicion of his teaching a contrary doctrine.

XXVI. But we are here to consider distinctly three things. 1. The true doctrine of Paul. 2. The calumny invidiously fixed upon him. 3. The prudential advice suggested to him by James and the elders. Indeed Paul, who was an excellent preacher of Christian liberty, set both Jews and Gentiles who had submitted to the gospel, at liberty from the necessity of submitting to circumcision and the other ceremonies: for he proclaimed to all, that *circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commandments of God,* 1 Cor. vii. 19. And he compares the law to a tutor, under whose tuition the Old-Testament church was placed, being then in a state of bondage: but, now the kingdom of heaven being set up in the



word, he declares that the same church was come to age, which, no longer standing in need of a tutor, was not again to be given up to bondage under those first elements of the world, Gal. iv. 1. Which certainly comprises both Jews and Gentiles. He every where published this privilege of the New Testament freely and openly. Nevertheless he was not against making some allowances for the weakness of the Jewish brethren, in the exercise of that liberty: in case there was not a spirit of contention, nor an opinion of necessity and righteousness, in standing up for the practice of the ceremonies. Calumny put a quite different construction on this conduct; as if he acted thus to the reproach of the law, and taught apostasy from Moses, and did not agree, in this doctrinal point, with others, who maintained the Christian faith. But the case was certainly the reverse: for it is no reproach put upon the law, to teach, that Christ made satisfaction to it; any more than it is a reproach put upon a hand-writing, that, on payment being made, it is cancelled. Nor is it any apostasy from Moses, to preach that Christ is the bestower of liberty, since Moses himself commanded him to be heard: nor did Paul disagree with the other apostles; because they also taught, according to the decree of the synod of Jerusalem, an immunity from that yoke; and Paul, in the exercise of that liberty, by no means disowned that charity and prudence were to be regarded. Nevertheless the calumny gained ground; and many of the brethren, who were not truly informed of the apostle's doctrine, entertained groundless suspicions of him. Hence arose the advice, that he himself should openly perform some certain ceremonies; not in order to create any prejudice to that Christian right and liberty, which he had preached; but to shew publicly, that he had done nothing inconsiderately, which could

give rise to any just indignation : that it was a vile calumny, by which he was defamed, as entertaining less reverent thoughts of Moses, and teaching the Jews a contempt of the law. With this advice the apostle complies, not that he approved the violence of those zealots, but to wipe off a calumny, and to suit himself prudently and friendly to the weak. Thus *unto the Jews he became as a Jew, that he might gain the Jews ; to them that are under the law, as under the law, that he might gain them that are under the law*, 1 Cor. ix. 20. These things being duly considered, it is evident, nothing can be concluded from this passage for the continuance of circumcision among the converted Israelites.

XXVII. From the Old Testament is objected Ezek. xliv. 9. where the Lord, describing the state of the church after the conversion of Israel, thus goes on ; *No stranger, uncircumcised in heart, nor uncircumcised in flesh, shall enter into my sanctuary*. By which words, all who have a right to enter into the sanctuary, are required to have the circumcision both of flesh and heart. If the question was about uncircumcision in general, we might very plainly explain it of the depraved disposition of the unregenerate heart. Nay, if the uncircumcision of the flesh was expressly mentioned, nothing could hinder us from taking a prophetic expression, borrowed from the rites of the Old Testament, in a spiritual sense. But when the uncircumcision both of flesh and heart is distinctly mentioned, it seems altogether necessary, we should certainly understand the one spiritually, but the other literally.

XXVIII. In answer to this reasoning I offer the following considerations. 1. That the whole context of Ezekiel concerning the building of a new temple, is mystical and allegorical, and is expressed by similitudes borrowed from the Old Testament, all which, as is sui-

table to the state of the New Testament, are to be explained spiritually. 2. That though the uncircumcision of flesh and heart are distinct, yet they are both mystical. Surely uncircumcision mystically signifies any depraved disposition of man. Hence we read of *uncircumcised lips*, Exod. vi. 12. and *ears*, Jer. vi. 10. Acts vii. 51. Nay, any impurity, even of those fruits which God had forbid to be eaten, is called uncircumcision,\* Lev. xix. 23. The uncircumcision therefore of the heart, in the mystical language of Ezekiel, signifies the impurity of the heart and inward affections; the uncircumcision of the flesh, the impurity of the outward actions, performed by the body, according to the distinction of Paul, 2 Cor. vii. 1. Both kinds of impurity are to be laid aside by him, who would be reckoned to belong to the communion of the people of God. *Who shall ascend into the hill of Jehovah? and who shall stand in his holy place? He that hath clean hands and a pure heart*, Psal. xxiv. 3, 4. But we are especially to take notice, that the discourse here is not concerning the Israelites, but concerning the strangers, who were to be admitted into the sanctuary. They certainly shall have their proper place in this new temple, Is. lvi. 6, 7. and not have reason to complain, *Jehovah hath utterly separated me from his people*, ver. 3. But to impose upon them, in the latter days, the necessity of circumcision, from which they were free all the intermediate time, is, as has been shewn, diametrically opposite to the doctrine of the apostles.

\* The words are, *And when ye shall come into the land, and shall have planted all manner of trees for food, then ye shall count the fruit thereof as uncircumcised: three years, it shall be as uncircumcised unto you, it shall not be eaten of.* The meaning in general is, it shall be unclean, and not to be eaten of, but cast away, and counted abominable, as the foreskins were.

## C H A P. IX.

*Of the Passover.*

**T**HE whole doctrine of the *passover* has been learnedly and copiously, above what can well be expressed, unfolded by the very laborious Samuel Bochart, *Hierozoic*, lib. ii. c. 50. But because that most excellent and invaluable book is rarely to be found in the hands of the youth under our tuition, we have thought proper, in this chapter, to exhibit what he hath handled at large, in a compendious way: yet in such a manner, as to follow at times our own judgment, and now and then intersperse what observations we have made from other authors. We will therefore briefly run over these seven particulars. I. The appellation of the passover. II. Its time. III. Its place. IV. Its ministers. V. Its guests. VI. Its rites. VII. Its mystery.

II. The name *Pascha* is Chaldee, as Philo justly observes. In Hebrew it is called *Pesach*, by the ancients *Phase* and *Phasee*. The root PASACH signifies to pass over. Josephus renders it HUPERBASIA: Philo, DIABATERIA. Just as there were also *sacrifices* called for *passage* at Lacedæmon, that is, for the happy progress of an expedition. But it is thus called, *Pascha*, because God, while he slew the first-born of the Egyptians, *passed over* the doors of the Israelites, on seeing the posts thereof sprinkled with the blood of the lamb, Exod. xii. 13. Thus Is. xxxi. 5. God delivers Jerusalem, by *passing over* it, while he takes due vengeance on other people. But the term *Pascha* is of various acceptations, denoting, 1. The passing over of the angel, who, while he smote the first-born of the Egyptians,

passed over the houses of the Israelites. 2. The *lamb*, which was slain in memory of this deliverance, *Exod. xii. 21. Kill the passover;* *Luke xxii. 7. Then came the day of unleavened bread, when the passover must be killed.* 3. The sacrifices then usually offered to God along with the lamb, *Deut. xvi. 2. Thou shalt sacrifice the passover unto the Lord thy God, of the flock and the herd.* 4. The festival days, on which these things were solemnized, *Luke xxii. 1. Now the feast of unleavened bread drew nigh, which is called the passover.* Seeing Christ our Lord suffered at that time, hence some of the ancients, who were not acquainted with Hebrew literature, derived the name *Pascha* from the Greek ΠΑΣΧΩ, *I suffer.*

III. The *time* is expressly specified, *Lev. xxiii. 5. In the fourteenth day of the first month, at even* (between the two evenings) *is the Lord's passover.* Where observe, 1. The month. 2. The day. 3. The hour or time of the day. The *month, Abib*, is mentioned *Exod. xiii. 4.* elsewhere called *Nisan*, *Neh. ii. 1. Esth. iii. 7. Abib* signifies in Hebrew an *ear of corn*, as yet *fresh* or green. Hence was the name of the month; because in those warmer countries, and especially in *Judea*, in that month, which answers partly to our *March*, partly to our *April*, the standing corn necessary for the support of life, is, according to *Philo*, beginning to ripen; and at that time the Israelites began to put the sickle to the standing corn, *Deut. xvi. 9.* and on the second day of the paschal solemnity, they offered to God a handful of the first-fruits. But why the same month is in *Chaldee* called *Nisan*, is not so evident. A great man conjectures, it ought to be written *Nissan*, as is done by *Josephus*; or the *dagesch* struck out of the letter SAMECH, to be made up by a long vowel; as *Necris* is often put for *Nisin*, that is, *stand-*

*arab.* And thus the appellation *Nisan* is very properly taken from the warlike ensigns or standards, with which, in that month, they first took the field. And this very time the Jews understand to be intended, 2 Sam. xi. 1. *And it came to pass, that after the year was expired, at the time when kings go forth to battle.* For a like reason, the two former spring-months were called by the Bithynians *STRATEIOS* and *AREIOS*, as by the Romans *MARTIUS*, from *Mars*. But this month is called the *first*, namely, of the sacred or ecclesiastical year, from the exodus out of Egypt; being otherwise the seventh of the civil year, whose beginning was about autumn, and whose first month was called *Tisri*. And there was the express command of God for this, Exod. xii. 2. *This month, namely Abib, compare Exod. xiii. 4. shall be unto you the beginning of months, it shall be the first month of the year to you.*

IV. The *day* of this first month set apart for the passover, was the fourteenth. The *hours*, or time of the day, was *between the two evenings*; the one of which was a little past noon, when the sun began to descend, the other a little before the setting of the sun. Not only the Hebrews distinguished their evenings in this manner, as may be seen in Buxtorf's lexicon under the word *NGALAL*; but also some of the Greeks, according to the testimony of Eustathius, *ad lib.* xvii. *Odyss.* "According to the ancients the evening is twofold; for the late evening, according to them, is the latter part of the evening towards sun-set, the other the early evening, the first of the evening, following just upon noon." See also Hesychius under the word *DEILE*. Within the compass therefore of that time, in which the sun begins to decline, and in which he sets, the passover was to be slain and roasted, that it might be eaten on the beginning of the fifteenth day, which was

at sun-set. Josephus says, that the paschal lambs were killed, *from the ninth hour till the eleventh*, that is, from three in the afternoon till five, *Bell. Jud. lib. vii. c. 17.*

V. As to the *place*; the passover was celebrated the first time in Egypt, *Exod. xii. 21.* then in the wilderness of Sinai, *Numb. ix. 5.* And in Egypt, indeed, every one slew it in his own house, as there was no altar, no place set apart for God there. But after the exodus none were allowed to kill the passover any where, but in the place which God had chosen; as is expressly enjoined, *Deut. xvi. 5, 6.* But that place was not Jerusalem only, after Solomon built the temple there, but also the very court of the temple, where they usually killed the other sacrifices. For God plac'd his name, and caused it to dwell not so much in the whole city, as in the temple. The Jews all agree in this: *They kill the passover as they do other sacrifices, only in the court of the temple*, says Maimonides, *lib. de Pasch. c. 1. sect. 3.* And a very learned English author has shewn, that this is confessedly the opinion of the Karaites, or scripturarian doctors of the Jews.

VI. And the reason is obvious: for every one knows, it was not allowed to kill the sacrifices but in the court of the temple. But that the *passover* was a real *sacrifice*, is evident from the following arguments. 1. Because the scripture in express words calls its *sacrifice*, *Exod. xii. 27. It is the sacrifice of Jehovah's passover.* Though this word in other places, denotes any feast whatever, made up of slain animals, as *Prov. xvii. 1.* yet that it is here to be taken in its most common and sacred sense, we gather from this; because the paschal sacrifice was a type of that most real sacrifice of Christ, concerning which Paul says, *1 Cor. v. 7. Christ our*

*passover* ΕΤΗΥΙΗ, is sacrificed for us. Josephus and Philo likewise every where call the paschal lambs ΤΗΥΙΑΙ, or ΤΗΥΜΑΤΑ, that is, according to the interpretation of Rufinus, *hostiæ, sacrifices*. 2. Because the persons, celebrating the passover, are said to *offer the offering to Jehovah*, Numb. ix. 7, 13. 3. Because the blood of the paschal lamb, as of a true sacrifice was offered to the Lord. Which may be gathered from the words of Moses, Exod. xxiii. 18. *Thou shalt not offer the blood of my sacrifice with leavened bread, neither shall the fat of my sacrifice remain until the morning*: of my sacrifice, that is, of my passover, as even Onkelos has it, *the blood of my sacrifice*, and Jonathan, *the blood of the libation of my passover*. And a parallel passage, Exod. xxxiv. 25. *Thou shalt not offer the blood of my sacrifice with leaven, neither shall the sacrifice of the feast of passover be left unto the morning*. 4. Because the blood of the paschal lamb was sprinkled as well as the blood of the other sacrifices. In 2 Chron. xxx. 16. speaking of the passover, it is said, that the priests sprinkled the blood, which they received from the hands of the Levites: also chap. xxxv. 11. *And they killed the passover, and the priests sprinkled the blood from their hands*. And none is ignorant, that this belongs to a sacrifice. Maimonides observes well on this occasion, that the sprinkling is of great importance, as being the foundation of the offering. And Peter alluding to this, says, that we are elected *unto sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ*, 1 Pet. i. 2. As therefore we have a more clear representation of the sacrifice of Christ in the passover, besides so many arguments, it is plain, we are by all means to assert, that the passover was a true sacrifice. And if so, it could not be properly killed any where, but in the court of the temple.



VII. The straitness of time and place is in vain objected: as if it was not possible, within the compass of the two evenings, to present and offer at one altar, so many thousand lambs. Concerning the prodigious number of these, see an extraordinary history or fable in Lightfoot on John xii. 12. For that the court of the temple was very extensive, appears from the twenty-two thousand oxen, and a hundred and twenty thousand sheep, which Solomon offered there at the dedication of the temple, 1 Kings viii. 63. and the sacrifices without number offered by the rest of the people, 2 Chron. v. 6. Moreover, there were very many and expeditious priests at leisure, for four hours, if circumstances so required, to be employed in offering these lambs. And those very persons, who tell us, there was such a prodigious number of paschal lambs, at the same time tell us, that the number could not be ascertained, but by the calculation made by the priests, who offered in the court.

VIII. The *ministrs* here were, 1. The common people. 2. The Levites. 3. The priests. It belonged to the *common people* not only to bring the paschal sacrifices to the priests, but also, if they pleased, to kill them. Which Philo, after the manner of orators, exaggerates, when he writes, lib. *de decalogo*: "That at the feast of the passover every one indiscriminately sacrificed, the law granting, on one extraordinary day once a-year, the office of priest to the whole people, to offer sacrifices for themselves." God himself seems to have granted that privilege to all the people, Exod. xii. 6. *And the whole assembly of the congregation of Israel shall kill it.* Nor was this peculiar to the passover, as Philo speaks, but allowed to the common people in the case of any other sacrifice, namely, to kill the sacrifices, even the most holy, whether for themselves, for private

persons, or for the whole congregation ; as Maimonides has more accurately observed than Philo, *de ingress. sacerd. in sanct.* c. 9. § 14. and the thing is clear from scripture. See concerning the burnt-offering, Lev. i. 3, 4, 5. concerning the peace-offering, Lev. iii. 2. and concerning the sin-offering, Lev. iv. 24.

IX. But when private persons did not chuse to kill the passover, or were not allowed on account of uncleanness, the Levites were substituted for this work, in their room, because they were more skilful and expeditious. We have an example, 2 Chron. xxx. 17. *For there were many in the congregation that were not sanctified ; therefore the Levites had the charge of the killing of the passovers, for every one that was not clean, to sanctify them unto the Lord.* Similar to this is the passage Ezra vi. 20.

X. The business of the *priests* was to sprinkle at the altar the blood received from the common people or the Levites, as we have already shewn from 2 Chron. xxx. 16. and xxxv. 11. They also alone burnt the fat on the altar, as the Jews constantly assert. Instead of all others let us only hear Maimonides, *de pasch.* c. i. § 14. who, after he had described a large circle of priests around the altar, with basons of gold and silver, adds, when any of them had killed the passover, the blood was received in a bason by the next priest, who was to deliver it to a second, and so on, till it came to the priest next the altar, who poured it out at once at the bottom of the altar, and returned the bason empty, which he had received full. After the blood was poured out, as he says elsewhere, § 6. they strip the paschal lamb of his skin, and opening his belly, take out the fat on the inwards, and burn it leisurely, as in every sacrifice. Which they might do, during the whole

night, till the morning-dawn. Which is a further confirmation, that the passover was a true sacrifice.

XI. As to the *guests*; they were, in the first place, all true-born Israelites, if they were not excluded by legal uncleanness. For, Exod. xii. 6, 47. *all the congregation of Israel* is commanded to solemnize the passover. And then the proselytes, who were *circumcised and became Jews*, Esth. viii. 17. whether they were bond-men born in the house, or bought with money, or mercenary, or inmates of the land of Canaan, subject to no bondage, or in fine, those whom they called proselytes of righteousness, who, upon being circumcised also, had a right to eat the passover, Exod. xii. 48. *And when a stranger shall sojourn with thee, and will keep the passover to Jehovah, let all his males be circumcised, and then let him come near and keep it; and he shall be as one that is born in the land: for no uncircumcised person shall eat thereof.*

XII. It is a question, whether women were likewise excluded by the same law, that the uncircumcised were; especially as the law commanded the males only to repair to the three festivals, Exod. xxiii. 17. and xxxiv. 23. Deut. xvi. 16. It would seem, they were not. 1. Because women cannot be numbered among the uncircumcised, nor accounted as such; for circumcision did not belong to them, but they were reckoned along with their circumcised parents or husbands. 2. Because all the congregation of Israel, as we have just shewn, is commanded to celebrate the passover. But the women make a part of this congregation, Deut. xxix. 11. 3. That the women, together with the men, celebrated these solemn festivals, appears from the example of Elkanah, who yearly carried with him his two wives, with his sons and daughters, to Shiloh to the solemn festivals, 1 Sam. i. 3, 4. Joseph also and the holy

virgin repaired yearly to Jerusalem to the feast of the passover, Luke ii. 41. From which it appears, that the same thing may be concluded concerning all the pious women in those times. 4. From a parity of reason: because in other eucharistical sacrifices, or peace-offerings, women also had their portion: thus Elkanah gave to his wife Peninnah, and to all her sons and daughters, parts of the sacrifice; but to Hannah, whom he loved, a worthy, a double portion, 1 Sam. i. 4, 5. When David likewise offered eucharistical sacrifices, he dealt out a part of them to all Israel, as well to the women as men, 2 Sam. vi. 18. And the daughters of the priests ate of the sacred food, Numb. xviii. 11, 19. And why may we not suppose, that women also partook of the passover, which was a kind of eucharistical sacrifice, or peace-offering? 5. We add the testimony of Maimonides, who says, that women were not only admitted to the paschal feasts, but also at times there was a company, which consisted only of women, *de pasch. c. 2. § 5*

XIII. We must not, however, omit here the observation of the Rabbins, who distinguish between the command concerning the passover, and concerning the not eating leavened bread. They say, that all were absolutely bound to this last, females as well as males. This law, not to eat leavened bread, Exod. xiii. 3. is, say they, “at every time and in every place equally binding on males and females.” See Hottinger, *jus Hebr. sect. 4. § 22*. But the command concerning womens appearing at Jerusalem to keep the passover, is no where to be found in express terms. Hence it is said in *Tabn. Hierosol. tract. Kidduschim. fol. 61. col. 3*. “The passover of women is a discretionary thing.” But those women who were led by a zeal for religion, were accustomed to present themselves before God,

In order to partake of this sacrifice, Lightfoot *ad Luc.* ii. 43.

XIV. The guests who partook of the paschal lamb, are commanded to meet, by houses or families, *Exod.* xii. 3. *They shall take to them every man a lamb, according to the house of their fathers, a lamb for an house.* But if a house had not a number sufficient to consume a lamb, the neighbours were to be called in, till a just number was made up, *ver.* 4. The Jewish masters took care, that the number of guests should not be under ten, nor above twenty. Which Jonathan's paraphrase on *Exod.* xii. 4. and Josephus *de bell. Jud.* lib. 17. c. 7. observe. In those companies or societies, called PHARISIAS, by Josephus, by the Hebrews CHEBEROTH, men and women sat down together, old men and young, whole and sick, masters and servants; in fine, every Jew, that could eat a morsel of flesh, not excluding even young children.

XV. They who were legally unclean, whether by touching a dead body, or by a leprosy, or whose seed went from them, or by any other accident, and women in their monthly courses, were debarred from the passover, *Numb.* ix. 6. Persons thus polluted, till the time for their purification was elapsed, were not permitted to taste the flesh either of the paschal lamb, or of any peace-offering, under pain of being cut off, *Lev.* xxii. 3, &c. And therefore the Jews, being to eat the passover, would not enter the judgment-hall, lest they should be polluted, *John* xviii. 28. But, under king Hezekiah, many tribes of Israel broke this law, for a great part of them had not sanctified themselves as they ought. Yet God, being appeased upon the prayer of the pious king, forgave those who were truly converted, *2 Chron.* xxx. 17, &c.

XVI. But lest they who are unclean, at the time of

that passover, should be deprived of such an excellent sacrament for a whole year, a second passover was, at God's command, appointed for them in the second month; on which a person on a journey afar off, was bound to attend, if he was not able to come to Jerusalem, at the stated time of the passover, Numb. ix. 10, 11. The Jewish masters fix \* a journey afar off, at fifteen miles without the walls of Jerusalem; so that a person at that distance from the city on the fourteenth day of the month, might lawfully keep the second passover. But why should he not rather set out on the preceding day, in order to be at the feast, and not suffer himself to be straitened in time? For if any one, who set out on a journey was retarded by the invincible slowness of his beasts, or by a disorder in his feet, or any accident of the like nature, such a person was not accounted to be on a journey afar off, but to be *ANOS*, *detained by force*. Philo therefore, *de vita Mosis*, lib. 5. seems to have better understood the meaning of this law, when he applies the following things to those, "who, on account of a journey afar off, are hindered from sacrificing with the rest of the nation. For," says he, "they who travel, and live in other parts of the world, are not guilty of any sin, for which they are deprived of the common honor with the rest. Especially as one country cannot contain so populous a nation, but is obliged to send out colonies into many places." Concerning this second passover of the unclean, there are fine things in Selden, *de synedrüs*, lib. 2. c. 1.

\* Ainsworth makes the following remark upon this. The Hebrew of this word *afar off* hath extraordinary pricks over it for special consideration. Hereby the Lord might signify, that we Gentiles who were unclean, even dead in trespasses and sins, and *afar off*, Eph. ii. 1, 13. should be made nigh by the blood of Christ, and so partakers of him, the second passover, who now is *sacrificed* 2 Cor. v. 7.

XVII. In the *rites* prescribed by Moses, there are five things to be observed. 1. The appointment of the paschal lamb. 2. The preparation. 3. The slaying. 4. The roasting. 5. The eating of it.

XVIII. The paschal beast was to be *σαη*, a *small cattle or beast*, a *lamb or kid*, Exod. xii. 3. for that name is common to both, Deut. xiv. 4. Ye shall eat *a small beast, of sheep, and of goats*: thus also, Exod. xii. 5. it is emphatically added, *Ye shall take it out from the sheep, or from the goats*. However it is probable, that the pious used this liberty, in such a manner, that they more frequently offered a lamb, as a more acceptable sacrifice to God, because in sheep there is a greater degree of meekness, docility, and innocence. And therefore it is, that though Christ is in so many different places proposed to us under the type of a lamb, yet we never once observe, that he is pointed out under the denomination of a kid. And therefore Theodoret, *quest.* 24. in *Exod.* seems not to have given a bad explication of the meaning of the lawgiver: "That he who has a sheep, should offer it; but he who has none, should offer a kid."

XIX. We are not to think that oxen were made use of in the paschal sacrifice, strictly so called; though in scripture even they are called by the name of the *passover*: as Deut. xvi. 2. *Thou shalt therefore sacrifice the passover unto the Lord thy God, of the flock and the herd*; and 2 Chron. xxxv. 8. *They gave unto the priests for the passover-offerings two thousand and six hundred small cattle, and three hundred oxen*: and again, ver. 9. *They gave unto the Levites, for passover-offerings, five thousand small cattle, and five hundred oxen*. The appellation *passover*, when it comprehends oxen, is taken in a larger sense, and then denotes those peace-offer-

ings, which were killed at the passover-festival, in order to feast on them with joy, before Jehovah. Thus, in the solemn passover under King Hezekiah, *they did eat throughout the feast, seven days, offering peace-offerings*, 2 Chron. xxx. 22. To this also, it seems, we should apply, what John relates, John xviii. 28. that the Jews would not enter the judgment-hall, lest they should be defiled; *but that they might eat the passover*: not certainly the paschal lamb, which they had eaten, at the same time that Christ did, the day before; but the sacrifices, that were usually offered, for the seven days of the feast, which were hence also called *passovers*. We therefore infer, that the sacrifice appropriated to the passover, consisted of a lamb, or a kid only.

XX. The Lawgiver requires three things, in the lamb, or kid, to be offered; that it be *sound, a male, and of the first year*, Exod. xii. 5. To be *sound*, signifies to be without defect, and blemish, Lev. xxii. 19, 20, 21. The blemishes in a sacrifice are described at large, ver. 22. God would have a *male*, because the more excellent things are to be offered to him; but a male is more excellent than a female, Mal. i. 14. In fine, it was to be *the son of a year*, or of the first year. By which expression is not meant a lamb come to, but short of his first year. For every beast was, from its eighth day, pure, or fit for sacrifice, Exod. xxii. 30. Lev. xxii. 27. From the eighth day therefore, if we regard this general law, a lamb might be offered, till it completed its first year. After which the Jewish masters exclude it from sacrifice. Yet to me it seems more natural, by a lamb of the first year, to understand that which is almost a year old, at which time it is come to its proper size, and its most grateful relish. Nor can I imagine that the ancient believers were so minutely nice in calculating the time, that they account-



ed their lambs profane, directly on the commencement of the second year; or that they set down the nativity of their cattle, in journals, lest they should mistake it a minute.

XXI. The *preparation* of the paschal lamb consisted in the keeping it up, or setting it apart, which was done on the tenth day, and continued until the fourteenth, on which it was to be killed, Exod. xii. 3. The Jews give the following reasons for this command. 1. Lest they should forget it, if they delayed it, and took no care about it, till the very moment of their departure, since they would then be hurried with a variety of business. 2. That they might more exactly observe, whether the lamb had any blemish. 3. That they might have an opportunity, from the sight of the lamb, to converse together concerning their redemption out of Egypt. 4. That they might have time to prepare themselves for keeping the approaching solemnity.

XXII. The *killing* of the lamb followed upon its separation: Exod. xii. 6. *And the whole congregation of the children of Israel shall kill it.* The blood was to be received in a bason, and a bunch of hyssop, to be dipt therein, with which they were to strike or sprinkle the lintel, and the two side-posts of the house, ver. 22. The lintel, I say, not the threshold, lest those that passed, should trample under foot the sacred blood, which was instead both of a sacrifice and a sacrament. For why should not true religion have the same effect on them, that superstition had on the people of Ashdod, who, for a long time, would not tread on the threshold of their temple, after Dagon had fallen on his face upon it? 1 Sam. v. 5. God himself shows the reason of this sprinkling, Exod. xii. 13. *And the blood shall be to you for a token upon the houses where you are: and when I see the blood, I will pass over you, and the plague*

*shall not be upon you to destroy you, when I smite the land of Egypt.* Not that there was any natural efficacy in the blood of the lamb, or that God stood in need of a sign, to distinguish his own people, 2 Tim. ii. 19. But this sign was given to the Hebrews, that thereby they might be confirmed and assured of their deliverance, Heb. xi. 28. *Through faith Moses kept the pass-over, and the sprinkling of blood, lest he that destroyed the first-born, should touch them.*

XXIII. God gave a command about *roasting* it, Exod. xii. 9. *Eat not of it raw, nor sodden at all with water, but roast with fire.* First, God forbids the eating it *raw*. Not that this is to be understood of what is quite raw : for the Israelites knew this of themselves. They were not so voracious, as usually to feed on flesh altogether undressed. It is therefore meant of that which is not sodden or roasted *enough*; as the Jewish masters well explain it. For, in that great hurry with which the first passover was enforced, and in so great a number of paschal lambs, it might easily happen, that some of them might be only half done, or scorched, unless the lawgiver had provided against it, by an express command. A thing not without its mystery, as we shall presently see. But it was not sufficient to have the lamb perfectly done, unless also done in that manner which God prescribed, namely, *roasted*, not *boiled*. This was quite otherwise, than in the other peace-offerings, whose flesh was customarily boiled, in order to be eaten, both by the people and the priests, even at the paschal solemnity. Wherefore, 2 Chron. xxxv. 13. these things are accurately distinguished : *And they roasted the pass-over with fire, according to the ordinance, but the other holy offerings sod them in pots, and in caldrons, and in pans.* Where observe, that in both cases the word BA-

SHAL is used, to shew, that it is applied both to boiling and roasting, according to the nature of the subject.

XXIV. The roasting is followed by the EATING it. Where, first, we are to observe the dress or attire of those who were to eat it, which they were to do, with their loins girded, their shoes on their feet, and their staff in their hand, Exod. xii. 11. which is the dress of travellers, and of those who undertake something laborious. For the garments of the orientals, being long and flowing, and generally ungirded, were to be tucked up, when either they addressed themselves to a journey, or some laborious work, that they might be no impediment to them, 2 Kings iv. 29. And a *person girded* does not seldom denote an *industrious person*, whom the Greeks call EUZONOS ANER, *a man well girded*, and the Hebrews CHALUTZ. And none is ignorant, that a *staff* is proper for a journey, as travellers are thereby supported in dangerous places, and defend themselves with it against aggressors and wild beasts: see Gen. xxxii. 10. Mark v. 8. Nor was the rod of Moses, which is so celebrated, any thing but a traveller's staff, Exod. iv. 2.

XXV. Their being commanded to eat the passover, with *shoes on their feet*, seems to be to the same purpose. For it is probable, while the Israelites were in Egypt, they were generally without shoes; at least they did not use them daily, during their severe bondage. As in the flourishing state of the Jews, we have examples of persons being unshod, even in Judea. As this want of shoes was less hazardous to the Israelites in Egypt, God was pleased to provide them with shoes, when they were now to undertake a tedious, hard, and rough journey. In other cases, one's being bare-footed, was a sign of submission and devotion, Lamd. iii. 5. Hence that saying of the Pythagoric school, "Do thy

religious worship and adoration bare-footed." And Berenice, the sister of King Agrippa, came bare-footed before the tribunal, to prefer her suit to Florus, who exercised great cruelties against the Jews, Joseph *de bell. Jud.* lib. ii. c. 15. This putting on of shoes, was not therefore a part of religious worship, but a symbol of their approaching journey.

XXVI. We shall not grudge to subjoin, because of the affinity of the subject, what Zaba Zago relates, in Damianus a Goes, concerning the manners of the Ethiopians. He affirms, they cannot enter their churches but unshod. Because, says he, the Ethiopic churches are not like that country, where the people of Israel ate the paschal lamb, on their departure out of Egypt, in which place God commanded them to eat it with shoes on their feet, and their loins girded, on account of the defilement of the country; but are like mount Sinai, where God spoke to Moses, saying, *Moses, Moses, put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground.* And this mount Sinai is the parent, from which our churches have derived their origin; just as the apostles from the prophets, and the New Testament from the Old. Thus far he: but the observation appears to me to be idle and silly; like those to which the easterns are too much addicted.

XXVII. But to return from this digression: Moreover, God was, Exod. xii. pleased to command them to eat the passover, with *unleavened bread, and bitter herbs.* Plutarch relates, that, among the Romans, the Flamen Dialis, or priest of Jupiter, was forbid the use of leaven, in *Quest. Roman.* Because as leaven arises from a state of corruption, so also when it is mixed, it corrupts the lump. Nor was only the paschal lamb to be eaten with unleavened bread, but God commanded the Israelites to abstain from leaven, for whole seven

days, *Exod. xii. 15.* Since the five intermediate days of these seven were working days, God ordered the first and last to be accounted festival : for as on the first they were set at liberty from such a hard and grievous bondage, so on the seventh the Red Sea swallowed up Pharaoh and all his host. And this divine institution served to perpetuate the memory of both these among his people. But of what sort these bitter herbs were, we are neither much inclined to inquire, nor is it of great importance. Whoever would know the opinions of the Jewish masters on this head, may consult our great author, *Bochart.* We hasten to other matters.

**XXVIII.** God also forbid them to break so much as a bone of the paschal lamb, *Exod. xviii. 46. Numb. ix. 12.* This law seems likewise to have a reference to their being commanded to eat it in haste ; for they who are in a hurry don't spend time in breaking and taking the marrow out of the bones. But a mystery also lay concealed in this law, of which presently.

**XXIX.** There was another law, not to leave any of the flesh of the lamb until the morning, but to burn what remained thereof, *Exod. xii. 10.* Of this kind were the laws in all sacred feasts, see *Exod. xvi. 19. Lev. vii. 15. and Lev. xxii. 30.* excepting only the flesh of the offering of a vow, or a voluntary offering, *Lev. vii. 16, 17.* The design of these laws was to preserve the sacred food from corruption, and from being put to profane uses. In the lamb, they were to take special care, that its remains should neither hinder nor clog the Israelites, who were now to depart ; nor yield matter of derision to the Egyptians, nor become a prey to dogs ; and perhaps also to prevent their becoming an object of idolatry, as the brazen serpent was.

**XXX.** Moreover, God commanded, that none should go out at the door of his house until the morn-

ing, *Exod. xii. 22.* lest they should meet with the destroying angel, who, indeed, could have distinguished the Israelites, even out of their houses; but they were to be taught, that their safety consisted in keeping themselves, as it were, under the protection of the blood of the lamb, with which they had sprinkled the posts of their doors. If they had rejected this sacrament of their security, they would thereby have also rendered themselves unworthy of the grace that was represented by that sign.

**XXXI.** In fine, it was ordained to be eaten in one house, and none of the flesh to be carried out, *Exod. xii. 46.* This law seems to be joined with *ver. 4.* in which those families, which were so small, as not to be able to eat a whole lamb, are commanded to join with their neighbouring families. But here lest any should think, that the lamb could be halved, and one half carried out to the absent family, the law directs two families joined together, to eat the lamb in one house, and carry none of its flesh abroad. Because so salutary a victim could not be divided; and nothing but an entire lamb, in every house, could rescue that house from the imminent destruction.

**XXXII.** But we are to observe, that some of those ceremonies were perpetual; as the killing, roasting, and eating the lamb, with unleavened bread, and bitter herbs, without breaking a bone, &c. others again were used only once, and no where else but in Egypt. To this may we reckon, 1. The law concerning the keeping up the lamb for the space of four days, before it was to be killed. God would have this done in Egypt, lest the Israelites, when among their enraged enemies, should not have lambs, if they were obliged to look out for them, only at the very last: but in Judea they had nothing to fear of this kind: and it would have been no

easy matter for those who came a great way to the city, to provide themselves precisely at that time, as the greatest part did not come till the preparation for the feast, or at most the day before, and then purchased from those who usually exposed lambs to sale in the temple, John ii. 13, 14. It also appears, from the history of Christ's last passover, that the disciples asked their master, only on the first day of unleavened bread, *Where wilt thou that we go and prepare, that thou mayst eat the passover?* Mark xiv. 12. Consequently they had not kept up a lamb four days before. 2. The law concerning striking the lintle and side posts with the blood of the lamb : because the reason which God gave for this command, could only respect Egypt, Exod. xii. 12, 13. And from 2 Chron. xxx. 15, 16. and chap. xxxv. 5, 6, 10, 11. we learn, that, in Judea, the paschal lambs were killed in the court of the temple, and there their blood was poured out. Nor does it appear that any part of this blood was carried into private houses, to be sprinkled on their door-posts. 3. The law concerning the eating the passover, with their loins girded, with shoes on their feet, a staff in their hands, and with haste. Because these things had a respect to that long and tedious journey they were in a few hours to take : but after they had performed that journey, they ate it quietly and ungirded, not standing, but sitting, not in haste, but at leisure ; as is plain from the example of Christ, who sat down on a couch, in an upper room, with his disciples. 4. The law not to stir abroad out of their houses, lest they should meet the destroying angel ; as in like manner appears from the example of Christ, and his disciples, who, in that very night in which they kept the passover, repaired to the mount of Olives, Matth. xxvi. 30.

XXXIII. It now remains, that we explain, and briefly shew the *mystery* of the passover, and to what all this pomp of ceremonies tended. And in general, it is certain, that two benefits were shadowed forth thereby; the one temporary, and peculiar to the people of Israel; the other eternal, and common to all true believers in Christ. On the former we shall cursorily hint a few things; on the latter be more distinct and explicit.

XXXIV. And, 1. The very name *Pascha*, which, as we have said, signifies a passing over, reminded the Israelites of the angel who passed over their houses, without touching them, in that night on which he fell on the Egyptians, in such a manner, that not a house was free from the slaughter, Exod. xii. 30. 2. The bitter herbs with which they were to eat the lamb, signified the *bitter life* they had led in Egypt, *under hard bondage, in mortar, and in brick*, Exod. i. 14. so that they justly might cry out, as they afterwards did in the Babylonish captivity, Lam. iii. 15. that they *were filled with bitterness, and made drunken with wormwood*. This they testified in the passover, saying to each other, as Maimonides *de pasch.* c. ii. § 40. relates, “We have eaten that bitter thing, because the Egyptians embittered the life of our fathers in Egypt, as is written, Exod. i. 14.” 3. The unleavened bread also, which was but little grateful to the palate, was eaten for the same end. Wherefore the master of the family, when he distributed the pieces of it to his domestics, addressed them thus: *This is the bread of affliction, which our fathers did eat in the land of Egypt*, in the very words of Moses, Deut. xvi. 3. They therefore set down the unleavened bread only in pieces, because not whole, but pieces of bread are given to the poor. 4. Most of the other rites signified to the Israelites, that, being now



called to liberty by God, they were as soon as possible to betake themselves out of that state of bondage. And therefore they were commanded to eat in a standing posture, with their loins girded, with shoes on their feet, and leaning on their staves, and in haste, because that very moment they were to depart. They were not to eat it boiled, but roasted, that being sooner done; and with unleavened bread, that they might not slip the opportunity of departing, should they stay till the lump was leavened. 5. However, as it is necessary to explain dumb signs by words; so, when their children asked, what this ceremony meant, they were commanded to answer, *This is the sacrifice of the Lord's passover, who passed over the houses of the children of Israel in Egypt, when he smote the Egyptians, and delivered our houses*, Exod. xii. 27.

XXXV. But a deeper mystery was veiled under these things, of which we are now to speak. And that we may do it with greater exactness, we will shew, that four things are represented by this sacrament. I. The very person of Christ. II. The sufferings he bore for us. III. The fruits of his sufferings. IV. The manner we are made partakers of them.

XXXVI. The scriptures frequently represent the PERSON of Christ under the type of the LAMB, John, i. 29, 36. on account of his meekness and humility, Matth. xi. 29. the simplicity of his manners, 1 Pet. i. 19. his extraordinary patience, Is. liii. 7. which was the more amazing in him, that though he was able to take vengeance and deliver himself, yet he voluntarily submitted, and, by an astonishing transformation, from the Lion of the tribe of Judah became a Lamb: and thus Samson's riddle was fulfilled in Christ, *Out of the eater came forth meat, and out of the strong came forth sweetness*, Judg. xiv. 14. This same lamb feeds us with his

flesh, gives us his blood to drink, and in fine, clothes us with his wool, Rom. xiii. 14. Gal. iii. 27. But there were peculiar circumstances in the paschal lamb.

XXXVII. For, 1. As the lamb was taken out of the flock, so also was Christ from among his brethren, Deut. xviii. 15. being a *partaker of flesh and blood, and in all things like unto his brethren*, Heb. ii. 14, 17. 2. The lamb was to be perfect; Christ in like manner is *a lamb without blemish, and without spot*, 1 Pet. i. 19. *who, through the eternal Spirit, offered himself without spot to God*, Heb. ix. 14. 3. The same lamb was to be a male, a symbol of vigour, strength, and excellency. So Christ also is that *man*, Jer. xxxi. 22. the *man-child*, Rev. xii. 5. 4. It was to be of the first year, that is, young, and of a most grateful savour, and of the greatest vigour; in order to represent, 1. That Christ was not to continue long among men, but to be cut off in the flower of his age. 2. That he is the sweetest food of the soul, beyond all the dainties of this world, Cant. v. 16. 3. That his sacrifice is of perpetual, and of the greatest efficacy. 5. Nor is it in vain, that the lamb was, for the space of four days, separated from the fold. Thus also it was with Christ, if we reckon prophetic days for years, see Ezek. iv. 6. For, at his thirteenth year, he left his mother's house, as a fold, where he was born and brought up, and was crucified the fourth after. But it likewise deserves observation, that Christ came to Jerusalem to the feast, and to his last passover, on that very day on which God had commanded the lamb to be kept up in Egypt; namely the tenth of the month Nisan. For, six days before the passover, he came to Bethany, John xii. 1. that is, on the ninth of the month Nisan: the day after, he went to Jerusalem, ver. 11. to present himself to be offered to God.

XXXVIII. Let us now consider the SUFFERINGS of Christ, the manner, place, and time, these being all signified by the passover.

XXXIX. As to the *manner*, 1. The lamb was to be killed, and that by the whole multitude of the congregation of Israel. So the priests, scribes, and Pharisees, with the whole body of the people, conspired to the slaying of Christ; for not being satisfied with mockings, smitings, and scourgings, they ceased not till he was given up to death, Luke xxiii. 18. and *they cryed out, all at once, saying, Away with this man.* 2. There is likewise an argument as to the kind of death. For as the blood of the lamb, so that of Christ was also shed; both for the people. Nor was the blood of the lamb poured out on the ground, but, as something precious, received in a bason; because it represented the *precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without spot*, 1 Pet. i. 19. For that blood is the perpetual treasure of the church, which Christ even at this day offers to the Father, and is for ever to offer, or present. 3. The lamb was not to be eaten raw, or not sufficiently done. Christ was also to suffer indeed, and not in a superficial manner. His cup was not to pass, till it was drunk up to the bottom. 4. The roasting of the lamb at the fire, expresses the burning heat of divine wrath, justly kindled against sinners, with which Christ, who presented himself as Surety for sinners, was to be scorched. Hence those complaints, Psal. xxii. 14, 15. *My heart is like wax, it is melted in the midst of my bowels: my strength is dried up like a potsherd, and my tongue cleaveth to my jaws.* See what we have observed concerning the peculiar manner of the roasting, book II. chap. 10. § 26.

XL. The *place* where both the passover and Christ was slain, is exactly the same. For the paschal lamb was, from the days of David, to be killed at Jerusalem;

the place which God had chosen for himself, to cause his name to dwell there. But it was there that Christ suffered, as himself foretold; *It cannot be, that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem*, Luke xiii. 33. And Luke xviii. 31. *Behold we go up to Jerusalem, and all things that are written by the prophets concerning the Son of man, shall be accomplished.*

XLI. There is also a manifest similitude with respect to the *time*. The passover was killed in the middle of the month Nisan, at the full moon, between the two evenings, that is, according to Josephus, from the ninth to the eleventh hour. On that very month, day, and hour, Christ was cut off; as is remarked, not without reason, by Matthew, chap. xxvii. 36, 50. Some observe, that, in the month Nisan, after the equinox, the days came to be longer than the nights; to signify that a new light then arose upon the world, when Christ dispelled the darkness of error and ignorance. And there are others who, by the full moon, will have the fulness of time, and by the two evenings, the evening of the world, and the last times, to be shadowed forth, in which Christ offered himself a sacrifice, according to that of the apostle, Heb. ix. 26. *Once in the end of the world hath he appeared, to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.* Which are at least ingenious, if not solid reflections.

XLII. It now follows, that we consider the consequences and *fruits* of this sacrifice; and indeed they are most excellent and abundant. For, 1. The posts and lintels of the Israelites were sprinkled with the blood of this lamb, that they might avoid the common calamity, and be preserved from the destroying angel: to teach us, that the justice of God spares all, whose consciences are sprinkled with the blood of Christ, Is. lii. 15. *He shall sprinkle many nations.* This is that *sprinkling*

*of the blood of Christ, this is that blood of sprinkling, spoken of by Peter and Paul, 1 Pet. i. 2. Heb. xii. 24. We are therefore no longer to dread the sword of the avenging angel. For, whether an angel of darkness, God hath delivered us from the power of darkness, through the blood of his Son, Col. i. 13, 14. or an angel of heaven, having made peace through his blood, he hath reconciled all things unto himself, whether they be things in earth or things in heaven, ver. 20.*

XLIII. 2. On the night the lamb was slain, the Israelites received full power to deliver themselves from the Egyptian bondage ; to teach us, that Christ, by his blood, has redeemed us from the bondage of the devil, the world, and sin, in order to call us to the glorious liberty of the sons of God, Heb. ii. 14, 15. John viii. 36.

XLIV. 3. In that very night the God of Israel inflicted his judgments on the gods of the Egyptians, Exod. xii. 12. Numb. xxx. 4. namely, four judgments if we may credit Jonathan, whose words in his paraphrase are these : “ Their molten images were melted down, their idols of stone cut down, those made of earth ground to powder ; in fine, those of wood reduced to ashes.” Though we cannot avouch this for truth, as the scripture is silent ; yet it is certain, God’s threatenings were not without their effect. And whatever they signified, we see an illustrious fulfilment of them in the death of Christ ; whereby, the middle wall of partition being broken down, by which many nations, who had been separated from the Jews, being called to the knowledge of the true God, cast their idols to the moles, and to the bats, Is. ii. 20.

XLV. 4. As the month Abib, before the institution of the passover, was the seventh month of the Jewish year ; but when God instituted the passover, he commanded, that it should, for the future, be accounted

the first, and from it begin to reckon their sacred or ecclesiastical year. This month began with the spring; at which time, when God sendeth forth his Spirit, all things are created, and the face of the earth is renewed, Psal. civ. 30. And this may be also applied to Christ, who introduced a new age, and abolished old things, in order to change them for the better: *Behold*, says he, *I make all things new*, Rev. xxi. 5. So that now we justly reckon time, not from the first creation of the world, which seems to have happened on Tisri, the first month of the civil year, but from the rising of a more auspicious star, at the illustrious epiphany or manifestation of our Saviour: for such new miracles of divine goodness cause former things, in comparison of *these, not to be remembered, nor come into mind*, Is. lxxv. 17.

XLVI. Moreover, we are to shew, in *what manner* the Israelites were made partakers of the benefits they obtained by means of the lamb. And here two things were required. 1. That they were to sprinkle the lintel and door-posts of their houses with the blood of the lamb. 2. To eat its flesh. For if any of the Israelites neglected either of these, they thereby rejected the grace annexed to these commands.

XLVII. By the door-posts of the houses are meant our hearts, because God sprinkles these with the blood of his Son, Heb. x. 22. *our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience*. And the hearts of men lie as open before God, as the door-posts of our houses to us, 1 Sam. xvi. 7. the doors of our hearts are to be set open, that by them the King of glory may come in, Psal. xxiv. 7. Rev. iii. 20. But we may be said to sprinkle our hearts with the blood of Christ, when, by a stedfast faith, we embrace the doctrine of the cross, and apply to ourselves the merits of his sufferings. We are however to

take care, that we do not sprinkle on the threshold what we are commanded to sprinkle on the lintel, and posts of the door, that it may not be trampled under foot, lest the apostle's threatenings should be executed on us, which he denounced against those who *tread under foot the Son of God, and account the blood of the covenant, wherewith they were sanctified, an unholy thing*, Heb. x. 29.

XLVIII. By the same faith also, the flesh is to be eaten. For why hast thou teeth and a stomach? (Is it not to eat?) Believe, and thou hast eaten. This eating is absolutely necessary to salvation, John vi. 53. *Verily, verily I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, ye have no life in you.*

XLIX. The flesh of the lamb was to be eaten neither altogether raw, nor half-done. And they are guilty of this crime, who digest not these mysteries by proper and diligent meditation. Meditation is to the soul, what concoction or digestion is to the stomach. Hence, according to Petronius, to publish to the public indigested thoughts, is to publish things not yet properly concocted and digested by an attentive meditation.

L. The whole lamb was likewise to be eaten, that nothing might remain: neither is it sufficient to receive Christ in part; as if one would be willing to enjoy his glory, but not partake of his sufferings; or to have him for his Redeemer, but not for his Lawgiver and Lord: or as if one not thinking it sufficient to trust in the merits of Christ, should place his hope of salvation partly in his own works, or in the intercession and mediation of others.

LI. What remained that could not be consumed, because of the small number of guests, was not suffered to be reserved to the next day, but was to be

burnt with fire. This may be applied partly to the type, partly to the thing signified. The type was to be reserved to another time. From the day the light of the gospel appeared, what regarded the shadows, was to cease and be abolished. As to the thing signified, whoever feeds upon Christ by a true faith, will not be found empty, or hungry on the morrow; nor does he stand in need of a new Christ, or a new offering of him. For as *by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified*, Heb. x. 14. so *he that cometh to him, shall never hunger, and he that believeth on him shall never thirst*, John vi. 35. Wherefore thou art under no necessity to reserve any thing of thine own for thyself, with which to make up a deficiency in Christ, when thou hast once apprehended him by faith.

LII. In the mean time, they were so to eat the flesh of the lamb, as not to break a bone of it. To break the bones of the lamb, is to pry and search into things that exceed our capacity. As if it was not sufficient for faith to be fed with things obvious, unless we attempted to search into those things, the knowledge of which is forbidden, and the discovery dangerous. To pry into such things, is to come off with damage in the attempt. This brings to mind that saying of Moses, Deut. xxix. 29. *The secret things belong unto the Lord our God; but those things which are revealed, belong unto us and to our children for ever*: and that excellent saying of Jerome, Prov. xxv. 27. though not so agreeable to the Hebrew, *The curious pryer into his majesty shall be overwhelmed with his glory*.

LIII. The bitter herbs, with which the lamb was to be eaten, signify the necessity of communion with him in his sufferings, Phil. iii. 10. if we would have communion with him in his glory: we are to wear a crown of thorns with Christ, that a crown of glory may suc-



ceed, *If we suffer, we shall also reign with him*, 2 Tim. ii. 12. Nor are these things to be applied only to the external afflictions of the body; but also to the internal distresses of the vexed soul, grieving for sin in a godly manner, fearing the wrath of God; without which the sweet consolations of the Lord Jesus, which he applies only to the mourners in Zion, Is. lxi. 3. are usually neither tasted nor felt.

LIV. Nor is it in vain, that leaven is so often and so expressly forbid those who are invited to eat of the lamb. For in scripture leaven is the symbol of corruption, and especially of hypocrisy, Luke xii. 1. Paul has writ very properly to this purpose, 1 Cor. v. 7, 8. *Christ our passover is sacrificed for us: therefore let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice, and wickedness, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth.* Leaven might also be applied to pride, because the leavened lump directly rises or puffs up; or to hatred and animosity, which embitter the soul. Now, whoever has communion with Christ, ought doubtless to be purged from all these vices; because he in whose mouth was found no guile, 1 Pet. ii. 22. cannot endure hypocrites; nor he who became obedient even unto the death of the cross, Phil. ii. 8. the proud; nor he who is our peace, Eph. ii. 14. the contentious; and therefore he offered himself, in order to reconcile us both to God, and to one another.

LV. But strangers, the defiled, the uncircumcised, were excluded from the paschal lamb: because righteousness hath no fellowship with unrighteousness, nor light any communion with darkness, nor Christ any concord with Belial, 2 Cor. vi. 14, 15. Nevertheless whoever he be, that, from a sense of his own uncleanness, humbly has recourse to the grace of God in Christ, ought not therefore to despond: for *the good Jehovah's*

*pardoneth every one, that prepareth his heart to seek God, Jehovah the God of his fathers, though he be not cleansed according to the purification of the sanctuary,* 2 Chron. xxx. 18, 19.

LVI. Again, the Israelites in Egypt were commanded to eat the lamb, girded, shod, and leaning on their staves. To which rites we may see frequent allusions in scripture. Christ, Luke xii. 35. Paul, Eph. vi. 14. and Pet. i. 3. command us to have our loins girded about: to signify, that the souls of believers are to be girded about with truth and soberness; to be ready for the heavenly journey, for the work of the Lord, for the conflict with spiritual wickednesses in heavenly places; to all which undertakings, flowing and trailing garments are an impediment. Paul, Eph. vi. 15. speaks of feet shod with the preparation, or promptitude, of the gospel of peace. For the gospel is to be preached with cheerfulness, and confessed and walked in without stumbling. God himself is the believer's staff, on whom he leans, and to whom he commends his soul. Faith also is instead of a staff, because by it we are said to stand, Rom. xi. 20. 1 Cor. xvi. 13. But we are to take particular notice, that this is the attire of travellers, which is the condition of all who are partakers of Christ. For in this life they are strangers, and in their way to a better country, Psal. xxxix. 13. 1 Pet. ii. 11.

LVII. The Israelites were also commanded to eat it in haste, because there was danger in delay from the Egyptians, who were soon to press them to be gone. And this is also applicable to us; because many enemies have a design upon us, the journey is long, the time short, and we feeble and easily apt to flag. Wherefore, as Lot was to go out of Sodom, and the Israelites out of Egypt, so we are commanded to make

haste, to stretch every nerve, in order to escape the jaws of the devil, imitating those violent, who take the kingdom of heaven by force, Matth. xi. 12. and remembering Lot's wife, who perished by her delay, Luke xvii. 32.

LVIII. Lastly, we are to observe, that the lamb was to be eaten in one house, out of which it was not lawful to go, for fear of meeting the angel of death. This house is the church, out of which there is no salvation, no communion with Christ. Let the false Nicodemists take notice of this, who imagine they can skulk in safety among Egyptians, and think it sufficient, if they believe in their heart, though with their mouth they confess not the Lord Jesus, separating what the apostle has joined together, Rom. x. 9. And therefore, if they be wise, let them not forsake the assembling themselves together with us, Heb. x. 25. And having once entered this house, let them never leave it, lest they be condemned for apostates; concerning whom Paul speaks, Heb. vi. 4, 5, 6. and chap. x. 38, 39. and Peter, 2 ep. ii. 20, 21.

---

## C H A P. X.

*Of the Extraordinary Sacraments in the Wilderness.*

**B**ESIDES the *ordinary* and *universal* sacraments of *circumcision* and the *passover*, some extraordinary symbols of divine grace were granted to the Israelites in the wilderness, which, in the New-Testament, are applied to Christ, and his benefits, and said to have the same signification with our sacraments. And they are in order these: I. The *passage* in the cloud *through the*

*Red Sea.* II. The *manna* which was rained from heaven. III. The *water* issuing out of the *rock*. IV. The *brazen serpent* erected by Moses for the cure of the Israelites.

II. The sacred history, Exod. xiv. very particularly relates, how Pharaoh, with mad rage, at the head of a vast army, pursued the Israelites, who were just departed from Egypt, and, as he imagined, were entangled on every hand, through a mistake of the way, in unpassable deserts: how, in the first place, a miraculous cloud, interposing between them and the Egyptians, protected the Israelites, who were trembling with fear, and calling out to heaven for help: next how the channel of the weedy or Red Sea was made passable, as on dry land, by the waters giving way on each hand, being divided by the rod of Moses, and by a strong east wind: how, in fine, the Egyptian monarch did not delay to pursue them close as they retreated, entered the sea as it opened a way for them, and was destroyed with all his army, the waters immediately returning upon them. For the better understanding of all this, we shall briefly explain these five heads. I. Why that sea, which Moses, Exod. xiii. 18. and xiv. 4. called *IAM SUPH*, or the *weedy sea*, is by Paul, Heb. xi. 29. and generally by writers, called *HE ERUTHRA THALASSA*, the *Red Sea*? II. Whether that drying up of the waters was natural, or altogether miraculous? III. Whether the Israelites passed over the whole breadth of that sea, and landed on the Arabian shore over-against Egypt, or only marched as far through it, as was enough to overwhelm the Egyptians, and returned again on foot, by taking a semi-circular compass, to the same shore? IV. In what sense the apostle might say, the *Israelites were baptized unto Moses in the*

*cloud and in the sea?* V. What may be the mystical signification of these things?

III. The reason is obvious why this is called the weedy sea; namely, because of the plenty of sea-weeds, with which it abounds, heaps of which being raised like mountains near the shore, and laid close together by the continual heat of the sun, afford the convenience of houses to the inhabitants there, who from their eating of fish are called *Ichthyophagi*. And Agatharcides says, that some of them live *under the ribs of fish, covered over with sea-weed*. Bochart in *Phaleg*. lib. iv. c. 22. may be consulted on the subject.

IV. Why it is called the *Red* or *Erythrean* sea, was formerly not so well known. The ancients generally referred it to the colour of the water; which some think was derived from the reflection of the solar rays; others from the circumjacent mountains being made red by the scorching heat, from which waters impetuously descended into the sea, and tinged it of a like colour; others, in fine, from the red sand that lay on its shore, or channel: not to mention any thing now about the fable of Perseus, who, after having killed the sea-monster, to which the daughter of Cepheus had been exposed, is said there to have washed away the blood, with which he was all over stained. But the undoubted experience of mariners shews the falschood of all this. Ludovicus Vartomanus, who sailed over the whole of it almost from its extremity to the mouth of the streights, says, "It is a thing sufficiently confessed by all, that the said sea is not red, but like other seas," *Navig.* lib. i. c. 21. The same thing Pietro della Valle, a noble Roman, an eye-witness, testifies, who says the waters are clear, transparent, and blue, and the sand of the usual colour, nay, whiter than ours, *Itiner.* p. i. c. 30. Diodorus Siculus writes, that "in colour it is altogether

green." Not that such is the nature of the water, but on account of the quantity of moss and sea-weed floating thereon. What is therefore said of the red colour is all fable, this prejudice having arisen from an erroneous interpretation of the name.

V. They come nearer the truth, who derive its name from king Erythras or Erythrus, who had this sea within the bounds of his empire. But who this Erythras was, all the profane writers are absolutely ignorant. The scriptures alone inform us of this: from which Nic. Fuller, *Miscellan. lib. iv. c. 20.* boasts that he made the first discovery; namely, that this Erythras was Esau, surnamed *Edom* or *red*, both from the hairy redness with which he was born, Gen. xxv. 25. and from that red pottage for which he sold his birth-right, ver. 30. This Edom, according to the genius of those times, having the whole authority in those parts, gave name to the country reduced under his dominion and power, so that it was also called *the land of Edom*, and even simply *Edom*, namely, of the feminine gender, Jer. xlix. 17. His posterity, proud of so great an original of their nation, lived on the borders of the sea we are now treating of: and hence it had its name: the Hebrew *Edomi* or *Idumean* sea, the Greek *ERUTHRAION*, and the Latin *Mare Rubrum*, differ therefore only in language. See, among others, *Vossius de idololat. lib. i. c. 34.*

VI. We are on no account to imagine, that what we are here told, befel the waters of the Red sea, was either altogether, or for the greatest part natural: as if Moses, who had great skill in the knowledge of nature, took the opportunity of an ordinary reflux, which, on the blowing of an east wind, was both more impetuous and lasting than usual; ventured, in the present imminent danger, to attempt the passage, and persuad-

ed the Israelites to follow his example : but Pharaoh, who was ignorant of these things, and delaying too long, was drowned on the return of the flood. For the whole of this history is full of miracles ; which none but the *enemies of the scripture*, as Scaliger, *de subtilitat. exercit.* 52. justly calls them, can doubt of. 1. It was a miracle, that the extraordinary cloud, which went before, and pointed out the way to the Hebrews, should now place itself in the middle between them and the Egyptians, Exod. xiv. 19. 2. It was a miracle, that when Moses lifted up his rod, and stretched out his hand, the sea should not only go back, but was also divided ; and giving way on each hand, yield a safe passage to Israel amidst the waters, ver. 16, 21. which never was, nor could be done by any natural reflux. 3. It is a miracle, that the waters, naturally fluid, should be collected together into very high heaps, and stand like a wall on the right and left of the Israelites, ver. 22. 4. It was a miracle of miracles, that when Moses again stretched out his hand and rod towards that part of the sea, where the Egyptians were pursuing them, the waters should return to their natural force, and drown all the Egyptians ; while the children of Israel had now either almost finished, or were still prosecuting their journey on dry land, through the midst of the sea, ver. 26, 27, 29. Can any mortal have so much impudence, as to dare to compare these things with the daily flux and reflux of the sea ? It is indeed true, that God here made use of the wind ; but it is also evident, that the same God exerted an extraordinary power, both by raising the wind so seasonably, and by executing such things by it, as could not be effected by any natural cause, by its own virtue. And therefore the Israelites deservedly admired, in this work, *that great hand of their God*, ver. 31.

VII. The inhabitants on the coast of the Arabian gulf, though barbarous to the highest degree, preserved the memory of this prodigy for many ages after ; as Diodorus Siculus vouches, lib. iii. where he writes as follows. “ The neighbouring Ichthyophagi have an ancient tradition, handed down to them by their ancestors, that, upon a certain great recess of the sea, all the parts of this bay being dried up, and the sea falling back to opposite parts, the channel appeared of a green colour, and that again the sea, returning with a strong tide, was restored to its former place.” In these words, who does not see that this miracle of Moses is described, the memory of which these barbarians did, though somewhat obscurely, propagate to their posterity ?

VIII. But it is a more intricate point, which is even at this day made the subject of debate among the learned, whether the Hebrews passed the sea straight forward, from the shore of Egypt, to the opposite coast of Arabia ; or whether they fetched a semicircular compass in the midst of the sea, and returned to the same shore from which they set out ? The former opinion is by far more commonly received ; and rests on those arguments, collected by Rivet in *Exod.* xiv. 21. 1. The words of the history seem to bear this meaning ; and it tends very much to shew the greatness of the miracle. The scripture says, that the *Israelites passed through the Red sea* ; but what others allege, was not a *transit* or passage, but a *circuit*. 2. It appears from the map of the country, that it must have been so. For, in order to come from Egypt to mount Sinai, as the Red sea lies between that mountain and Egypt, it must of necessity be passed over. For though the foot-passage from Rameses to Sinai is direct, leaving the Red sea on one side, yet so blocked up, and every where so rough on account of rocks, as not to be fit for the journeying of so



great a people. 3. The same is concluded from Numb. xxxiii. 8. *And they departed from before Pi-hahiroth, and passed through the midst of the sea into the wilderness*; which seems to denote quite a different thing, from their returning by a circuit, or compass to the wilderness. 4. Add the authority of Josephus, who declares, that the Israelites passed over to the opposite shore, *Antiq. lib. ii. c. ult.*

IX. But the contrary opinion has also great names, and no mean arguments to support it. 1. They desire us to take notice of the intent of the passage through the sea; which was the drowning of the Egyptians, and by that means to manifest the glory of God to the people all around. And therefore it is probable, the Egyptians were thrown out on that part of the shore which was nearest to Egypt, that the judgment of God might be manifested to that kingdom. 2. They observe, that the part of the Red sea, which the Israelites passed over, is distant from the opposite shore at least six, others say, fifteen leagues: which journey it seems, could not possibly be accomplished by so great an army, together with their children, women, and baggage, in the compass of a short night, as was done here, ver. 21, 23. 3. It appears from Exod. xiii. 20. that before the Israelites entered into the sea, they encamped in the wilderness of Etham, in the border of the wilderness. And yet, after their coming out of the sea, they again proceeded to the wilderness of Etham, Numb. xxiii. 8. They consequently returned to the same shore, but at a greater distance from the place from which they set out. This argument cannot be answered, but by saying, either that there were two wildernesses of the same name, on each side the Red sea, which Lyranus does; or that the whole country, quite to mount Sinai, went under the same appellation, according to Rivet: but

whether this can be proved, is matter of inquiry. 4. They add, that the Red sea does not lie between Egypt and mount Sinai, but that the journey by land is directly performed with camels and other cattle. Of this may be seen the *Itinerarium of della Valle*, p. 1. c. 27, 28.

5. The argument for the contrary sentiment, taken from its being said, that the Israelites *passed* through the Red sea, seems to be of little weight. For the sacred history uses very general terms, *And they went into the midst of the sea*, Exod. xiv. 22. *They walked upon dry land in the midst of the sea*, ver. 29. It is, indeed, said Numb. xxxiii. 8. *And they passed through*. But besides, that NGABAR sometimes simply signifies *to go on before*, as Gen. xxxiii. 3. *And he passed over* (went on) *before*; the Israelites may very properly be said to have passed through the waters of the sea, though by taking a semicircular compass they returned to the same shore. For in every journey there is an *intermediate passage* from the term *from which*, to the term *to which*. Nor is it necessary, that every passage should be in a direct line. 6. Nor is it more convincing, that they are said to have walked *in the midst of the sea*, though others oppose this very reason. For certainly they who had the sea both on their right and left, must have walked in the midst of the sea by what way soever, or whither-soever they went. So that it appears, nothing certain can be brought from scripture for the opposite opinion. The decision of the question depends principally on an exact plan or map of the country. Whoever wants more on this head may consult Fagius in *Exod.* iv. and Christian. Schotanus, my honored predecessor in the chair at Franeker, *Biblioth. sacr.* t. 2. p. 142. add Genebrardus in *Chron.* p. 66. Gregor. Turon. *Hist. lib.* 1. c. 10. Abulensis, and Grotius on the place, and, who

is more full on the subject, Ludovicus, de Tena *ad Hebr. xi. difficult.* 19. and lastly, Usher, *epist.* 105.

X. The apostle alluding, 1 Cor. x. 1, 2. to this history, says, that *all the fathers were under the cloud, and all passed thro' the sea, and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea.* Here are three difficulties to be cleared up: first, It is inquired, how the apostle could write, that they were *under the cloud*, since the sacred history declares, that the cloud went *behind them*, Exod. xiv. 19. But this is of little weight: for it was behind them in such a manner, that it hung a great way over them, and extending to a vast breadth and height, encompassed them under its protection: as there is an allusion to this, Is. iv. 5. *And Jehovah will create upon every dwelling-place of mount Zion, and upon her assemblies, a cloud by day.*

XI. The other difficulty is something more considerable; namely, how the Israelites could be *baptized in the cloud and in the sea*, since they were not dipt in the water of the sea, nor wetted by the cloud. But we are to know, 1. That the apostle uses the term *baptism* here in a figurative sense. For, because the Corinthians gloried of baptism, the apostle applies the name of baptism to those things, of which the Israelites might glory, as much as the Corinthians could of baptism, and which were to them instead of baptism. 2. There is also some sort of agreement in the external sign; a cloud differs very little from water, and the sea is water already: the cloud hung over their heads, so also water hangs over baptized persons. Compare this with what we shall presently advance from Gregory of Nyssa, concerning the cloud. The sea surrounded them on all sides; so does water also, those that are baptized. 3. This sign signifies the same that baptism does, and so baptism is the antitype of it, as on a like subject Peter

said, 1 Pet. iii. 21. See *Cameron in 1 Cor. x.* And the ancient Jews have observed, that, in the baptism of the Israelites, there was indeed a peculiar respect had to the pillar of cloud. In *Pirke R. Eliez. c. 44. R. Zacharias* speaks thus : “ The pillar of cloud surrounded the camp of the Israelites, as a wall surrounds a town : nor could an enemy or foe approach to them.” But “ the cloud preserved those who wanted true baptism, even without the camp, which was holy.” Gul. Vorstius has ingeniously compared this passage with this place of the apostle. But what we have said concerning the passage of the Israelites through the sea, and the baptism therein, appears much more probable to us than the judgment of Selden, in other respects a learned man, who by the sea understands here any receptacle of water, and will have the passing through the sea to be the same, as to be dipped in water, *de synedr. lib. i. c. 3.* But this intricate way of speaking seems not to agree with the simplicity of the apostle.

XII. Thirdly, It is proper to inquire, in what sense they may be said to be *baptized unto Moses* ; since that seems to be too great an honor to be conferred on a servant, or any mere man ? 1 Cor. i. 13. I answer, It is one thing to be baptized *unto a person* ; another, to be baptized *in the name of a person.* In whose name soever we are baptized, we are baptized by his authority and command ; we acknowledge him for our King, who alone can institute public seals ; we devote our obedience and worship to him, so as for the future to be called by his name ; from him we, by faith, expect that spiritual grace, which is sealed by baptism. Paul carefully disclaimed this honor, because it was greater than became a man. To be baptized unto any person, is by far of a lower degree : for either it signifies simply, to be baptized by the ministry of any one ; or thus,

that, by receiving baptism, we acknowledge such a person to be a faithful servant of God. Both may be here with propriety joined together. *They were baptized unto Moses*, that is, according to the Syriac, *by the hand of Moses*; or, as Augustine reads on Psal. lxxvii. *by Moses*. For Moses, by his prayers, obtained for them this protection of the cloud, and this passage through the sea. Moses, by stretching out his rod, divided the water. Moses first entered the channel of the sea, and both led and encouraged the rest to venture with him. And thus they were baptized by the means of Moses. But there is more implied in this manner of speaking. As these miracles were sacraments of divine grace to the true and spiritual Israel, so they were also symbols, by which God confirmed the ministry of Moses, and proved him to be a typical deliverer and mediator. And therefore in the place, where we read of their passing through the sea, the people is said *to have believed Jehovah and his servant Moses*, Exod. xiv. 31. and in so far the people did well; for, Exod. xix. 9. when God himself set forth the authority he had bestowed on Moses, he says, *Lo, I come unto thee in a thick cloud, that the people may hear when I speak with thee, and believe thee for ever*. And thus they were baptized unto Moses, because by this sign God taught them to acknowledge Moses for a faithful prophet, and an eminent type of the Messiah, by whose intervention those benefits should be conferred upon them, which were both great in themselves, and earnest of the greatest blessings to be conferred by the Messiah. And in this respect Moses had something peculiar above other ministers.

XIII. This very passage of Paul leads us to meditate on the mystery of this sign: for it teaches us, that, in its signification, it answers to our baptism. Tertullian,

*lib. de baptismo*, says, “First, when the people went out of Egypt, and, by passing through the water, escaped the tyranny of the king of Egypt, the water overwhelmed him with all his hosts. Which figure is more evident in the sacrament of baptism. The nations are delivered from the world, namely by the water, and leave the devil, their old tyrant, sunk in the water.” But let us descend to particulars.

XIV. This miraculous cloud was, 1. A symbol of God’s gracious presence. For *God was in the cloud*, Exod. xiii. 21. and *the angel of God*, Exod. xiv. 19. namely, *the angel of the covenant, the angel of his presence*, who had appeared to Moses in the bush, and led the Israelites through the wilderness, Is. lxiii. 9. 2. It prefigured the future incarnation of the Son of God: for as the Son of God veiled the infinite glory of his majesty in this cloud, spoke from it, wrought miracles, and protected his people; so in like manner he was, in due time, to conceal his majesty under the assumed form of a servant, Phil. ii. 7. but in such a manner, that the rays of his glory might at times shine forth in his divine discourses and miracles, which no age ever saw any either like them, or equal to them, John i. 14. 3. It signified God’s protection towards the elect, and his pointing out the way, through the wilderness of this world, to the heavenly Canaan. For as Gregory of Nyssa finely says of this cloud, *de vita Mosis*, “It was such a miracle, that, while the shining rays of the sun were hot and scorching, it defended the people like an interposing screen, and tempered, with its shade, and the gentle drops of dew that were diffused, the heat of the air; but in the night it became a fire, and by its own light afforded the Israelites, as it were, a torch or flambeau from evening till the rising of the sun.” Such is the protection and guidance that we have in Christ,

who, by his shadow, screens us from the heat of divine wrath; Is. iv. 5, 6. and enlightens us by his word and Spirit, *as the light of the world, which whoever followeth shall not walk in darkness*, John viii. 12. who, in a word, is the *author and finisher of our faith*, Heb. xii. 2. 4. As this cloud placed itself in the middle between Israel and the Egyptians; so Christ takes upon himself those evils which threaten his people, and *the glory of the Lord is their rear-guard*, Is. lviii. 8.

XV. We may observe in the *passage* through the Red sea, the following things. *Pharaoh* and the *Egyptians* are the figure or emblem of the devil and sin, who use their utmost endeavour to keep the elect under their yoke of bondage, and, whenever, with a generous mind, they aspire to liberty, to pull them back again. But they shall lose their labour, and in the end dearly pay for their wickedness, in a way answerable to their crimes. Because Pharaoh commanded the young children of the Israelites to be drowned in the river, Exod. i. 22. himself with all his hosts is, by the law of retaliation, drowned in the sea. The angel of the waters publishes a similar procedure of divine justice, Rev. xvi. 6. *Because they have shed the blood of saints and prophets, thou hast given them blood to drink: for they are worthy.*

XVI. MOSES was a type of Christ our Deliverer and Saviour. 1. Moses, by his prayers, interceded for the people, and obtained for them this great salvation. Christ is our Advocate with the Father; and all the good that befalls us, is owing to his intercession. 2. Moses with his rod, as a moral instrument, divided the waters: Christ, with the wood of his cross, hath opened a new and living way to heaven. 3. Moses was the leader of the people, and went before them, through a

way by which none ever went before. Christ also went before us in the road of sufferings, *leaving us an example, that we should follow his steps*, 1 Pet. ii. 21. 4. Moses with the rod, with which he divided the waters, that the Israelites might pass through, got the waters to return and drown the Egyptians. The same cross of Christ, which *unto them which are called is the power of God, is unto the Jews a stumbling block, and to the Greeks foolishness*, 1 Cor. i. 23, 24. *to these the savour of death unto death; but to those the savour of life unto life*, 2 Cor. ii. 19.

XVII. The WATERS of the Red sea signify afflictions, and even death itself; so likewise do the waters of baptism, the fellowship in the sufferings, death, and burial of Christ, Rom. vi. 3, 4. But as the Israelites marched to their deliverance through the midst of the waters, as through the midst of death; so, in like manner, the sufferings which we undergo for Christ, work for us a far more exceeding weight of glory, 2 Cor. iv. 17. and death itself is the passage to eternal life, John v. 24. The waters which saved Israel, destroyed the Egyptians. The death of our body, which presents our souls pure before God, as a flock of sheep newly shorn, which come up from the washing, Cant. iv. 2. entirely destroys in us all the remains of the devil and of sin, insomuch that our eyes shall never more behold those enemies, to whose troublesome and malicious assaults we have been exposed even to the very last.

XVIII. That strong EAST WIND, which by its violence drove the waters before it, for the benefit of the Israelites, was an emblem of the Spirit of Christ, John iii. 8. of Christ, I say, who is \* *the dawning, day-spring*

\* The word ANATOLE, which our translators render *day spring*, is the same which the Septuagint use, Jer. xxiii. 5. Zech. iii. 8. and vi. 8. where the Messiah is spoken of under the name of the *branch*.



from on high, Luke i. 78. and applies to us, by the efficacy of his Spirit, the virtue of his merits, by removing all hindrances, nay directing them to the salvation of his people : *Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith Jehovah of hosts, Zech. iv. 6.* By the same Spirit of his mouth he will hereafter consume that wicked one, who opposes his kingdom, 2 Thess. ii. 8.

XIX. The *Israelites*, when just come out of Egypt, are a figure of believers, who, having no sooner renounced the devil, and by the power of Christ recovered their liberty, are immediately exposed to the persecution of Satan and the world, who endeavour to bring them back again to bondage. And though they have now happily surmounted the first danger, yet they have still a wide sea to cross, lofty tops of mountains to pass over, and in fine, an unpassable wilderness to go through, before they obtain that full salvation, which is the mark they aim at and desire. When every thing seemed to be given up for lost, and no way of escape appeared, then God came to Israel's help, and opened a way through the midst of the sea. So, in an especial manner, he comes by his grace to the relief of his church, when she is destitute of all human assistance, and nothing but the most certain destruction seems to hang over her, Is. xliii. 2. *When thou passest through the waters, I will be with thee ; and through the rivers, they shall not overflow thee.* This deliverance happened to Israel, when they did nothing at all towards it, Exod. xiv. 14. *Jehovah shall fight for you, and ye shall hold your peace ;* but only believed, and beheld the mighty hand of God, Heb. xi. 29. *By faith they passed through the Red sea.* 'Tis thus also, that God works out eternal salvation for us ; for us, I say, *not working, but believing in him that justifieth the ungodly ;* Rom. iv. 5. The *Israelites*, after their passage through the sea,

and the destruction of their enemies, sung a joyful song of triumph to the praise of God their Deliverer ; thus also John, Rev. xv. 2, 3. saw the saints, who, having got over the sea of glass, which was mixed with fire, sung the song of Moses the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb. And thus far of the passage through the Red sea.

XX. We are next to speak of the MANNA, where we are to consider, 1. The name. 2. The thing itself. 3. Its origin. 4. Its adjuncts. 5. The duties of the Israelites concerning it. 6. Their sin. 7. The mystery of it.

XXI. The surprise of the Israelites gave rise to the name. When they first saw it, they said to one another, Exod. xvi. 15. MAN HU, *it is manna ; for they twist not*, MA HU, *what it was*, and ver. 31. *And the house of Israel called the name thereof manna*. We can on no account assent to those, who render MAN HU, *what is this ?* For MAN, never signifies in Hebrew *what*, and here it is very expressly distinguished from MAH : nay, it is not very common in Chaldee taken in that sense, as they usually say MAN, of a person, not of a thing. I will not however conceal it, that they speak with greater freedom than they ought, who absolutely deny, that MAN in Chaldee is applied to a thing. Drusius *ad Joh. vi. 31.* hath given some examples to the contrary. But the Israelites spoke then in Hebrew, not in Chaldee. I know not, whether they are in the right, who affirm, that MAN is an Egyptian word, and is equivalent to an interrogative pronoun ; but though they are, yet it does not seem probable, that the Israelites would express a thing so sacred by a term borrowed from a nation so odious, not only in that first surprise, but also ever after. And then, it is altogether trifling to say, that the food which God gave to the Is-

raelites, was always called *what*; only because, when at first they did not know it, they asked, *what is this?*

XXII. It is much more agreeable to derive the word from MINNAH, *he prepared, appointed, determined*: and hence the name *manna*, *portion*, even of the food, allotted for any person, 1 Sam. i. 4, 5. Neh. viii. 10, 12. and generally elsewhere. But from *manna*'tis easy to form *man* by an \**Apocope*, especially in the exclamation of persons under a surprise, and when *he* is the next letter that begins the following word. And this is the more probable, as such an Apocope is often to be met with in the word *manna*: once in the imperative, CHÆSÆD VÆEMÆTH MAN, *Prepare* (or appoint) *mercy and truth*, Psal. lxi. 7. and again in the † preterite, JOH. i. 17. VAMAN, *And Jehovah prepared a great fish*; and what comes nearest to the point in hand is, when an allotment of food is spoken of as in Dan. i. 5. VAMAN, *And the king appointed them a daily provision*. As therefore both the form of the term agrees to it, and the signification is very suitable; what remains but that we say, with the most learned of the Jews, that *man* signifies the food appointed, prepared for, and given to Israel as their portion? Such a name became this miraculous food. And what is added is no objection, namely, that the Israelites knew not what it was. For, in general, they knew from the prediction of Moses, that they were to be satisfied with bread, ver. 12. from which they conjectured, that what they saw, was the portion which was intended for them from heaven; and this they expressed by the name, *man*. But they did not distinctly know, what it would be, nor had they

\* A figure which takes away the last syllable or letter of a word.

† The author's words are indeed, *iterumque in futuris, ac in the present*; but I imagine, there is a mistake, as the words quoted are rendered in the preterite tense.

any peculiar name by which to express it. To this the author of the book of Wisdom seems to have alluded, when, chap. xvi. 20. he calls *manna bread prepared from heaven*. And therefore this name has so far prevailed, that it has remained unvaried in all languages, and is even given also to things which have any similitude with that food of the Israelites.

XXIII. As to the *thing* itself, naturalists well know, there are three things reckoned among watery meteors; namely, dew, honey, and manna. But the learned are not agreed about the original of manna. *Christophorus Vega apud Jonstonum de admirandis meteororum*, c. 10. is of opinion, that the manna of the shops is the work of certain small bees, like thick-bodied gnats, from which, as they sit in clusters on trees, something flows down in drops, like a kind of sweat. *Vossius, Physiolog. Christianæ* lib. v. c. 21. says, it is the sap of the larch-tree, or of the ash, and that *Matthias Lobelius* was the very first who said so. The more common opinion is, that it is a kind of aerial honey sprinkled with dew, which, in the summer-months, during the scorching heat of the sun in the day-time, runs together by the nocturnal cold into clusters, and is rounded into grains, from the flowing down of the dewy humor, and from the moisture of the air; and generally settles on trees, herbs, and stones; as *Lemnius de herbis Biblicis*, c. 3. describes it. But it has a kind of medicinal virtue, by which it loosens, and gently purges.

XXIV. Now the question is, whether the manna of the Israelites was of the same species and nature with the common? It is sufficiently agreed on, that some miraculous circumstances attended the manna of the Hebrews; but there is no solid reason to conclude from this, that the thing itself was altogether new, and was

never produced by natural causes at any time, or in other places: since God could so multiply the dew conveyed in great plenty from some other quarter, to be matter fit for the production of manna, as to be sufficient for the daily supply of that great multitude; and so dispose it, as to be endowed with those wonderful adjuncts, we are hereafter to speak of. It is certain, Josephus thought it was a natural manna, and relates, that in his time it still continued to be plentifully rained down about mount\* Sinai, *Antiq. lib. iii. c. 1.* And Franciscus Vallesius, *Philosoph. Sacr. c. 57.* insists at large, that the manna of the Israelites was altogether the same with the common. Cardan also *de subtilitate, lib. xxi.* relates, that in the desert of Traga in Lybia, there is so much of it gathered in a day, especially about the town Agadez, as that a pound, of 28 ounces, is sold for two pence; and adds, the inhabitants, by eating it, live sound and healthy, though the air be pestilential. They who are of this opinion, likewise observe, that they do not undervalue the favor granted to the Israelites, in such an extraordinary manner, when they search into the natural causes of things; but praise the infinite wisdom of God, who disposes all things in such a way, that even the most extraordinary may in a good measure seem to have happened according to the ordinary course of nature; as Vallesius speaks in the place above quoted. Others again think, that the manna of the Israelites was something extraordinary, never seen before, and after it ceased, was never after to be met with; and when it is called angels food, and every where spoke of, in the holy scripture, as prepared by the special hand of God, they think a natural cause

\* They have, says he, in that country to this very day, certain dews and rains, that seem to have somewhat of reason's dew; this that fell upon the intercession of Moses.

ought piously and religiously to be excluded in this case. Thus Rivet in *Exod.* xvi. 13.

XXV. Our judgment is, that there is no reason, why we may not conclude, that God, in the production of this manna, made use of natural causes, as he had before used the wind in drying up the Red sea. And it is very probable, this manna took its rise from the same, or the like causes, from which the ordinary is produced: and so far it may be called natural. Yet the continued and daily concurrence of those natural causes, for the production of it, in such quantities, was miraculous, and altogether extraordinary. Thus far then, I say, it was miraculous. We add, that, at this day, no manna is known, which, in every respect, is of the same nature with the manna of the Israelites. For, to omit other things, the manna of the Israelites was of a consistent substance, supplied the place of corn, and was given to the people for food. The common manna is a medicine, not a food; and cannot be the ordinary food of any people, without a miracle.

XXVI. To the manna of the Israelites, the Polish comes nearest, which was not long ago found strewed in the fields; it was small and like sugar; and when it is boiled up with butter and a little sugar, may easily vie with the most delicate Italian jellies or dainties, as Keckerman describes it, *Physic.* lib. vi. c. 10. A Lapid in *Exod.* xvi. 21. treats more largely on this, and declares, that, from the constant accounts of the Poles, it rains down in the nights of the months of June and July, and settles on the herbs like a dew: that, before the sun is up, it is gathered in sieves, sifted, pounded, mixed with water, and made into a kind of hasty pudding. But if the sun begins to be hot, the husk of it dissolves, and the grain of the manna, inclosed therein, is lost. He adds, that he had seen the grains, and that

they resembled millet, are only longer and of a ruddy colour, and found the taste of it like that of \*panic. But even this manna is different from that of the Israelites. 1. In figure, for it is oblong, whereas that of the Israelites was round like coriander-seed. 2. In colour, being ruddy, whereas the other was white. 3. The Polish is included in a husk, whereas the other had none. 4. The manna of the Hebrews melted before the sun, and vanished; only the husk of the other is dissolved, but the grain is hard, and falls to the ground.

XXVII. However, there are many concurring circumstances, which here proclaim, that a miracle must by all means be admitted. For, 1. The manna, which is commonly known, is gathered only at certain seasons of the year; but this came down daily. 2. During so long a time, none fell on the Sabbath, but in a double quantity on the day before. 3. It was found daily in such quantities, as to suffice to feed so many thousands. 4. If it was kept till the next day, it spoiled; except that which was the portion of the Sabbath. 5. And yet that part of it which God commanded to be laid up, remained untainted for some ages after. 6. It fell in all places, wherever the Israelites encamped; but was not known among the neighbouring people, at least not used for food, much less for their daily food. 7. It ceased, after they passed over Jordan, and they had got a full supply of ordinary bread: and perhaps there are more circumstances to the same purpose.

XXVIII. The *origin* of the manna was from God, as the principal cause. It is every where ascribed to him, as a singular privilege, which he bestowed on his people Israel, Exod. xvi. 4, 8, 16. Deut. viii. 3, 16. Neh. ix. 15, 20, 21. But God formed this bread in

\* This is a grain like unto millet, with a knob full of corn.

the air, from the vapours or exhalations, properly prepared by the sun, and by the other stars, if they contributed any thing towards it. Whence it is said, *that he commanded the clouds from above, and opened the doors of heaven, and gave them of the corn of heaven*, Psal. lxxviii. 23, 24. But the air, which is the seat of meteors, is called heaven; as *the fowls of heaven*; and in Lucretius, “the air which is called heaven.” And as the angels are ministering spirits, Heb. i. 14. whose ministry God very frequently used in the whole œconomy of the Old Testament, and who upon other occasions supplied God’s servants with food, 1 Kings xix. 5, 6, 7. I see not, why a celebrated expositor of our day, who in other things makes the church of that age subject to angels, can deny, that this food was prepared by angels. Suidas says, “manna is a food supplied from above;” and “is called the bread of angels, because they supplied them with it.”

XXIX. And yet I doubt, whether any sufficient argument can be formed from Psal. lxxviii. 25. for the ministry of angels in this particular. We there, indeed, find *LÆCHÆM ABIRIM*, which the Septuagint translate *ARTON ANGELON*, *the bread of angels*: just as the author of the book of Wisdom calls it *TROPHEN ANGELON*, chap. xvi. 20. *angels food*; and R. Solomon in like manner, *LÆCHÆM MALACHIM*. But, first, we are under no necessity to understand angels by *ABIRIM*, which signifies *the strong*. For that is a general name, and is applied to men of valour, or *heroes* among men, Jer. xlvi. 13. Lam. i. 15. Let it therefore be called *the bread of the strong*, because it made the Israelites robust and strong; as supplying the place of ordinary bread, by which the heart is supported, though, at first sight and taste, it might seem light; or, what I would chuse, the bread of *heroes*, that is, such as even



the greatest nobles would reckon delicious. God is also called *ABIR*, the (*Hero*) mighty One of Jacob, or of Israel, Gen. xlix. 24. Is. xlix. 26. Nor is it unusual in scripture, when speaking of God, to use the plural number; of which they who have but a small share of learning, are not ignorant. Why may we not therefore be allowed to explain it of the *bread of God*, which the *Hero of Jacob* gave them, and which also spiritually was a representation of himself? Drusius also has observed this on John vi. 31. Again, should we grant, that angels are meant, yet I do not recollect, that they are called *ABIRIM* in scripture; but I well remember, that they are represented as *GIBBOREI CHOACH*, *excelling in strength*, Psal. ciii. 20; yet the matter would still remain undecided, since it might be called the bread of angels, because of its excellence and spiritual signification: for it signified, that God, who is the life and joy of angels, was to descend from heaven, in order in like manner to become the food, that is, the joy and life of men.

XXX. Moses here also acted his part; who, it is very probable, interceded with God by prayer, that he would give food to the starving people. Josephus says, these were poured forth on a high rock, adding of his own fancy, that the manna first fell, and thickened on the palms of his hands, as they were stretched out to heaven, when he returned thanks to God: and that Moses, suspecting what it was, tasted it, and joyfully, upon the discovery, shewed the people the favor God had bestowed on them: That the people, having seen their food rained down from heaven, imagined it snowed, the season of the year comporting with this. But these things neither agree with reason, for it is beyond all probability, it should snow in that hot climate in the month of May, when these things happened;

nor with scripture, which speaks expressly of some persons, who went out of the camp at break of day, and first observed the manna, Exod. xvi. 15.

XXXI. The Gemarists go too far, when they say in *Taanith, fol. 9. col. 1.* "That the Israelites had three good shepherds, Moses, Aaron, and Miriam; and three benefits given them by their hands, the fountain, the cloud, and the manna. The fountain, for the merits of Miriam; the pillar of cloud for the merits of Aaron; and the manna for the merits of Moses." But what Christ says, contradicts this assertion, John v. 32. *Verily, verily, I say unto you, Moses gave you not that bread from heaven: but my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven.* Nor was the typical bread from Moses, but from God. Moses was only the messenger, not the meritorious cause of the divine gift: and much less did the antitype Christ, with his grace, the bread which came down from the third heavens, proceed from Moses. This, however, Moses did; having by his prayers obtained the favor of God, he told the people in God's name, what should happen with respect to their food, and explained the whole design of the manna. Philo has prudently observed, that God, indeed, gave his people comfort, but discovered it first to Moses: "the one, indeed, on account of his natural benignity and affection toward men, but the other because he would put honor on the leader, whom he himself had appointed."

XXXII. The *adjuncts* of the manna are either *internal* or *external*. To the former belong the figure, colour, taste. Of the *figure* it is said, 1. That it was a *small thing, as hoar frost on the ground*, Exod. xvi. 14. small, indeed, at first sight, yet precious in itself, and of the greatest efficacy; as God usually displays his wonderful power in the smallest things. 2. That it was

MECHUSPAM ; a word which we no where else meet with in scripture, and therefore diversely explained. The Vulgate has, *quasi pilo tusum, as if pounded by a pestle* ; that is, of such minuteness, that it seemed to be brought to that smallness by some art, and as in a mortar. Others translate it, *decorticatum, peeled* ; Junius, *rotundum, round* ; as also Erpenius the Arabic interpreter has it ; and Kimchi says, it signifies the same thing as NGAGOI, *round*. Other Jews translate it *relectum, disclosed* ; and imagine, the manna was shut up in the dew, which was over and under it ; as in a coffer, and the upper dew ascending, by the more advanced elevation of the sun above the horizon, the manna appeared in sight. But all this, to speak in the softest manner, is uncertain. 3. That *it was like coriander-seed*, ver. 31. Not in colour, since coriander-seed is black ; but because it was small and round. Well say the Talmudists in *Joma. c. viii. fol. 73. col. a.* “ round as coriander, and white as pearl.”

XXXIII. With respect to its *colour*, it is said, *Exod. xvi. 31.* that it was *white*, and *Numb. xi. 7.* *the colour thereof as the colour of bedola* ; but what that was, interpreters are not agreed. The Jews insist, it was a kind of precious stone ; but are opposed by Junius and Marcus Marinus Brixianus ; because *Gen. ii. 12.* it is said, *there is bedola and the onyx-stone* ; wherefore, as the name *stone* is, by way of distinction, added to the word *onyx*, they conclude, that *bedola* cannot be a stone. Others imagine, it was *crystal*, and consequently the colour of the manna was bright and transparent. Most of the moderns, following Josephus, from the affinity of the word, contend, that it was *bdellium* ; concerning which Serapion, quoted by Drusius, says, that “ the Jewish bdellium is the gum of a tree, that grows in Arabia ; and that the better sort is that of a good fla-

your, tough within, and soon dissolving, inclining to white, not having any bits of wood or other impurities in it, &c." Pliny adds, it is transparent, and like to wax, lib. xii. 9. See Salmas. *Exercit. Plinian.* p. 306. and *de homonymis hyles Iatrecq.* c. 109. From this they conclude, that the grains of the manna were transparent and of a whitish cast: which is a sign of its great purity and perfect digestion. But I must not conceal, that Bochart in *Hierozoic.* p. 2. lib. 5. c. 5. has by his arguments convinced me, that *bedola* is a *pearl*, for which they still very frequently fish in that place, which Moses has described Gen. ii. 12. as Petrus Texeira an eye-witness, and Benjamin in *Itinerar.* p. 105. testify. Besides, both the manna and the pearl are of the same colour, namely white: and both of them are round: nor is the observation of Junius or Brixianus to the contrary of any weight. Since it does not follow, that because the onyx is called a stone, *bedola* is not a stone likewise. Not to mention now, that the lawyer also excepts pearls from the class of stones and gems, *lege, Quum aurum* 19. § *Gemma autem*, 17. & *seq. ff. de auro & argento legato.* And though pearls are usually called stones by the Hebrews, yet they are of a quite different kind from those stones produced in the earth; such as gems properly so called. They who contend for *bdellium*, have scarce any other argument but the affinity of the appellation, which is often fallacious: in other respects *bdellium* and manna have no such agreement.

XXXIV. Its *savour* or taste is likewise highly commended, Exod. xvi. 31. KETZAPPI CHITH BIDBASH, *Sicut epichyti e.e. melle*, as Junius translates, "as of a wafer made of honey," or, according to the Vulgate, *quasi simile in melle*, "as of fine flour in honey." And Numb. xi. 8. *as the taste of fresh oil.* As the scripture

thus determines the taste, the fictions of the Jews are very trifling, which the Papists too greedily catch at, the better to put a varnish on their monster of transubstantiation; as that the manna had all kinds of tastes, and that every individual Israelite tasted in it whatever he pleased; young men, bread; old men, honey; young children, oil: as the Jewish masters trifle in *Schemoth Rabba*, sect. 25. with whom the author of the book of Wisdom, chap. xvi. 20. seems to agree. It is astonishing, with what nicety the Papists dispute on this matter; namely, whether this was only the privilege of the pious, or common to them with the wicked. Tivinus, after Augustine, Abulensis, and Hugo Cardinalis, stands up for the former; but is opposed by Corn. a Lapide. This being observed, there are other questions also started; and among the rest, whether the manna changed not only its taste, but also its substance, at the desire of those who eat of it, so as to be turned into an egg, a pullet, or lamb, as often as such things were longed for; or whether a change only was made in the qualities? In either of these ways, they find something in the manna to support their doctrine of transubstantiation. For if the former, as has seemed good to doctors of great reputation, we have an evident example of a transubstantiation. If the latter, with the Jesuit a Lapide, hence at least may be concluded, that accidents may remain without their substance; because, as a different taste usually accompanies a different substance, the substance of the manna remaining, the taste was changed at will, and proved nourishing: whence it follows that the accidents of bread may also remain, and prove nourishing in the transubstantiated wafer. But these are the dotages and fond sportings of men, who shamefully abuse their wit, and are overturned by three arguments from scripture. 1. As it accurately

describes the peculiar taste of the manna. 2. As it mentions the industry of the Israelites in the different ways by which they prepared it for their more convenient use. 3. As it gives an account of their loathing it, Numb. xi. 6. which could not happen, did the manna yield the palate any taste at pleasure.

XXXV. However, we have not yet got over all the difficulty: for, as the taste of honey differs from the taste of oil, we may inquire, how manna can be compared to both in taste? But this difficulty may be obviated three ways: if we say, first, that the taste of the manna was somewhat different, when it was eaten in a plain manner, from what it was, when differently dressed and prepared by the Israelites: the one may therefore be understood of manna undressed; the other of that which was boiled. And again, which I would prefer, it might, in a different respect, be compared both with honey and with oil: not that in all respects the taste of it resembled either oil or honey; but partook of something of both, the sweetness of honey, and the fatness of oil; in general a taste mixed of both. It might be added, as honey is\* the *chief of sweet things*, as the son of Sirach speaks, whatever things are sweet to the taste, may be compared with honey. And so manna may be said to have the taste of honey, that is, in general, to be very sweet. Wherefore the author of the book of Wisdom, chap. xix. 21. calls it a *kind of ambrosial food that could easily melt*, EUTEKTON GENOS AMEROSIAS TROPHEIS.

XXXVI. The external adjuncts or circumstances are place and time. The *place* where God fed the Is-

\* The author of Ecclesiasticus, speaking of the bee, says, *her fruit is the chief of sweet things*.

† Our English version renders it a kind of heavenly meat, that was of a nature apt to melt

raelites with manna was the wilderness. The favor of heaven supplied them with what the barrenness of the soil denied: and when they were destitute of ordinary bread, produced from the earth, they were satisfied with bread which came down from heaven. Finely says Josephus: "So divine and admirable was this food, that it supplied the want of all others to those that partook of it:" and truly believers may go every where with safety, when God leads the way, even through the wilderness, and a land not sown, Jer. ii. 2. *The young lions do lack and suffer hunger; but they that seek Jehovah, shall not want any good thing,* Psal. xxxiv. 10.

XXXVII. We are to observe the following things concerning the *time* when the manna was given. As, 1. That the Israelites had none, before they left Egypt: then they happily exchanged their cucumbers, pumpions, garlic, and every servile food, for the bread of heaven, and the dainties of angels. 2. That this bread was for the first time rained down from heaven, when there was nothing in the land to stay their hunger. Thus God usually provides for his own people in due season, and, where ordinary means fail, employs extraordinary. While a famine raged in all places, the rapacious ravens carry a daily portion to Elias, 1 Kings xvii. 6. 3. That the manna was rained every day, except on the Sabbath; when none was to be seen on the ground: but a double portion was gathered the day before, for the supply of the following. Thus the goodness of God is new every day: neither will the observance of his commands, especially that of the Sabbath, prove detrimental to any. 4. That the manna continued forty years, till the Israelites came into Canaan, where they could eat of the fruits of the land, Josh. v.

12. For where ordinary means are within our reach, we are not to desire or expect extraordinary.

XXXVIII. The Israelites were to perform the following DUTIES with respect to the manna. *First*, They were to gather it very early, because it would melt, when the sun was more advanced. So hateful to God is sloth, that when raining down bread from heaven upon his people, without their labour, he commanded them to rise with the sun to gather it. Man was not suffered to be idle even in paradise.

XXXIX. *Secondly*, They were to gather it by a certain measure, an homer for each : a quantity, it is probable, sufficient to satisfy even the most robust, and those of the largest appetite. For an homer was a large measure, concerning which may be seen Wascrus *de antiq. mensur. lib. ii. c. 3.* where he shews, that an homer contains as much as forty-three shells of eggs and a half. Tirinus has computed the allowance of each to have been about fifty of our ounces. God stinted them to a certain measure, to set bounds to their excessive appetite ; but indulged them in such a measure, as would shew the riches of his bounty.

XL. But the account here given by Moses deserves particular consideration, namely, that some of the Israelites gathered more, others less : but that afterwards when it was measured by the homer, he who had gathered more, had nothing over, and he who had gathered less, had no lack, *Exod. xvi. 17.* Some have conceived a twofold miracle here ; one about the gathering of the manna ; the other about the consuming it. They imagine, if any had gathered less than the appointed quantity, before it came to be measured, what was lacking was miraculously added by an angel ; but if more, the overplus was taken away by an angel, and invisibly added to what others gathered. They also



imagine, that every one consumed an entire homer of manna a-day : but as this was not possible in such a diversity of ages and health without a miracle, they boldly pronounce, that God very unequally attempered the nutritive efficacy of the manna in equal quantities to the strength and appetite of every person ; and besides, heaped the manna closer in the homer for the more voracious, but looser for the weaker and the young.

XLI. But all these things are framed at pleasure ; nor are we to multiply miracles without necessity. As to the gathering, the manner of it seems to have been thus. Every one gathered as much as he could : and, as is usual in such cases, some gathered more, others less, as some were more diligent than others. But what was collected by all who lived under the same tent, seems to have been thrown into one heap ; from which the master of the family taking the appointed measure, so distributed to each his portion, without paying any regard to the labour or diligence employed, but to the divine appointment, so that each had an equal portion. For so much could with ease be jointly gathered, as that every one might have an equal portion. These thoughts have, in my opinion, been judiciously suggested by the most excellent Rivet ; and may be confirmed from 2 Cor. viii. 14, 15. where Paul exhorts the rich to supply the wants of the poor out of their abundance, by this argument ; because *it is written, He that had gathered much had nothing over ; and he that had gathered little, had no lack.* As if he had said, “ As formerly it was the will of God, that, among the Israelites, they who had gathered much manna, should supply the wants of those who had gathered less, that there might be an equality ; so among Christians, it is but just, that those who, by the bounty of God, are possessed of an affluence of good things, should supply

the wants of those for whom a more scanty provision is made.”

XLII. I am also of Rivet's opinion with respect to their eating the manna ; namely, that every one had really such a quantity allowed him, as was sufficient even for the largest appetite, yet that each was at liberty to eat as much as he pleased ; and therefore that most of them had more food, than either necessity required, or than they could well eat : but that, as they were not allowed to keep what was over till the next day, they might throw it away towards evening ; that so they might profess their faith and confidence in God, who, they were persuaded, would grant them a fresh supply the following day. And the throwing away the superfluous manna was no sign of contempt, any more than the burning what was left of the paschal lamb ; but rather an evidence of a sincere trust and confidence in God.

XLIII. The *third* duty was, to reserve none of the manna for the morrow, ver. 19. Not that every person was obliged to consume their measure daily, and force it upon their loathing stomach beyond their appetite : for this, as I have just hinted, was inconsistent with the holiness, wisdom, and goodness of God. It was enough, if nothing was reserved for the use of the following day. What remained might either be burnt in the fire, or buried in the earth, or given to the cattle, or destroyed some other way. But God, by this method, was pleased to try their obedience, Exod. xvi. 4. and to exercise their diligence every day, and teach them contentment, and to inculcate faith and trust upon them, that, depending alone on his providence, they might wholly commit to him the care for the morrow, Matth. vi. 25, 31.

XLIV. *Fourthly*, The day before the Sabbath they were to gather a double quantity, ver. 7. and were allowed to lay up whatever was left of that till the next day, ver. 25. which neither stunk, as what was reserved on other days, nor had any worm therein, ver. 26. By this God intended, that, on the Sabbath, they should desist from every work that regards the care of this animal life, and devote themselves to him alone. And in fact he shewed, that he would add other things to those that seek his kingdom and righteousness; and that it would prove no detriment to any, if, laying aside the care of the body, they at stated times laid themselves out for God: as also, that, during the six days of this life, we are to gather those things which may be of service on the Sabbath; for, on the seventh day, that is, after this life, there will be no longer time for working: *Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in the grave whither thou goest*, Eccl. ix. 10. We are far from thinking, that this here was the first institution of the Sabbath, but rather that it was a solemn renovation of what was instituted from the beginning of the world, but had been interrupted by the bondage in Egypt, and a confirmation of it by the miracle of the manna. For Moses, ver. 3. speaks of the Sabbath, as a thing formerly known by the Israelites, *This is that which Jehovah hath said, To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto Jehovah*, &c. We are not ignorant of what the great Selden, *de jure nat. & gent. &c. lib. iii. c. 9. seq.* has largely, and learnedly indeed, opposed to this; but it is not of that weight, as to sway with us.

XLV. *Fifthly*, and lastly, God commanded an homer of manna to be laid up in a golden urn or pot, for a perpetual memorial thereof, and placed before his

face through all the generations of Israel. Aaron did this accordingly; namely, at the due time, when the tabernacle and ark were reared up. For these things are related here, by an evident prolepsis or anticipation, on occasion of this history, ver. 33. though, as is very plain, it was not done till afterwards. God, indeed, would not have the memory of so great a miracle die away among the Israelites: and therefore he not only took care to have these prodigies recorded; but the remains of the miracle, great beyond all exception, and adapted to strike every one with amazement, to survive. Nevertheless, to prevent their being made an occasion of superstition or idolatry, he wisely ordered them to be laid up in the most holy place, and removed from the use of the common people.

XLVI. We must here, by the way, remove an apparent contradiction. Moses says, Exod. xvi. 34. that a pot with manna, agreeably to the divine command, was by Aaron laid up *before the testimony* to be kept. But the testimony is either the ark, so called, because the testimonial tables of the covenant were laid up in it, or the tables themselves that were in the ark. But Paul writes, Heb. ix. 4. *In which (the ark) was the golden pot, that had manna, and Aaron's rod that budded, and the tables of the covenant*; where he places the pot with the manna in the ark, as well as the tables of the covenant. This difficulty is so much the greater, if we compare 1 Kings viii. 9. and 2 Chron. v. 10. where it is expressly said, that there was nothing in the ark, but the two tables of the law. Many things have been ingeniously devised by the learned, to take off this apparent contradiction. I own, I am best pleased with the observation of Drusius on Exod. xvi. 34. that the particle *in* with the Hebrews, and those that adopt their way of speaking, sometimes denotes *at, near, by*. To

prove this, he quotes Josh. x. 11. and Judg. xviii. 12. Another learned author has very properly added Josh. v. 13. 1 Kings xvii. 3. Jer. xiii. 5. Col. iii. 1. And therefore *in which*, here denotes, *at or near the ark*. Yet Drusius himself starts a difficulty, which he owns he is not able to remove. "Every thing would answer well," says he, "unless there followed, *the tables of the covenant*: for these were within the ark. But that the preposition *in* should signify two different things in the same place, is not very probable: take care therefore, how you believe this." But we are not so soon to lose heart. We have at least found this, that *in* sometimes denotes such a latitude of place, that it even comprehends those things which are *near* and *by*. Moreover, the ark was so framed, that some things might be placed on the sides of it without, as appears in the case of the volume of the law written by Moses, which was placed *in the side of the ark of the covenant of the Lord*, Deut. xxxi. 26. All the things therefore mentioned by Paul were *in the ark*, that is, *within the compass of the ark*, though some of them were within it more than others. Nor could Paul speak less properly thus, than we do, when, for instance, we say, *in the human body* there are skin, and flesh, and bones, and bowels: where *in* is used in the same sense, and yet with some latitude.

XLVII. There are three *sins* of the Israelites recorded with respect to the manna. 1. That several of them, contrary to the express command of God, reserved some of it for the morrow, Exod. xvi. 20. With such insolence does the wisdom of the flesh set itself in direct opposition to God, though, by his astonishing goodness, he renders himself amiable, and at the same time venerable. And this obstinacy of corrupt nature is not to be subdued by any miracles. But what was

reserved, began to swarm with worms, and was putrefied. To teach us, that whatever is unjustly and covetously reserved, contrary to the command of God, stinks before God and men; and hence worms arise, that is, various kinds of evils, especially the worm of conscience. Whereas, on the contrary, what was reserved against the future Sabbath, proved permanent and incorruptible, Matth. vi. 20. 1 Tim. vi. 19. 2. That they went forth on the very Sabbath to seek for it; however then they found nothing, ver. 27. God justly frustrates the desires of those, and renders their labours abortive, who undertake any thing contrary to his command. Nor have such any reason to expect the divine blessing on their labours, who, on the day of the Lord's rest, are employed in things that regard their own subsistence, while they omit the worship of God, Is. lviii. 13, 14. 3. That at last they loathed and disdained the manna, though it was the sweetest and most wholesome of all food, especially in comparison of the cucumbers, the melons, the leeks, the onions, and the garlic, Numb. xi. 5, 6. Thus men usually prefer the carnal refuse of this world to the treasures of heaven, the husks of the earth, to the dainties of angels. And that nothing on this earth is so delightful, but that one time or other it begets a loathing: even the most excellent gifts of God, natural, as well as spiritual, on account of this perverseness of our minds, through custom, lose their value in our esteem.

XLVIII. Now let us consider the *mystery* of the manna. Paul teacheth us, that this food was sacramental, 1 Cor. x. 3. where he calls it *spiritual meat*: but it was so, not in its own nature, for it was appointed for the support of the animal life, but in signification, wherein it answers to our mystical supper. Augustine on Psal. lxxvii. 1. says, "it was spiritual, that

is, it signified something spiritual." And Christ declares, John vi. 32. that himself was that true bread, which came down from heaven, and was prefigured by the manna. The Jews, however blind, promise to themselves a new manna by the Messiah. For thus in *Midras Cohelet*, fol. 86. col. 4. "The first redeemer caused the manna to descend, so also the latter redeemer will make the manna to descend : as it is written, *And there shall be an handful of corn in the earth*, Psal. lxxii. 16." Though their expectations were really carnal and corrupt, yet they are the remains of ancient and spiritual instruction. So likewise in *Midras Cantici*, fol. 16. c. 4. "The last redeemer shall be revealed to them. And whither will he lead them ? some say, to the wilderness of Judah, others to the wilderness of Sihon, and Og ; and he will cause the manna to descend to them." But it is to be observed, that Christ frequently fed the multitude in the deserts of Judea, and in the wilderness of Og, with the food of his word, which is more excellent than any manna ; and when there was occasion for it, stayed the hunger of the body with bread, which he multiplied no less miraculously, than the manna formerly was. See other testimonies of the Jews in Viega on Rev. ii. 17. But, according to the method prescribed, let us come to particulars.

XLIX. Manna denotes that food, which was appointed, prepared by God, and given to the Israelites for their portion, in order to the support of life. So Christ is the gift of God, John iv. 10 ; that excellent gift, foreordained by God, 1 Pet. i. 20. and by his unspeakable goodness bestowed on the true Israel, for their portion, Jer. x. 16. by which they should live. Thus Jesus himself declares, John vi. 51. *I am the living bread, which came down from heaven : if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever.*—The

manna was given to the Israelites, when they were least concerned about the blessings of God, and put a greater value on the good things of Egypt, and had again tempted God. Christ came into the world, when it was most corrupted, and offered his spiritual blessings, at a time when the very best could scarce ascend above earthly and carnal things.—Israel did not know the manna, when it was first given, though promised by Moses. Though Christ was so often promised by Moses and all the holy prophets, and described to the life, yet when he came into the world, the world knew him not, John i. 10.

L. Though the origin of the manna was from heaven, yet the vapours or exhalations, from which it was congealed together, were raised from the earth by the efficacy of the sun. Christ several times repeats it, that he came down from heaven, to give life to the world, John vi. He who is the *day-spring from on high*, Luke i. 78. is also the *fruit of the earth*, Is. iv. 2.—We have already observed, that angels were employed about the descending manna. A great multitude of the heavenly host sung the birth-day song, when Christ first came into the world, Luke ii. 13.—Moses, indeed, could not give the manna, yet he promised it, and explained the nature of it. So neither was he the author of true salvation, but testified of Christ, and taught that the life of the soul consists in communion with him, John v. 46.

LI. The manna was, in its form and figure, small and minute, promising nothing great at first sight: thus also Christ, when he was seen only with the eyes of flesh, had neither form nor comeliness, that we should desire him, Is. liii. 2.—Yet the white colour of the manna, and usually that of pearls too, represented the most excellent purity of the Lord Jesus, and the glory



of the divine majesty, *shining* forth in the assumed form of a servant.—The taste of the manna, that was so very sweet, like honey, and the most excellent oil, signifies the unspeakable delights of that grace we obtain by Christ, whose sweetness none understand but they who taste it, Psal. xxxiv. 8.—In order to *be* a more proper food for Israel, it was ground in mills, or pounded with pestles, or baked in pans, Numb. xi. 8. Christ was also prepared by various sufferings, that he might be most sweet and wholesome food to our souls.

LII. The manna was rained down in the wilderness: and Christ came into the world, and to the people of Israel, when, like a wilderness, it was overgrown with thistles and thorns, and most barren of good fruit; and, by his coming, *comforted all the waste places of Zion, and made her wilderness like Eden, and her desert like the garden of Jehovah*, Is. li. 3.—It was then, that the Israelites obtained the manna, when all that they had brought out of Egypt, was spent, and they saw they must inevitably perish by famine, unless they were relieved by the unexpected favor of heaven. Christ bestows his grace only on those, who, sensible of their want, and rejecting every worldly comfort, chuse to owe their salvation to him alone, Luke i. 53. *He filled the hungry with good things, and sent the rich empty away.*—Nor can any one hope for the consolations of divine grace, unless he first quit the Egypt of this world, and the prison of sin, and passing through the Red sea of sorrowful repentance, he give himself up to be led and directed by the Holy Spirit, in the way to the heavenly Canaan, Is. xxxii. 16, 17.

LIII. The manna came down every day, and whenever the morning dawned, presented itself fresh to the Israelites. Thus also the grace and tender mercies of the Lord are new every morning, Lam. iii. 23.—Yet

this bread was in such manner given for six days, as none of it was to be seen on the seventh. This seems to signify, that Christ would in his appointed time appear among the Israelites, and converse daily with them ; but afterwards would neither be seen, nor sought for, any where on earth, nor be imagined to be either in this or in the other place. But because that day was the seventh of the week, this set forth, he should cease to be seen by men on the seventh, but on the first day of the week, when he returned from the grave, he would present himself to the view of his people almost as early as the sun.—When the Israelites were come into Canaan, the manna ceased ; every thing which regards the state of the church, wandering in the wilderness of this world, consequently every healing grace, and every thing which flows to us from Christ as Mediator, and supposes any defect, shall cease after the last day, when God himself shall be all in all to his church, when introduced into the heavenly country, 1 Cor. xv. 28.

LIV. The manna was not bestowed on the Israelites, as the effect of their sowing or culture, or of any human industry ; but by the gratuitous gift of the divine goodness and bounty alone : the only thing required of them, was to receive, to gather, and make use of that gift of God. Thus in like manner, the life and salvation we have in Christ the Lord, *is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy*, Rom. ix. 16. And his grace is *as a dew from Jehovah, as the showers upon the grass, that tarrieth not for man, nor waiteth for the sons of men*, Mic. v. 7. It is however our duty, by faith to receive, and apply to ourselves the offered grace. And this was what our Saviour meant, when he said, John ix. 27. *Labour not for the meat which perisheth, but for*

that meat which endureth unto everlasting life, which the Son of man shall give unto you.—And this, indeed, was to be done early in the morning, not letting slip the opportunity, Is. lv. 6. *Seek ye the Lord, while he is near.* Psal. lxxiii. 1. *O God, thou art my God, early will I seek thee.*—The Israelites were to go without the camp, in order to have the manna. Whosoever labours to find Christ, must not indulge too much the ease of the flesh. When the spouse sought her beloved in her bed, she found him not, Cant. iii. 1. but when she had gone a little further, she found him, ver. 4.

LV. Though God gave the manna in a certain stinted measure, yet in a quantity sufficient for those of the largest appetite : Christ deals out a portion of his grace to each, in such a manner as nothing may be wanting to their salvation, 2 Cor. xii. 9. His grace, however, is equally set before all the elect, that each may take of it to his full satisfaction, Cant. v. 1. If they open their mouths wide, they shall be filled with the goodness of the Lord, Psal. lxxxix. 10. and xxxvi. 8, 9.—Our esteem and longing for the divine grace can indeed never be to excess ; nor are we forbid to strive after more : let each account it said to himself, 1 Cor. xii. 31. *Covet earnestly the best gifts.* But yet every one ought to be content with the most free and wise dispensation of our Father, humbly confessing ourselves unworthy even of the least. But if any, by the blessing of God, is found to have gathered more than others, his duty is to lay out his abundance for the common benefit, and supply the wants of others from the plenty of his gifts.

LVI. The manna, that was kept to the following day, became tainted, and ceased any longer to be either the usual, much less the sacramental bread. Thus also the eucharistical bread, the antitype of the

manna, after the time is over, when it is distributed to be eaten, loses the virtue of a sacrament ; and if it be kept contrary to the command of God, instead of being a spiritual food, will be found tainted with the maggots of a base superstition.—A double quantity was gathered the day before the Sabbath, for the use of that day of rest : on the same day of the week, the labour of Christ's soul being redoubled, such an abundance of grace was purchased for the elect, even enough to satiate, and make them happy through an eternal Sabbath.—Nor are we to apprehend, that the spiritual gifts, laid up that day, can be tainted by any corruption.—In a word, the keeping the manna in a golden pot, and the laying it up in the tabernacle, before Jehovah and the testimony, set forth; that he who came down from heaven, to be the bread of life to sinful man, should again be taken up into heaven, and continue in the sanctuary not made with hands, and in a state of uninterrupted life before God ; whence also the communion with Christ in glory is called *the hidden manna*, Rev. ii. 17.—However, we are, above all things, to be on our guard, lest, with the ungrateful Israelites, we loath the incomparable delights of the heavenly grace, and prefer the husks of this world before them, and so incur the justest vengeance of a despised Deity.

LVII. But forasmuch as *the favor of meat is nothing, if there be no drink*, as Josephus introduces Moses speaking to God ; and because the superabundant fullness which is in Christ, was to be shadowed forth to the ancient people, as well as to us, the divine goodness indulged the murmuring Israelites likewise with drink, which was as miraculous as their meat. For, the people being parched with thirst, and finding no water, either for themselves or children, much less

their cattle, in the parched wilderness, Moses, at God's command, striking with his rod the rock which was in Horeb, on whose summit the glorious majesty of the divine presence was seen, opened large veins of water, *Exod. xvii. 1.—6.* This miracle is celebrated in many places of scripture, *Psal. lxxviii. 15, 16. He clave the rocks in the wilderness, and gave them drink, as out of the great depths : he brought streams also out of the rock, and caused waters to run down like rivers.* Some imagine the rock itself was turned to streams of water, from *Psal. cxiv. 8.* where the Vulgate translates, *qui convertit petram in stagna aquarum, et rupem in fontes aquarum,* “ which turned the rock into a standing water, the flint into a fountain of waters ;” the Septuagint, *TOU TREPΣANTOS.* But this is a poetical hyperbole, as if we should say, heaven itself was dissolved into showers. Nothing is more ridiculous, than to bring this in support of the monster of transubstantiation. But whether God first miraculously produced the water in that place, or whether, when Moses smote the rock with his rod, he suddenly set open the veins of water, which had been there before, but had been shut up till then, is not for us to determine, since the scripture is silent. What the Jews feign, that the rod of Moses was made of adamant, and hence penetrated the rock by the stroke ; and that therefore Moses is said not to have struck *upon the rock,* but *in the rock,* *ver. 6.* is trifling to the highest degree.

LVIII. As there is no great difficulty in this historical account, we hasten to the consideration of the mystery, set forth, *1 Cor. x. 4. And did all drink the same spiritual drink.* Spiritual, not surely in its own nature, but in its signification, as we have intimated, concerning the meat. *For they drank of the spiritual rock that followed them,* that is, the water of the rock which fol-

lowed them in a plentiful stream in the wilderness: *And that rock was Christ*, that is, as Tertullian, *de patientia*, says well, “signified Christ:” with whom Augustine agrees, *quest. 57. in Leviticum*, “The rock was Christ, not in substance, but in signification.” Let us take a survey of the similitude.

LIX. It is certain, Christ is often called a rock in scripture, on account of his eternal duration, Is. xxvi. 4. and impregnable strength, Psal. xxxi. 2. and, which is the consequence of that, a most safe habitation, Psal. lxxi. 3. Yet I imagine these respects do not come under our present consideration. Christ is here represented by a rock only, as that gave water to quench the thirst of the Israelites.

LX. The true similitude is this. 1. This rock hath its name from a *parched dry waste* (for this is the meaning of *Horeb* in Hebrew) and seemed to promise nothing less than what it produced, namely streams, for giving water to such a number of people with their cattle. Is not Christ also *as a root out of a dry ground?* Is. liii. 2. And is it not something above a prodigy, that he who complained of thirst on the cross, should call out to others, *If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink. He that believeth on me, as the scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water,* John vii. 37, 38? 2. The rock did not produce water till it was smitten. Thus also *it became God to make the Captain of our salvation perfect through sufferings*, Heb. ii. 10. When his side was pierced with the spear, immediately there issued out blood and water, John xix. 34. And by this means he became *a fountain opened to the house of David, and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem for sin, and for uncleanness*, Zech. xiii. 1. 3. Nor was it lawful to smite the rock with any other instrument than the rod of the Lawgiver: to intimate,

that Christ was to undergo the same sufferings, and the same curse, threatened by the law to the sinner man, Gal. iii. 13. 4. The smiting of the rock was performed in the sight of the elders of the murmuring people. At the loud clamour of an enraged multitude, and at the desire of the elders, many of them also standing by, Christ was nailed to the cross, Matth. xxvii. 41. 5. The majesty of the Supreme Being displayed itself on the top of the rock. When Christ suffered, did he not, even at that time, so veil himself as if he was void of divine glory? But they who were most unwilling to own it, were obliged to confess it, Matth. xxvii. 54. 6. Such a quantity of water flowed from the rock, that was sufficient not only to quench the thirst of the Israelites, but also to follow them in streams, whithersoever they travelled in the wilderness, Psal. lxxviii. 15, 20. Psal. cv. 41. Thus also the abundance of grace that is in Christ, makēs *our cup to overflow, and goodness and mercy to follow us all the days of our life*, Psal. xxiii. 5, 6.

LXI. What we have recorded, Numb. xx. 8. is different from this history, and is likewise mystical. There Moses is commanded indeed, not to smite the rock with his rod, but only to speak unto the rock, before the eyes of the Israelites, in order to its producing water. By which, it seems, was signified, that Christ ought to suffer but once, and that his one offering was sufficient for perfecting believers, Heb. ix. 27, 28. Heb. x. 14. The efficacy of which was to be dispensed to the elect by the preaching of the gospel. But Moses, contrary to the will of the precept, though according to the will of the divine decree, in smiting the rock twice, was a type of those who wickedly indeed, but by the determinate counsel of God, persecute over

again, and evil entreat Christ, after once suffering on the cross, in his mystical body, Acts ix. 4. Col. i. 26. As out of the rock, which was smitten twice, there issued out much water, and the congregation drank, Numb. xx. 11. so, in like manner, even the afflictions of believers have turned out to the advantage of the church, Phil. i. 12. The blood of the martyrs, like a fructifying rain, has watered the paradise of God ; and the sparks, flying every way from their funeral piles, have far and near kindled a new light of faith, and new flames of love : so that the church never experienced a greater abundance of divine consolations, than when she was forced to endure the heaviest strokes of persecution. Yet as Moses himself, who was so faithful, so dear to God, was for this very thing excluded the land of Canaan, Numb. xx. 11. so none of these persecutors shall go unpunished for this their rash presumption, Psal. cv. 14. 2 Thess. i. 6.

LXII. There now remains the sacrament of the *brazen serpent*, whose history recorded Numb. xxi. 6. Bochart has distinctly explained, *Hierozoic. p. 2. lib. 3. c. 13.* The sum of which is this. The Israelites, for murmuring against God, and against Moses, and speaking with contempt of the heavenly manna, incurred the heavy displeasure of the Deity. And therefore serpents were sent among them, to bite the people, and immediately cut off many by an infectious calamity. The scripture calls these serpents *seraphim* ; which name they have in common with the most exalted angels, and is derived from *burning* ; but are so called, because they send a flame out of their mouth, and burn by their venomous breath. The Greeks call some serpents from their heat, *PRESTERAS* and *KAUSONAS*. But whether *seraph* here denotes a water-serpent, or an amphibious serpent, which is Bochart's opinion, or any other



species of serpents, is neither so very certain, nor much our concern to know. It is more profitable to consider, how the divine mercy, importuned by the complaints of the people, and the confession of their sin, and the prayers of Moses, afforded a present remedy for so great an evil. At the direction of God, a *brazen serpent* was framed by Moses, and put upon a pole ; that whoever looked upon it, when it was thus erected, might find a most infallible cure for the mortal bites of the serpents : which also the event plainly proved. Three things are here distinctly to be observed. 1. The misery of the people. 2. God's favor and goodness. 3. The duty required of man, in order to his partaking of that goodness.

LXIII. In the misery of the people, we are to consider both the sin and the punishment of it. It was a sin, to throw contempt upon the manna, and to murmur against God and against Moses. The depraved corruption of nature scarce any where more plainly shews itself, than in the people of Israel ; who, though loaded with so many benefits by God, so often chastised with paternal rods, yet incessantly returned to their natural disposition. Nor do they rise up against Moses alone, by whose means they had escaped so many dangers, but against God himself, who was present among them, by such extraordinary signs of his majesty : and with a frantic wantonness loath the manna, even the heavenly manna, which they had lately received with so much eagerness. Does not this plainly argue the unconquerable depravity of our nature, and the incredible abuse of the divine beneficence in man, when left to himself ? And as we are all of the same frame, we may behold a specimen of our own perverseness in the Israelites.

LXIV. The punishment consequent on the sin, was the bites of fiery serpents; by which it is not improperly imagined, are shadowed forth the suggestions of the devil, when he tempts to despair, and which Paul calls *the fiery darts of Satan*, Eph. vi. 16. and which spread their poison through every part. For the devils are truly *seraphim*; who, as in their first creation, they shone fair with the flames of divine love, so after their sin became horrid and scorching serpents. As themselves are scorched with the fire of divine vengeance, so they burn with rage against God and his people. And indeed they are justly given up to the vexations of Satan, who contemptuously reject the word of the gospel, and the grace of God in Christ, which is sweeter than any manna; or blaspheme against God himself, as Hymeneus and Alexander, 1 Tim. i. 20.

LXV. But as those Israelites who found the bites of the serpents mortal, not being careful to obtain a cure, are an emblem of the impenitent, who despise the grace of God, and so die in their sins: so they who had recourse to Moses, confessing their sins, and imploring the grace of God, plainly signify those, whom a sense of sin, and dread of divine judgment, excite to wiser resolutions; such as those who were pricked in their heart, and said to Peter and the other apostles, *Men and brethren, what shall we do?* Acts ii. 37. and the jailor, Acts xvi. 29, 30. But for their sake, God commanded Moses to put a brazen serpent on a pole, and promised, that as many as were bitten, should, by looking to it, be cured. Indeed, I make no manner of doubt, but this serpent was a representation of Christ: for he himself asserts, John iii. 14. *As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up.* This type represents the anti-type several ways,

LXVI. *First, As to the form.* That the serpent was a type of the devil, not of Christ, is asserted by a learned author without any probable reason. Though the serpents, which destroyed the Israelites by their venomous bites, were a figure of the devil, yet all circumstances loudly declare the brazen serpent, which was made at God's command, and ordained to cure the bites of the other serpents, was a sacrament of Christ. Nor is it more improper to represent Christ by the figure of a serpent, than, what the learned author so often inculcates, by that of a wanton goat. The similitude consists in the following things. 1. That Christ, though himself free from all sin, came *in the likeness of sinful flesh*, Rom. viii. 3. 2. That, by a voluntary covenant-engagement, he substituted himself in the room of those, who by nature, like all others, are a *generation of vipers*, Matth. iii. 7. 3. That by virtue of that engagement, by bearing their sins, he was made *sin and a curse*, 2 Cor. v. 21. Gal. iii. 13; and so had truly the figure of a serpent, without its poison.

LXVII. *Secondly, As to the matter of it, whereby, in different respects, were represented both the vileness of the human nature, the excellence of the divine, and the efficacy of the gospel, as the learned have observed.* 1. The serpent was not of gold, but of brass, which is a meaner metal, to hold forth Christ to us, as one *in whom there is no form, nor comeliness, no beauty, that we should desire him*, Is. liii. 2. 2. To signify the divine power of Christ by the firmness and durability of brass. Whence Job vi. 12. *Is my strength the strength of stones? or is my flesh of brass?* And in the poet, *a monument is said to be more lasting than brass.* 3. As among metals brass is the most sounding. Whence Paul, 1 Cor. xiii. 1. *I am become as a sounding brass.* Thus Christ crucified seems to be rightly set forth by

brass, as also the preaching of the cross, *whose sound went into all the earth*, Rom. x. 18.

LXVIII. *Thirdly*, As to the *lifting up*. This lifting up of the serpent on a pole, prefigured the lifting up of Christ, not his glorious exaltation in heaven, but his ignominious lifting up on the cross, John iii. 14. as John himself explains that phrase, John xii. 32, 33. For, according to the Syriac and the language of the Targum, *to lift up*, signifies *to hang up on a tree*. Both actions are denoted by the same term. And as Bochart has learnedly observed, that manner of speaking seems to have taken its rise from the decree of king Darius: at least it may be confirmed by that, Ezra vi. 11. *Who-soever shall alter this word, let timber be pulled down from his house, and being set up, let him be hanged* (put to death) *thereon: set up*, that is, hanged up. But holocausts, or whole burnt-offerings, called in Hebrew *elevations*, because they were carried upwards, signified, that Christ, when offering himself for sin, should be lifted up on the cross. Nor is it for nothing, that God would have the serpent lifted up *by Moses*. Because it was in consequence of the curse, thundered out by the law given by Moses, that Christ was nailed to the cross.

LXIX. *Fourthly*, With respect to the *benefit*. As from the serpent the Israelites obtained the cure of their mortal bites; so *in the wings of Christ there is healing*, Mal. iv. 2. *He healeth all our diseases*, Psal. ciii. 3. Wherefore as the Jews, depending on such a present help, little dreaded the bites and stings of the other serpents; so the believer, who relies upon Christ, and makes nothing of the assaults of devils, cries out with full assurance, *O death, where is thy sting?* 1 Cor. xv. 55.

LXX. In order to partake in so great a benefit, God required nothing of the Israelites, but to look to the brazen serpent : just so a bare look to Christ, lifted up on the cross, perfectly cures the wounds given by the devil ; namely, a look of faith, by which Moses saw him, who is invisible, Heb. xi. 27. Thus Christ himself explains it, John iii. 14, 15. *As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up ; that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life.* If therefore any among the Israelites were blind, or voluntarily turned away their eyes, there remained no hope of salvation for them : so neither at this day for unbelievers, or for *those that rebel against the light*, Job xxiv. 13. or for those, *whose minds the god of this world hath blinded, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ should shine unto them*, 2 Cor. iv. 4. Yet as even a weak sight might be saving ; so a faith still in a state of weakness, if it be genuine and sincere, rescues us from death : and as whoever was once bit and cured by the sight of the serpent, if again bit, he was to have recourse to the same remedy ; so if, after our restoration, we fall again into sin, the same faith succours, as before.

---

## C H A P. XI.

### *Of the Blessings of the Old Testament.*

**A**S the Old Testament is nothing but the covenant of grace, as it was dispensed before Christ came in the flesh, it is necessary, that all the blessings or good things, which were promised by the covenant of grace, as such, have likewise a place in the Old Testament.

But the benefits of the covenant of grace are eternal salvation, and whatever has a necessary connection therewith; such as, regeneration, vocation by the word and Spirit of grace, faith, justification, spiritual peace, adoption, and, in a word, all the particulars explained in the preceding book. Though most of these are much more eminent under the New Testament, yet all of them, as to their substance, were conferred even under the Old, as this is evident from the nature of the thing, and from what we have proved before. We shall only treat of the good things peculiar to the Old Testament, especially under the Mosaic dispensation.

II. And they are five. I. The election of the Israelites for a peculiar people. II. The inheritance of the land of Canaan. III. The familiar demonstration and inhabitation of the Divine Majesty. IV. The shadowing forth of divine mysteries, and daily sealing them by a religion of ceremonies. V. An almost uninterrupted succession of inspired prophets.

III. It was certainly a great benefit, that God *should choose* the people of Israel, above all other nations of the world, to have communion with himself in a most stedfast covenant. God himself declares this in these words, Deut. vii. 6. *For thou art a holy people unto Jehovah thy God. Jehovah thy God hath chosen thee to be a special people unto himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth.* In consequence of this election, it was, 1. That Israel was called *the first-born son of God*, Exod. iv. 22; that is, above all other people, whose souls the same God had made, and to whom he gives life and breath, and all things: a singular people, his only beloved, lord of all the rest, having a double portion of the blessing, an inheritance, not only earthly, but also spiritual. 2. That they should be the peculiar property of God, his treasure, ΠΕΡΙΟΥΣΙΑ, and, as it

were, his royal riches, which he boasts of in the world, and glories in, *as his Segullah*; concerning the emphasis of which word, see what we have said, book iii. chap. xii. § 7. and chap. xiii. § 19. 3. That they again might glory in God, as in their portion. For when God took them for a people to himself, he, at the same time, gave them a right to call him their God, and to have him for their portion: as these things are joined together, Deut. xxvi. 17, 18. *Thou hast avouched Jehovah this day to be thy God; and Jehovah hath avouched thee this day to be his peculiar people.* Jer. x. 16. *The portion of Jacob is the Former of all things; and Israel is the rod of his inheritance.* 4. That they should have a right to expect the Messiah, from the midst of them, as one of their brethren, Deut. xviii. 15, 18.

IV. In these things, certainly, great was the *advantage of the Jew, and much the profit of circumcision, much, I say, every way*, Rom. iii. 1, 2. Hence the apostle, Rom. ix. 4, 5. in strong terms amplifies that *advantage of the Jews; who are Israelites, to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises: whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came.* Yet none of these things, nay, not all of them together, if we only consider the external confederation, was sufficient to them for salvation: *For they are not all Israel, which are of Israel: neither because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children*, Rom. ix. 6, 7. Very many of them, notwithstanding they were the children of the kingdom, were cast out, Matth. viii. 12. Yet, in this election of the whole body of the people to the communion of a very close but yet external covenant, there was a certain type of those who were actually chosen to grace

and glory : and the godly among the Israelites, besides these outward prerogatives, enjoyed the saving favor of God, and the privilege of the mystical covenant, in and by them.

V. The *second* benefit or privilege of the Old Testament was the *land of Canaan*. This God had promised to Abraham and his seed, Gen. xii. 7. xiii. 15. & xv. 7. nay, and assigned it to them by oath, Gen. xxvi. 3, 4. Exod. xxxiii. 1. Ezek. xx. 6. This promise, confirmed by oath, God calls *BERITH*, a *covenant*, *DIATHEKE*, a *testament*, that is, the last and irrevocable disposal of his will, Gen. xv. 18. *In that same day Jehovah made a covenant with Abraham, saying, Unto thy seed have I given this land.* And because, in consequence of that testament, the seed of Abraham was to possess that land, it is therefore called their inheritance, Lam. v. 2. Heb. xi. 8.

VI. But we are by no means to understand this, as if that typical inheritance made up the whole inheritance of the Old Testament, or that we are to give such a confined definition of the Old Testament, as if it was only the will of giving the land of Canaan. Much less are we to say, that they who deny this, either admit no Old Testament at all, or confound it with the new. For the Old Testament, as I have several times repeated, is nothing but the very testament of grace, as proposed under the veil of types, which were afterwards to be abrogated. But heaven and salvation, and God himself, are the inheritance of the children of God, by the testament or covenant of grace : and as that testament is invariable, the substance of the inheritance cannot be one thing under the old, and another under the new œconomy of the same testament. The difference of the œconomies consists in this, that the same inheritance is held forth different ways : in the New Tes-



tament clearly and without any veil ; in the old, wrapt up in types and earthly pledges ; among which, after the covenant was made with Abraham, the typical inheritance of the land of Canaan was the most eminent. In the Old Testament it was conjoined with bondage ; in the new with liberty ; to which the inheritance of the Gentiles is likewise added.

VII. That this inheritance was typical, both reason declares, and the scripture attests. For as the whole habitable world cannot be the happiness of the soul, and is subject to vanity, by reason of sin ; there is no country, considered in itself, of such value, as to deserve to be called the inheritance of the people of God. And certainly, God's covenant-people have something more to expect from him, than what even the wicked may possess. Nor is there so vast a difference between Syria, Egypt, and Canaan, if we consider only the fertility and pleasantness of countries, as that the possession of the Israelites, unless something higher was implied, should be so much commended, as to be the \* envy of all other nations. In fine, if all their happiness consisted in the fields which they possessed, what became of those pious persons, who, at the risk of this life, and this earthly inheritance, willingly laid down their lives for the love of their God ? and what was the reason, why Moses, just on the confines of death, expressed so great a desire after that land, at least to see it with his eyes, Deut. iii. 25. but because he eagerly wanted, some way or other, to taste that pledge of heaven which he was debarred from entering into ?

VIII. But scripture also very plainly declares the same thing. When the ungrateful Israelites had, by their murmurings, provoked God, he swore in his wrath,

\* The author's words are, *tam invidiose predicanda sit*, which could not, I conceive, be rendered, but by a periphrasis.

*As truly as I live, they shall not see the land which I swear unto their fathers, Numb. xiv. 21, 23.* It is thus expressed, Psal. xcvi. 11. *Unto whom I swear in my wrath, that they should not enter into my rest.* Which Paul, Heb. iv. 1.—11. refers to the kingdom of the Messiah, and to the spiritual and heavenly rest, purchased by Christ: intimating, that the quiet possession of the land of Canaan, into which Jesus, or Joshua the son of Nun, introduced the children of those rebels, was a type of the spiritual rest, purchased for the elect by Jesus the Son of God, and of Mary.

IX. The analogy or similitude consists in the following particulars. 1. The land of Canaan was eminent for its situation, pleasantness, fertility, and for the excellent fruits of the earth, above very many other countries of the world: whence it is so often called *a goodly land, a land flowing with milk and honey*, a phrase used even by poets as well Greek as Latin; *the pleasant land*, Psal. cvi. 24. Zech. vii. 14. and in a word, *the glory of all lands*, Ezek. xx. 15. where the inhabitants were made to suck honey out of the rock, and oil out of the flinty rock, and butter of kine, and the pure blood of the grape, Deut. xxxii. 13, 14. It therefore represented the delightful pleasantness and abundant plenty of the spiritual blessings in the kingdom of Christ, both of grace and of glory: concerning which Jeremiah prophesied, chap. xxxi. 12. *Therefore they shall come and sing in the height of Zion, and shall flow together to the goodness of Jehovah, for wheat, and for wine, and for oil, and for the young of the flock, and of the herd: and their soul shall be as a watered garden, and they shall not sorrow any more at all.* Compare Joel iii. 18.

X. 2. The land of Canaan was, in a peculiar manner, *Jehovah's land*, Hos. ix. 3. where himself intended to dwell, Psal. lxxxiii. 12. Whence it is called *the*

*place which Jehovah had made for himself to dwell in, Exod. xv. 17. and his holy habitation, ver. 13. But it is called so, not only because God was to have a temple in that land, and to display some peculiar symbols of his presence, but also because in that land he was to send his Son to them, and to anoint him in the midst of them, both King and Lord, by pouring out his Holy Spirit. The Israelites therefore, in their land, which in a peculiar manner was the land of God, had a pledge of the revelation of the Messiah in the midst of them. That SHEKINAH, SKENOSIS, inhabitation of God in Canaan, was a symbol of what John describes, Rev. xxi. 3. Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell (tabernacle) with them. And in the last place, Jerusalem, which was the throne of glory in the land of Canaan, Jer. iii. 17. was a pledge of heaven, which is the habitation of the holiness and glory of God, Is. lxiii. 15.*

XI. 3. The land of Canaan was given to Israel in virtue of the testament of grace, not for any merit or worth of theirs, but by the mere favor of God, Deut. vii. 7, 8. *Not because ye were more in number than any people ;—but because Jehovah loved you, and because he would keep the oath which he had sworn unto your fathers, hath Jehovah brought you out with a mighty hand.* Compare Deut. iv. 37, 38. Ezek. xvi. 60. and Ezek. xxxvi. 32. Thus also the inheritance of heaven comes to believers from the most free grace of God alone, and the most free testament of God the Father and of Christ, Luke xii. 32. Eph. ii. 8. But yet Israel was to travel through a large and great wilderness, and to conflict with the Canaanites, in various and severe battles, before they could enter upon the possession of the promised land. They also to whom a full right to heaven is freely given, through the grace of Christ, are to walk

in that narrow way, beset with briars and thorns, and to fight valiantly against the enemies of their salvation, and take the kingdom of heaven by violence.

XII. Lastly, Though Moses indeed brought Israel out of Egypt, yet he could not bring them into the promised land ; that office was reserved for Joshua. And certainly, when the law is subservient to the covenant of grace, it tends to drive the elect out of themselves, by making them acknowledge their vileness and misery : nevertheless it is by Jesus only that we are introduced into a state of grace. Moses is to begin the work, and prepare the soul, and lead the people round through the wilderness : but it is the office of Jesus to put the last hand to the work, to say, *It is finished*, and procure true rest to the souls of his people, Matth. xi. 28.

XIII. The *third* blessing of the Old Testament, is the familiar and clear *demonstration* or display of the *divine majesty* : such as was made in the appearances of angels, when they declared the will of God ; nay, and of God himself, when he presented himself to the view of the patriarchs and prophets under a visible appearance. But that glorious epiphany or manifestation of God before the assembly of the whole people, when he came to give his law, and to establish his covenant, is of all others the most remarkable. This prerogative of Israel was indeed so great, that no people on earth ever enjoyed any thing like it : Deut. iv. 32, 33. *For ask now of the days that are past, which were before thee, since the day that God created man upon the earth, and ask from the one side of heaven unto the other, whether there hath been any such thing as this great thing is, or hath been heard like it ? Did ever people hear the voice of God speaking out of the midst of the fire, as thou hast heard and live ?* There were likewise the conspicuous sym-

bols of the divine presence in the pillar of cloud and fire, in the sacred and heavenly fire, in the cloud of the sanctuary, and many other things of a similar nature : wherefore God is said *to have had his fire in Zion, and his furnace in Jerusalem*, Is. xxxi. 9. Which visible symbols of the divine familiarity gradually ceased upon the manifestation of Christ in the flesh, of which they were appointed to be types and figures.

XIV. The *fourth* blessing of the Old Testament consisted in the *ceremonies*, and in the daily use of them. I own, that, in a certain respect, the ceremonies were a grievous yoke, and belonged to the faults or defects of that testament : but there was likewise a remarkable representation of Christ in them, and of the grace that was to be obtained by him. And because God was pleased in those times to set his mysteries before them in riddles, parables, and figures ; it was the extraordinary happiness of Israel, that they had continually before their eyes these pictures of the divine goodness, and of a Saviour to come, while other nations were left to themselves. And the rather, as the elect were instructed by the patriarchs, and the prophets, and by those who had been taught by them, in their mystical signification, according to the measure of those times. And in them they had not only a prefiguration, but also a confirming seal of the coming of the Messiah, to whom they all led as by the hand, and without whom they had been a ludicrous farce, and unworthy of God, 1 Pet. i. 10.—12.

XV. And for this reason it is, that the scripture so often mentions this thing, as a great blessing granted to the Israelites, Psal. cxlvii. 19, 20. *He showed his record unto Jacob, his statutes and his judgments unto Israel : he hath not dealt so with any nation.* Is. xlii. 21. *Jehovah is well pleased for his righteousness sake, that*

is, for his truth and goodness : *he will magnify (him by) the law, and make it (him) honorable.* Hos. viii. 12. *I have written to him the great things of my law.* Which is not only, nay, I may venture to say, not principally, to be understood of the moral, or even the forensic or judicial law ; but chiefly of the doctrine of grace, which was prefigured by the ceremonial law. For the principles of the moral law implanted in man at his creation, still remain in the conscience of men, though no new revelation had been superadded : and for the safety of bodies politic, many things have been happily devised by wise men. But as to the mysteries of the ceremonial law, these were the peculiar privilege of the people of God ; and, on account of them, the Israelites looked on themselves as having the pre-eminence above all other nations.

XVI. For the same reason, the godly assisted at those ceremonies with so much delight and cheerfulness of soul, and on the contrary accounted it the greatest part of their unhappiness, if at any time they were banished from their country, and forced to live at a distance from these holy things ; for it was their continued prayer, that they might be allowed to live in the house of God for ever. See Psal. xxiii. 6. Psal. xxvii. 4. Psal. xlii. 2, 5. Psal. lxxxiv. 2, 3. Psal. lxxxix. 15. As, without all doubt, they learned from those ceremonies, their uncleanness and guilt, which tended to the saving humiliation of their soul ; so in them also they beheld the expiation of guilt, and the sanctification from sin, the absolution or purging of the conscience. True that was only typical by the ceremonies, but it was true and spiritual through him, who was prefigured by them.

XVII. Which things being so, those persons seem too much to depreciate those salutary institutions of

God, who scarcely ever consider them, but as an unsupportable burden, and a hand-writing contrary to those who observed them, and as the penalty of breach of covenant; and insist, that what God declares Ezek. xx. 25. is to be applied to them, namely, that he gave Israel *statutes that were not good*, and judgments whereby they should not live. But the celebrated Dr. John a Marck, who was formerly my intimate colleague, has vindicated this passage in such a manner, as entirely to supercede any defence of mine. We acknowledge, that there was something in the ceremonies, which was both grievous, and testified their imperfection, and that the expiation of sin was not yet perfected; but of these things we shall speak in their place. But at the same time we insist, that they had a reference to the gospel, and were a picture of Christ and his benefits, and seals of grace. Neither are we to think, that they were effects of his wrath in such a manner against Israel, as if they were not given as tokens of a singular favor to that people. The Jews themselves really were, and at this day are still sensible of this; for though they acknowledge, they cannot find out the reason for these ceremonies, yet they affirm, that a more secret wisdom is contained in them than they can perceive. To this purpose Abarbanel *in legem*, fol. 197. col. 2. writes concerning them: "Lo! the principal intention in them, is to be as a book of sublime wisdom and divine doctrine, which students in the law may contemplate, till they perfect their souls by those apprehensions and notions."

XVIII. The *fifth* and last blessing of the Old Testament is an almost uninterrupted *succession of inspired men*, by whom the church in those days, instructed in all their doubts, were without any hazard of being de-

ceived. For, in the first ages, the patriarchs might be consulted, to whom God immediately revealed himself, and who, in a state of such longevity, were generally many at a time, or at least were almost contemporary with one another. After them succeeded Moses. He was followed by a long succession of prophets, even to the time of the Babylonish captivity, if we except some very few and short intervals, such as are mentioned, 1 Sam. iii. 1. and 2 Chron. xv. 3. Under the Babylonish captivity flourished Ezekiel and Daniel : after this last came Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, not to say any thing now of Nehemiah and Ezra. And after the Holy Spirit ceased to dictate things to be written for the canon of the church of Israel, yet even to the coming of Christ, he ceased not to move, in an extraordinary manner, the minds of some by his divine inspiration, as is evident in Simeon, in Zacharias the father of John the Baptist, and in Anna the prophetess. But under the New Testament, after the canon of scripture was completed by the apostolic writings, those prophetic enthusiasms or impulses gradually expired.

---

## C H A P. XII.

*Of the Imperfections falsely ascribed to the Old Testament.*

**T**HAT the Old Testament required no deficiency to be supplied, appears even from this, because otherwise a place would not have been sought for a second ; as the apostle, Heb. viii. 7. proves to a demonstration. Having therefore treated of the blessings and privileges of that testament, it is proper, that we now consider its *imperfections* and defects. Not that we would de-



tract any thing from the divine grace, as it was displayed in the times of old (because the ancient fathers both acknowledged and actually experienced, that it was sufficient for their salvation) but that we may set a higher value on the infinite riches of the divine bounty, which were reserved for the more auspicious age of the New Testament.

II. But in handling this, two prudential precautions are to be premised. 1. That, in order to overvalue our own condition, we do not too much undervalue that of the ancients. 2. That, by duly acknowledging our own privileges, less than they deserve, we may be found unthankfully to undervalue the grace of God. And because some have erred in both these extremes, we propose to manage this subject in the following method. In this chapter we shall confute what some persons, who in other respects are learned and orthodox, seem to have advanced with too little caution against the Old Testament ; and then shew from scripture, in what things it was really defective.

III. We here pass over unregarded the heresy of the Socinians, who assert, with the utmost effrontery, that there was no promise of eternal life in the Old Testament ; that Jesus Christ was the first and only preacher of that important truth : a blasphemy we have already confuted. At present our business is with brethren, whom we esteem in the Lord ; only we must always give the preference to the sacred truth. It does not become us nor any Christian, to multiply disputes without cause, and to wrest things, well or tolerably said, to a worse meaning than they will bear ; and when we have wrested them, invidiously to expose them : a manner of procedure this not to be used with enemies, much less with brethren. It is, however, incumbent on all, to endeavour to speak with the utmost caution.

and perspicuity they are able : nor should any one take it amiss, if things which are spoken improperly and harshly, and less consistently with the truth, are modestly, calmly, and without any party-zeal, taken notice of and corrected : especially if they have escaped from persons of character in the church ; and are urged by some with a warmth not to be commended, as if they excelled the common doctrine of the reformed churches by the commendation of a purer and more sublime knowledge ; so if any person that does not assent to them in all respects, is scarce accounted a learned and unprejudiced divine.

IV. In the first place, I imagine, that these following words of a celebrated interpreter have justly given offence to learned men : “ The scope of these words is to shew that though very great temporal benefits were bestowed on the Israelites, yet, before the last times, none that were *true and permanent* ; nor was *salvation itself actually* discovered to them.” *Cocceii Ult. Mos.* p. 886.

V. Who that reads or hears these words, would not be led by their very sound to imagine even this, that though the Israelites really enjoyed temporal privileges, such as possession of the land of Canaan, a peaceable government, a flourishing kingdom, prosperity as subjects, long life, and the like, yet they had no benefits that were true and permanent ; by which one can scarce forbear thinking, that they had no communion with the Messiah, nor part in his peculiar blessings, as reconciliation with God, peace of conscience, reformation after the image of the divine purity, foretastes of the joys of heaven, and a happy removal of the soul from this to an immortal life ? for these, if any, are deservedly and usually called true and permanent benefits, and salvation itself. Whoever therefore affirms,

that very great temporal privileges, and in the same breath denies, that such as were true and permanent were bestowed on, and salvation itself disclosed to the Israelites, speaks in such a manner, as to suggest to the mind of the reader, that the spiritual blessings of the soul, and eternal life, were neither bestowed on, nor discovered to them.

VI. And it is also scarce possible for the reader not to be confirmed in that suspicion, if in another part he reads, that the only delight the Israelites had, was, that they could extend their meditations to the felicity of the latter times, which yet they were not to see with their own eyes. But the same author's preface to the psalms inculcates this in a set, premeditated discourse, not far from the beginning. "This, indeed, was their only solace: for, while they were singing most of the psalms, they were, in the type of David, either singing beforehand the afflictions and exaltation of Christ, or reaching forward to the latter times; and deploring their present forlorn case, were endeavouring to change it into the joy of the future time, nay, assuming the disposition, the joy, the zeal, and sharing in the combats and victories of those who were to see what themselves did not, to hear what themselves did not hear. *This, I say, was their only comfort. For neither what they saw could yield them any delight; because they were shadows: nor what they heard; because it was only, partly a promise, partly an accusation of sin and guilt, with which man is born, but was not then abolished and blotted out: nor what they possessed: because they were to leave them, or because the wicked enjoyed them as well as they: in fine, because they were no real blessings, capable to satisfy the soul.*" Who may not gather from this, that, in the psalms of David, the present blessings of saving grace were neither foretold, com-

mended, or celebrated, and therefore the Israelites did not possess them, though not only the hopes of these blessings, but also the actual possession of them, have been, in all ages, the subject and cause of unspeakable joy? For if David, in his psalms, can celebrate even such spiritual blessings which are connected with eternal salvation, as himself and other believers enjoyed even at that time; with what design can it be said, that their only solace and comfort consisted in meditating on the joy of the time to come, and that they possessed blessings, which were neither real, nor sufficient to satisfy the soul? Who, on reading these things, could imagine he was perusing the writings of a reformed Doctor?

VII. But I would not have you to believe, that this very learned author, though he writes in this style, is gone over to the Socinians, whom, in almost all his writings, he has strenuously opposed, and happily confuted. He repeats it a thousand times over, and makes it appear, by cogent arguments, against those most pestilent heretics, that the promise of the spiritual and heavenly inheritance was made to the fathers of the Old Testament, and the possession of it granted to them in consequence of the testament of grace. And in the very place we first quoted, § 885. he writes, that "Jehovah was the Father of that people; for he purchased and made them, and bestowed all good things upon them, which is to be understood not only in a figurative sense, or with respect to any external favor; but with respect to the benefit of redemption, the new creation, and the donation of all things necessary for life and godliness, by which he is in truth manifested to be the Father of that people, with respect to his elect children, who were at all times contained in that people, as in a seminary, but less frequently in the great multi-

tude of the Israelites of that age." So far well: I could wish he had stopped here.

VIII. But these two assertions are so different, that they seem to be even contradictory. For as the blessing of redemption, the new creation, and the donation of all things necessary for life and godliness, and in fine, to have God, not in figure, but in truth, for their Father, are indisputably true and permanent blessings, and are even salvation itself: whoever asserts, that these things were bestowed on, and discovered to the Israelites, and yet denies, that true and permanent blessings had been conferred upon, and discovered to them, seems to involve himself in a manifest contradiction.

IX. What then? Did memory, did judgment, did soundness of mind fail this very learned author, when he advanced things so contradictory? But his acknowledged learning forbids us to suspect any such thing. Let us then declare the matter as it is. By true and permanent benefits, which, he says, were not bestowed on the fathers of the Old Testament, he means the blessings peculiar to the New, as the truth is opposed to the type, and what is permanent to the shadow, that was to vanish. And salvation with him denotes complete salvation. He has found an interpreter and apologist in a divine of very great name, who, with great confidence, tells us, that this assertion is for the most part in scripture-terms; which might have been better understood by divines, if they had taken as much pains to read and meditate on the writings of God as of men: and he endeavours to shew, that some of the things peculiar to the New Testament, as such, are sometimes held forth by the name of *salvation*, and of true and permanent benefits. For this purpose he quotes Heb. ii. 3. where *salvation* is said *at the first to have begun to*

*be spoken by the Lord*: that is, the work of salvation, which Christ now began to perform; or even that clear and effectual doctrine of the gospel, which calls us to salvation. He further observes, that those benefits are sometimes called *true*, which are opposed to those which were *typical*, as John i. 17. *The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ*: and as the blotting out the hand-writing, which was against us, and that glorious decree of adoption, mentioned Gal. iv. 5. are said to be true benefits: he asserts, that they are justly called *permanent*, in contradistinction to the covenant of grace, as it was a covenant with the Israelites, which was neither faultless nor permanent, Heb. viii. 7, 9. From all which he concludes, that it is to speak agreeable with the scriptures, to say, that true and permanent benefits, and salvation itself, were not bestowed on, and discovered to Israel.

X. These things require a particular consideration. It is my real judgment and persuasion, that these learned men would have acted a far more prudent and generous part, if sometimes, for the sake of truth, they had abandoned those whom they have set up as heads of their party; confessing both that they were men, and that sometimes their thoughts and discourses were less accurate; and not first to excuse every thing, however uncautiously spoken, with great confidence, and then to defend it as most genuine, and most exactly agreeable to scripture-language, though but with very indifferent success, and at the expence of the reputation of their brethren.

XI. But let us consider the constant tenor of the sacred writings. These call the spiritual blessings of the soul, TO ALETHINON, *the true*, Luke xvi. 11. in opposition to the unrighteous mammon, or the false riches of this world: and the grace, granted to the elect,

AS SUCH, TEN ALETHE CHARIN TOU THEOU, *the true grace of God, wherein they stand*, 1 Pet. v. 12. Whether we understand this of the doctrine of grace, or of that saving grace itself, which, by that doctrine, is offered to, and conferred on the elect, which ver. 10. was called *the eternal glory of God*, it is very evident, that true grace is opposed to any false persuasion whatever concerning salvation. They are also expressly called *permanent blessings*, Heb. x. 34. *Knowing in yourselves, that ye have in heaven a better and an enduring substance*, which is not opposed to types and shadows, but to the good things of this world, which are fading, and subject to spoiling or rapine. ΗΥΡΑΡΧΙΣ ΜΕΝΟΥΣΑ, *enduring substance*, answers to the Hebrew words ΤΟΣΙΑΗ and ΙΕΣΗ, which signify, *a true, solid, and permanent substance*. But that is what the supreme wisdom has, from the beginning, promised to, and bestowed on those who observe her, Prov. ii. 7. *He layeth up sound wisdom (substance) for the righteous*; and Prov. viii. 21. *to cause those that love me, to inherit substance*. Our Lord calls these very benefits *treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through and steal*, Matth. vi. 20. Now, the believing Israelites were undoubtedly admitted to the possession of these. The learned author himself writes, *Jadagnt. Natur. Sabbat.* § 4. that “holy persons, who believed the promise, and expected salvation, had the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit.” Which, no one doubts, are permanent. In a word, what does *salvation itself* more commonly signify, than that happiness of the soul, which is begun here upon earth, and will be perfected in heaven, and is the end of our faith? of which 1 Pet. i. 9. *Receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls.*

The salvation of the soul is its deliverance from the condemning and domineering power of sin, and its delighting in God as the fountain of happiness. And this is the end of faith, not only under the New, but also that which obtained under the Old Testament. Which was indeed discovered to Jacob, and by him to his children, when he said, *I have waited for thy salvation, O Jehovah*, Gen. xlix. 18. As therefore spiritual blessings are called in scripture true, permanent, and salvation itself; and the brethren dare not refuse that these were granted and discovered to the ancient Israelites, must we not acknowledge, that whoever says, that true and permanent benefits, and salvation itself were not granted and discovered to the Israelites, does not speak according to scripture?

XII. Moreover, should we allow, that some benefits were peculiar to the new testament, which may be eminently called true and permanent, and salvation itself; yet it does not follow, that he speaks truly and advisedly, according to the rules of logic and divinity, who, without restriction, denies that true and permanent blessings were granted to Israel; since, besides those benefits peculiar to the new testament, there are others also which are true, permanent, and saving. An universal negative proposition does not exclude some one, but every species without exception. It is one thing to say, that Israel had not some degree or measure of true and permanent benefits; another, that they had not the blessings themselves. He who would assert the former, which is true, should not use words that signify the latter, which is absolutely false.

XIII. But let us take a more distinct view, how well the brethren maintain their ground by scripture, 1. We allow, that the apostle, Heb. ii. 3. by salvation understands that great happiness, whose cause was then pre-



sent, and the gospel in its perfect state, wherein the salvation, now begun to be impetrated, and soon to be fully so, is declared : and it is certain, salvation in that sense was not before the manifestation of Christ ; nor did the Israelites enjoy it. But he that would illustrate this, should distinguish between this salvation, already impetrated or obtained, and salvation about to be impetrated ; or between salvation, and the promise of salvation ; and not, as our author does, between salvation and temporal benefits. For certainly eternal salvation was given and manifested to Israel, though the cause of salvation, as it now appears, and the work of salvation, as already begun, could not be preached to them. Because what Christ had promised and engaged, was at that time sufficient to procure salvation, to be manifested and bestowed.

XIV. 2. None will deny, that true benefits are sometimes opposed to typical : but this observation is altogether foreign to the case in hand ; unless the brethren mean, that the Israelites enjoyed only typical good things, but were destitute of those true or spiritual blessings, which were signified by the typical. What we just quoted from the preface to the psalms, and which I own I do not sufficiently understand, seems to tend to this. But let these things pass. Let us go on with what is perspicuous. Moses indeed, who was a servant, could not bestow those true blessings. Yet Christ, who was the same yesterday and to-day, bestowed on believers, even under the Mosaic œconomy, true benefits, in and with the typical. And when they deny, that true benefits were bestowed on Israel, I cannot think, they will reckon remission of sins, and redemption, and a new creation, &c. among the number of those which were typical ; and they own that these were bestowed on Israel. To what purpose then is the

inculcating here a distinction between true and typical benefits? But, say they, the blotting out the hand-writing, and that glorious degree of adoption, are true benefits. Are they so? And is not also remission itself, the hand-writing not being yet blotted out, and adoption itself, though not in that degree, to be reckoned among the true benefits? Did the types of the Israelites only prefigure that measure of grace peculiar to the New Testament; not saving grace itself, which is common to both dispensations? Were their sacraments signs only of this grace, which is freely bestowed on us, and not also of that, of which they themselves were made partakers? Let the learned authors tell me, I pray, whether the new creation, redemption, remission of sin, adoption, friendship with God, and the salvation of the soul, both in heaven and on earth, and the like spiritual blessings, which the Israelites enjoyed, belong to the law, and are given by Moses, or to the truth and grace which came by Christ? If they affirm the latter, as I imagine they will, I again beg of them to explain, what the passage quoted from John makes to the purpose: as from that it is clear, that true benefits, as opposed to typical, were bestowed even upon Israel: which yet the words, now under examination, deny.

XV. 3. The main point is, that the œconomy of the Old Testament was not permanent and stable, like the œconomy of the New. In the former there is *the removing of those things that are shaken*, that, in the latter, *those things which cannot be shaken, may remain*, Heb. xii. 27. But it is wrong to infer from this, that under a mutable œconomy, which was in due time to be changed, there were no permanent blessings either bestowed or made known. Because the bestowing and manifesting permanent benefits proceeds not from

those circumstances, which are mutable, but from the very covenant of grace, which is God's eternal testament. Then again granting, there is some permanent benefit under the New Testament, which was not under the Old, I cannot therefore indeterminately affirm, that permanent blessings were not bestowed on Israel. I shall give a palpable instance. The apostle says even to believers under the New Testament, while they sojourned on this earth, Heb. xiii. 14. *Here have we no continuing city.* The celebrated interpreter says well on this place: "It is peculiar to Christians, and those who join themselves to Christ, that they have not here a city. They are without a city in the world. Some may say, the apostle denies not that they have a city, but they have no abiding one: nay, he denies, that we have a city here, because no city is abiding." Can I therefore be allowed to assert, that no permanent benefits are bestowed on believers of the New Testament? I cannot think it. I conclude, it had been much better, the brethren had frankly owned, that the learned author, while he was writing these things, betrayed human frailty, and spoke uncautiously, than, by far-fetched pretences, to palliate things, which the reformed churches will never acknowledge as their doctrine.

XVI. *Secondly,* The excellence of the Old Testament is too much lessened by asserting, that the *circumcision of the heart*, mentioned Deut. xxx. 6. was a blessing peculiar to the New Testament. It is worth while to hear, how the learned author explains himself. First, he desires us to observe, that this verse treats of the time of the Messiah, the foregoing signs of whom are explained in the preceding verses: and therefore he enumerates circumcision of the heart, mentioned here, among the blessings of the New Testament, *de jure*. § 352. Consequently he says, "that God hence promi-

sed a kind of circumcision of the heart, which he would not give till that time," *Sum. Theol. c. 53. § 7.* But what is that circumcision of the heart here promised? Let us hear the learned author himself, when professedly commenting on this place. "By circumcision of the heart we are here to understand, whatever answers to circumcision, as a figure, and is contained in God's covenant, except those things that do not belong to this life," *Ullim. Mos. § 334.* And more clearly still: "To sum up the whole briefly, the circumcision of the heart here promised, ver. 6 is regeneration by the Spirit of adoption. Above all it signifies regeneration, or sanctification by the Spirit of faith and the love of God. Secondly, it denotes consolation in hope of eternal life, by the expiation of Christ," *ibid. § 336, 337, 338.* From these quotations, if duly connected, arises this argument: The circumcision of the heart promised Deut. xxx. 6. is a benefit of the New Testament, which God did not bestow till then: but regeneration by the Spirit of adoption, or sanctification by the Spirit of faith, and of the love of God, and consolation in hope of eternal life by the expiation of Christ, is the circumcision of the heart there promised: therefore such regeneration or sanctification, and consolation in hope of eternal life, is a benefit of the New Testament, which God did not bestow before that time. This conclusion necessarily follows from the premisses, when placed in due order. But the premisses are the very words of the learned author.

XVII. And yet he does not admit the conclusion; but protests against it. *And the fathers had both: for they could not, without the Spirit of God, 1 Cor. xii. 3. and the creation of a clean heart, Psal. li. 10. and the circumcision of the heart, call Christ Lord, as David does, Psal. cx. 1. And they had the hope and joy of sal-*

zation, Gen. xlix. 18. Psal. li. 12. xvii. 15. & xlix. 15. *Ibid.* § 339. If any can reconcile these things, I own I cannot. There is only one way of getting clear; namely, by making a distinction in regeneration, sanctification, and consolation in hope of eternal life; as that there is a certain regeneration by the Spirit of adoption; another from something else, than from that Spirit: a certain sanctification by the Spirit of faith and love of God; another not: a certain consolation in the hope of eternal life by the expiation of Christ; another from some other way. The former of these are indeed peculiar to the New Testament; and the latter belong to the old. But these very learned persons must excuse me, if I confidently affirm, I never learned from scripture of any regeneration, but what is from the Spirit of adoption; any sanctification, but what is from the Spirit of faith and love; any hope of eternal life, but what is by the expiation of Christ, either to be made, or already made.

XVIII. What does he then intend, when he denies, that the fathers had circumcision of heart? I know not whether, in what I am to say, I shall express the whole of his meaning: but I had rather err on this side, in not saying the whole, than in charging the author with what either he has not said, or I have not sufficiently understood. "It appears," says he, "that here a spiritual grace is signified, in some measure common to those under both testaments, but in its fulness peculiar to those under the new: and that thus something is promised to be superadded to what they had received, peculiar to the New Testament." *Ibid.* § 335. They had therefore regeneration, sanctification, and consolation, but in some measure only. But what is there to be superadded to what they had received? That must be some third thing, even that which the circumcision

of the heart denotes ; namely, “ The removing the vail from the eyes, and the yoke from the conscience, in order to serve God without the fear of death in liberty and joy. For in circumcision the taking away the fleshy substance doubtless signifies freedom from the yoke of such a law.” *Ibid.* § 340.

XIX. But we distinctly offer the following considerations against such intricate notions. 1. Thus the circumcision of the heart is a blessing of the covenant of grace as such, and equally belongs to believers of both testaments. Which we make appear thus. The foreskin of the heart always signifies in scripture that impurity and depravation, which is naturally inherent in the soul, and is increased by repeated evil actions : but the circumcision of the heart is nothing but the taking away that foreskin, that is, that depravation ; which is done by regeneration and sanctification. This Moses declares, Deut. x. 16. *Circumcise therefore the foreskin of your heart, and be no more stiff-necked.* And Paul, in like manner, Col. ii. 11. describes the circumcision of the heart, which is done without hands, to be *the putting off the body of the sins of the flesh.* But that this was the privilege of believers in all ages, appears from this, because without it none can be *a Jew, whose praise is of God*, Rom. ii. 28, 29. But none will deny, that, in consequence of the covenant of grace, there were always such. And as circumcision of the heart is this very regeneration and sanctification, without which none can see God, we must of necessity say, that it is the privilege of all those that were saved at any time. A greater or less degree of sanctification alters not the species. Nor do I imagine, any believer at this time will, even as to the degrees of sanctification, claim to himself a superiority above David, or Moses, or Abraham. Who then will ascribe the circumcision

of the heart to himself, and refuse it to those heroes, who were also partakers of the same grace with them, though not in an equal degree ?

XX. 2. Besides, to understand, by circumcision of the heart, the removing of the vail and yoke, or, which is the same, the abrogation of the ceremonies, is contrary to all sound divinity and reason. For, 1. Let but one single testimony of scripture be produced, where the Holy Spirit thus explains it. 2. We are, on the contrary, taught, that circumcision was, as it were, the entrance to the observance of that law, in which it was a yoke, Gal. v. 3. How then could it signify to the Israelites, on their receiving it, the abrogation of that yoke ? 3. Circumcision itself was a great part of the yoke, Acts xv. 5. compared with ver. 10. Besides, what is more absurd, than that the receiving the yoke should signify the removal of it ? What sacramental analogy is there here ? 4. As there is a relation between circumcision and uncircumcision, if circumcision be the abrogation of the ceremonies, it necessarily follows, that the ceremonies themselves are the foreskin, or uncircumcision of the heart, than which what can be more contrary to scripture-language ? 5. If it be objected, that the ceremonial law is called *a carnal commandment*, Heb. vii. 16. therefore its abrogation was fitly prefigured by cutting away a small part of the flesh ; I shall invert the argument, and conclude, therefore it hath its confirmation in that act, which, if any thing, should be accounted among the carnal, as it was performed in the flesh ; wherefore it is also called *the covenant of God in the flesh* of the descendents of Abraham, Gen. xvii. 13. For the apostle calls that commandment carnal, which, as to the external rites, is performed not in the spirit or mind, but in the mem-

bers of the body. Otherwise it might, with equal reason, be said, that the killing and burning the sacrifices prefigured the abrogation of the carnal ceremonies : which is unworthy divines. There was indeed that in circumcision, as also in the other ceremonies, which might discover imperfection, and give hope of a more joyful time, and presignify, that when that time should come, the ceremonies were to be abrogated ; yet the thing signified was not the abrogation of the same.

XXI. 3. And though sometimes circumcision of the heart was the same thing as taking away the vail and yoke ; yet it is not promised in that sense, Deut. xxx. 6. For God himself explains it otherwise in the following words, which run thus : *And Jehovah thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love Jehovah thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayst live.* That circumcision therefore is meant, whose immediate effect is the sincere love of God, and the more remote, life or salvation. Now, what is this but regeneration, or sanctification, without which there can neither be the love of God, nor life ? But both may be, where the vail and yoke of ceremonies are not yet removed. The Jewish doctors also agree, that here sanctification is meant ; though they give it too great an extent, and think that a perfect sanctification is here promised. We shall not scruple to transcribe a few things out of Moses Gerunden-  
sis. “ Their heart will desire nothing, but what, in every respect, is virtuous. And this is the circumcision mentioned here. For concupiscence and appetite are the foreskin of the heart : but to circumcise the heart is to set it free from that appetite and concupiscence.”



XXII. 4. If we grant, that something is here promised, which was to be performed to the elect Israelites in the time of the Messiah ; yet this by no means proves, that this benefit was peculiar to that time, and was not bestowed on their ancestors before. I shall not go far to shew the weakness of that consequence. In ver. 8. God promised conversion to the Israelites of that time, that they might hearken to the voice of Jehovah, and do all his commandments. Yet such a conversion is no peculiar benefit of the New Testament ; because in almost the same words, the Lord ascribes it to the Jews in the Babylonish captivity, ver. 2. Therefore we conclude, that they by no means speak according to scripture, who deny, that circumcision of the heart, in whatever sense performed, had place under the Old Testament.

XXIII. *Thirdly*, In the same base manner, they make the *writing the law on the heart*, a blessing peculiar to the New Testament : because Heb. viii. 10. it is said from Jer. xxxi. 34. *For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord ; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts ;* that is, says our author, in Jer. xxxi. § 61. *I will cause them to receive my law, delight therein, and not forget it.* If these words be taken as they lie, it follows that the ancient believers, who lived before the times of the New Testament, did not receive the law of God, nor delight in it, but forgot it. But that these things are most eminently false, appears from the example of David alone ; who professes that *he received* the law, when he says, Psal. cxix. 11. *Thy word have I hid in my heart :* and adds ver. 16. *I will delight myself in thy statutes, I will not forget thy word.* How then is this a blessing peculiar to the New Testament, in which David claims an interest in so many words ?

XXIV. But there is something else implied. Here, says the celebrated interpreter, the law of the love of God is spoken of. But that commandment, *Thou shalt love the Lord thy God*, Deut. vi. could not, under the Old Testament, have its full efficacy on the hearts of believers : because “ where there is fear (which they who differed nothing from servants, could not be without, Gal. iv. 1.) there is no perfect love, 1 John iv. 18.” And when *the love of God is shed abroad in the heart by the Holy Ghost*, Rom. v. 5. and the love of God is not bestowed with sadness, as formerly, but with the *exceeding joy of sons*, it is excellently, and, as it were, peculiarly said, that *the law of God is written in the heart*. All this we may find in *Sum. de fad.* § 352.

XXV. But I don't meet with these things in the sacred writings ; for they declare that even the ancient believers loved God, Psal. xviii. 1. and Psal. cxvi. 1. and that *as their Father*, Is. lxiii. 16. and with the *exceeding joy of sons*, Psal. xliii. 4. and *without any fear*, that did not become the children of God, Psal. xlvi. 2. and Psal. xxiii. 4. nay, that they had a joyful sense of the love of God, *shed abroad in their hearts*, Psal. iv. 7. and heard God *saying to their souls, I am thy salvation*, Psal. xxxv. 3. In a word, that *they delighted themselves in God's commandments, which they loved*, Psal. cxix. 47. What can now remain as a requisite towards writing the law on the heart ?

XXVI. But yet you will say, something is here promised to be obtained by virtue of the new covenant, which the old could not give, in the place of which the new was substituted on account of its imperfections. I answer, The apostle does not here oppose the covenant of grace, as it is dispensed after the coming of Christ, to the same covenant of grace, as it was dispensed before, but opposes the covenant of grace, as

in its full efficacy under the New Testament, to the national covenant made with the Israelites at mount Sinai; and as a spiritual covenant to a typical. In which covenant the people promised obedience to God; and God promised the people, that, if they performed that obedience, he would accept and reward it; but did not promise to give them a heart to obey: as may be seen in their first engaging in covenant, *Exod. xix. 5, 6, 8.* and in the solemn confirmation of it, *Exod. xxiv. 7, 8.* where there is no promise made of a new heart. And therefore, in consequence of this covenant, the law was not written on the heart of the people of Israel. And hence it was, that they broke that covenant by their apostasy, and made it of no effect: and that God refused to be called their God, and to acknowledge them for his people; and that in contempt he called them the people of Moses, rather than his own, *Exod. xxxii. 7.* Here a better covenant is opposed to that Israelitish covenant, which is not formally the covenant of grace, but is only considered with respect to its typical or shadowy pomp, the effect of which is the writing the law on the heart, and communion with God, as the fountain of salvation. Moreover, that covenant is referred to the days of the Messiah; not that it was only then to exist in those effects of it; but that at that time it would be exceeding glorious, and produce effects very conspicuous. However, the elect from among Israel, even in the ancient times, besides their engagements by the Sinaitic covenant, were joined to God by the covenant of grace, which he had solemnly renewed with Abraham. And from that covenant they had every thing, that the writing the law on the heart comprizes, and God himself for their God, that is, the fountain of salvation. As the covenant of grace, under which the ancients were,

is not to be confounded with, so neither is it to be separated from, the Sinaitic covenant ; neither are we to think, that believers were without all those things, which were not promised by the Sinaitic covenant ; and which the typical covenant, *because of its weakness and unprofitableness*, could not bestow ; as they were likewise partakers of the Abrahamic covenant, which was a pure covenant of grace : and hence were derived the spiritual and saving benefits of the Israelites.

XXVII. *Fourthly*, The godly, who are zealous for the truth, are not without cause offended, when they read in express terms, that “ justification is promised in scripture, as a blessing not of the ancient, but of the latter times,” *Sum. Theol.* c. 69. § 3. that “ remission is promised, as a gift of the New Testament,” *de fœd.* § 353. That “ *before Christ came, there was no remission,*” *Inlag. nat. Sabbat.* § 3. And in a word, that “ *no sin was properly forgiven under the Old Testament,*” *Sum. Theol.* c. 96. § 26.

XXVIII. But he who speaks so, understands, by remission of sins and by justification, something more than the will to remit the punishment of sin, and to bestow eternal life for the sake of the Mediator, received by faith. He means by these terms, “ that then the will to punish sin is excluded, by appointing a sacrifice for sin ; and the declaration and testimony included ; that sin is blotted out and expiated :” as he explains himself in *Animadv. ad quest.* 83. *quest.* 68. This he has expressed more clearly, *Sum. Theol.* c. 51. § 9. “ As to that justification, which is the discharge and perfecting of the conscience, or the consolation arising on account of the cause of righteousness being now manifested, they had not that formerly.”—He has accurately and briefly explained the whole of his meaning in *Comment. ad Col.* ii. § 110. “ In sum, the

difference of remission, according to the times, is thus :  
 1. There was a remission of sins, and indeed a confession of sin not as yet expiated, and of righteousness not as yet brought in, but without bondage and a yoke ; even before the law : previous to which sin was not imputed. 2. There was a remission of sins with bondage, a yoke and ordinances, which exacted a hand-writing contrary to them, both evident and plain ; and that under the law. 3. There is a remission of sins, with a declaration of righteousness being brought in, and of the death of Christ, for the doing away of sin, even on account of the blotting out the hand-writing, and that under the New-Testament."

XXIX. Against all this I offer the following considerations. As the scripture asserts, in express terms, that the ancient fathers had remission of sins and justification, it is neither laudable nor prudent to deny it. For, in what sense soever you do it, it looks at least like an attempt to gainsay God, and correct his language. Which ought to be very far from every one that loves and reveres God. Besides, the scripture is express ; as concerning remission of sins, Psal. cxxx. 4. *But there is forgiveness with thee*, Exod. xxxiv. 7. *forgiving iniquity, and transgression, and sin* ; so concerning justification, Jam. ii. 21. *Abraham our father was justified*, and Rom. iv. 2, 3. As God has declared, that these had remission and justification, to what purpose then is this denied ? You will alledge, you have done so in a different sense : but let us now consider whether in a right and a good one.

XXX. By remission of sins and justification you understand absolution, on account of the payment being actually made, together with an entire discharge from the hand-writing ; such as certainly did not exist under the Old Testament. But I do not remember, that any

has proved, that the term *justification* is used in that sense any where in scripture, to distinguish it from that absolution which the ancients enjoyed. For what is said Acts xiii. 39. *By him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses,* is not to the purpose. There it is shewn, we have the truth in the saving grace of Christ, of which they had only the shadow in the external ceremonies of the law of Moses. There is no opposition made in that text between the Old and New Testament, only between internal communion with Christ and the external ceremonies. But it is beyond all controversy, that believers, even under the Old Testament, were partakers thereof. We have the term, *APHESIS*, *remission*, once in that sense, Heb. x. 18. but once only, that I know of. In other respects *APHESIS* is frequently asserted of the ancient fathers, as we shall presently shew. Seeing therefore the scripture *frequently* declares, that the ancient fathers enjoyed remission of sins; and either *once*, or but *rarely* ascribes remission with any annexed limitation to the New Testament, contradistinguished from the Old; it does not appear consistent with Christian prudence, *so often* to deny a *remission* under the Old. It had been better, in order to prevent offence, to say plainly and distinctly, that such a mode or manner of remission did not obtain under the Old, as does now under the New Testament. Nor can any plead in excuse such scripture-expressions, which say, that the Old Testament had not benefits in such abundance, as John vii. 39. for these expressions are not so common. And whoever in his discourses attempts to render scripture more intelligible to the less experienced, ought not to frame his expressions, by what is both more rare and obscure. but

by the ordinary tenor of scripture, in order to throw a light on the more obscure passages and phrases.

XXXI. In fine, we cannot approve his saying, that the hand-writing was not exacted of the fathers before the law of Moses. For sacrifices, and circumcision, which *is not of Moses, but of the fathers*, John vii. 22. belong to the ordinances, and were types of Christ to come, and implied a confession of guilt which was not then expiated, but are abolished by the cross of Christ. And if they made no part of the hand-writing, is there any reason why they may not be observed under the New Testament, at least in the manner in which they were observed before Moses? The brethren make the state of the Israelitish church too servile, beyond the other periods, both the preceding and the following. But these things do not properly concern this controversy.

XXXII. Many have also been offended, that Psal. xxxii. li. ciii. and the like, which exactly describe remission of sins and the justification of a sinner, should be thought to contain a prophecy concerning the New-Testament times, as if the psalmist, on that occasion, “delighted himself in the anticipation of the joys of the New Testament times,” *Sum. Theol. c. 69. § 24.* and frequently elsewhere, especially in his commentaries on these psalms. These things seem very disagreeable, nor are they thought possible to proceed but from one, who denies that the fathers had remission of sin, together with that holy security of soul, which delights itself in God. Yet it is not to be denied, that the brethren elsewhere loudly protest, that they ascribe to the ancient fathers that remission of sins, which begets a full assurance of hope concerning happiness, and a consolation and a glorying even in death. And charity,

which thinketh no evil, obligeth us to believe, that they speak thus from the heart. However, I look upon that method of interpretation to be very indecent, whereby things of a doctrinal nature, which have no respect to the different œconomy of times, are rashly transformed into prophecies concerning the New Testament. And I find nothing in those psalms, at least so far as they declare the grace of God in the remission of sins, which may not be applied to David, and to believers, his contemporaries. Nor does any thing occur in the New Testament, which authorises believers of the last times to appropriate these things to themselves beyond others. Let us consider each of them.

XXXIII. There is nothing in Psal. xxxii. that savours of prophecy. The title shews it is \* *a doctrinal ode*, containing the doctrine concerning the true happiness of a sinner, as common to every age; and declares, that this consists in remission of sins. Moreover, by his own example, he shews to whom that happiness belongs, and after what manner it may be obtained. This he proposes, ver. 5. for the imitation of others, and presses it ver. 8. and the following, in very strong terms. Who, but one blinded with prejudice, can find a prophecy in all this? And certainly, when David pronounces the person blessed, *unto whom Jehovah imputeth not iniquity, &c.* I would fain know, whether he includes himself in that blessedness. If he does, it is no prophecy of the New Testament times, which is what I contend for. But if he excludes himself from that happiness, he also excludes himself from the benefit of that justification, which is obtained by faith; but Paul brings in this happiness of David, Rom. iv. 6. to prove the doctrine of justification by faith, and shews that Abraham was made partaker of it: but this

\* *A Psalm of David, Michtil*; that is, giving instruction.



I imagine none of the brethren will say. I would also fain know, what person speaks ver. 3, 4. Is there here any kind of *prosopopœia* representing to us a believer of the New Testament? But what proof is there for such a fiction? what demonstration have we for it? or does David himself speak? Certainly, the title of the psalm leads us to this: and there is nothing in these words, which are not true concerning David; and which he does not elsewhere affirm of himself; see *Psal. vi. 2, 3.* But if the prophet affirms of himself, what is there spoken of the grief and anxiety of a soul not yet sensible of God's being reconciled, he certainly also speaks of himself, ver. 5. *And thou forgivest the iniquity of my sin:* for these words cannot be separated from the foregoing. I entreat the pious reader to compare this commentary, by which such a plain psalm is turned to I know not what kind of drama, where, under the mask of David, quite different persons lie concealed, with the clear and savoury commentary of Calvin, and, if I am not mistaken, he will evidently see the mask fall off.

XXXIV. Of the same nature is *Psal. li.* The inscription and occasion of it there mentioned, prove, that it is so evidently applicable to David, that it is superfluous to add a single word. The learned author himself, in his commentaries, applies many things to David. And on the title of the psalm he expressly says, "It is a prayer of David to God after his conversation with the prophet Nathan." And on ver. 1. "All are bound to have recourse to grace, and lay hold on that, and consequently, *with David,* to apply to themselves the grace of God." Why then does he elsewhere wrest these things to the New Testament times? Is it, because ver. 7. he says, *Sprinkle me with hyssop;* by which ceremony the atoning sacrifice of Christ was re-

presented? But is not that very expression more applicable to a believer under the Old, than under the New Testament? How could he more effectually express the activity of the ancient faith, which takes a distant prospect of a Saviour to come through a thick cloud of ceremonies? "The man of God knew," says Musculus, "that the expiation of sin consists not in ceremonial actions; but is rather by the grace and Spirit of God in Christ to come." Or is it because, ver. 18. he speaks of the sacrifices of righteousness, which were to be offered after the rebuilding of Jerusalem, or of the sacrifice of Christ, whereby he made the fullest satisfaction to the justice of God? But what can be inferred from this? Could not believers of the Old Testament sing praises for the benefits bestowed on them, and, at the same time, make mention of the future satisfaction of Christ, in virtue of which they obtained those blessings? And then why may we not, with Bucer and Musculus, understand by these sacrifices, those spiritual sacrifices, of which Peter speaks, 1 Pet. ii. 5. and which are abundantly offered to God, when he does good to Zion, &c. that is, enriches his church with his spiritual grace, as well under the Old as under the New Testament? Unless, with Calvin, Mollerus, Piscator, the Dutch commentators, and others, we had rather explain it of the legal sacrifices themselves, but offered in a proper manner according to the divine prescription, and by faith: which is still farther from the sentiment of Cocceius.

XXXV. Psal. ciii. contains nothing, which regards only the New Testament times. And ver. 19. & 22. are to no purpose produced, as if they treated concerning the kingdom of liberty and grace, which was to extend through all the world. For it is not certain, that these words are to be referred to the kingdom of

heaven under the New Testament. There is nothing in them which may not be applied to the kingdom of God's power or providence. "It is plain," says Musculus, "these things are not spoken concerning the kingdom of grace, but of the kingdom of God's power, authority, and dominion." But was it not likewise true under the Old Testament, that *Jehovah had prepared his throne in the heavens; and that his kingdom ruleth over all?* Was the state of the New Testament times represented to Micaiah, when he saw Jehovah sitting on his throne, and all the host of heaven standing by him? 1 Kings xxii. 19. Did Nebuchadnezzar also prophesy of the New Testament times, when he called God *King of heaven*, and ascribed to him an *everlasting kingdom over all the inhabitants of the earth?* Dan. iv. 36, 37. Can it be said under the New Testament alone, *Bless the Lord all his works?* But the psalmist, Psal. cxlviii. even under the Old Testament, invited every thing in heaven and in earth to that duty. I omit other passages, lest, in a thing so plain, I should be charged with a too superstitious exactness. However, I will not deny, that those things which are spoken concerning the kingdom of God's power, which extends itself over the whole earth, and concerning his eminent majesty over all creatures, do illustriously shine forth in the kingdom of liberty and grace, as Moilerus has likewise observed. But yet there is no reason to turn all this into a mere prophecy concerning the time to come. Well says Amyraldus in his preface to this psalm, "There is nothing here, which can be properly typical, or which, by any mystical interpretation, can be referred to the fulness of time." But should we grant, that the prophet, filled with the abundance of divine grace, was, from the sense thereof, moved to sing, towards the close of the psalm, concerning the

kingdom of liberty and grace ; does it therefore follow, that what he had before sung of the bounty of God towards himself, and of the pardon of all his sins, was not applicable to himself, but only to believers under the New Testament ?

XXXVI. What has also perplexed some, is that laboured distinction, and so often inculcated, of *PARE-SIS*, *passing by*, and *APHESIS*, *pardon*, which is usually pretended to be of extraordinary use in divinity. But they generally explain it thus : that *PARE-SIS* denotes *a passing over, a passing by, a concealing*, whence it comes, that God does not punish sins, nor has a purpose of exacting them of the sinner ; nevertheless he does not declare, that satisfaction has been made, but on the contrary reserves to himself a power to call the sinner before him, that is, to remind him, that the debt is not yet cancelled, and to exact of himself the hand-writing, by which he may own, as by the subscription of his own hand, that guilt is not yet abolished and expiated. This the scripture would call *PARIENAI*, *to pass by*, to which answers *HECHEROSH*, *to be silent*, Psal. l. 21. and Esth. vii. 4. They distinguish this *passing by* two ways. 1. Before the law of Moses, when God was altogether silent, and sin not *imputed*, by exacting the hand-writing. 2. After the law, when God called the sinner before him, and demanded the hand-writing. But by *APHESIS*, properly so called, they understand that pardon of sin, by which God declares, that Christ has made satisfaction to his justice, and pronounces the meritorious cause of the right to life to be now actually in being, affirms sin to be blotted out, tears the hand-writing, and finally gives a discharge ; as if he should say, “ I have received, I will not give in pledge.” All this we find in *de ferd.* § 339. *Sum. Theol.*

c li. § 11. *Animadvers. ad quest. 83. quest. 68. ad Rom.*  
 iii. § 72. *More Nebo.* p. 65. &c.

XXXVII. On this I observe, that in the main there can be no controversy, if it be allowed, that the guilt of sin did not lie upon believers, in such a manner, that they, on supposition of Christ's suretiship, should be forced to bear the punishment of it in their own person. So far, indeed, they were obliged to remember, 1. That, according to *the law*, they are debtors. 2. Though, on account of the covenant engagement of the Messiah, they are absolved from the penalty, yet as that engagement was not yet actually fulfilled, so far their guilt was not yet expiated; but that it continues to lie on him, who was still *their Surety*, from whom it will demand sufferings and death; and as they themselves, by the decree of election, are *one mystical body with the Surety*, so far it lies upon them, to give satisfaction, not in their own person, but by the Surety. Just as the catechism speaks: "We are to make payment *by another*." If, as I apprehend, this be what the brethren meant, none will dissent from them. But then their boasting of the extraordinary usefulness of their distinction will appear groundless; since they say nothing, but what all orthodox divines either have said, or would say.

XXXVIII. Moreover, that distinction cannot be proved, from the terms PARESIS and APHESIS. For it is certain, that APHESIS is ascribed to believers before the actual expiation of sin, Lev. v. 10. KAI APHETHESETAU AUTO, *and it shall be forgiven him*, and so in other places. And lest any should cavil, that this is meant of a typical forgiveness (which yet was the symbol of the true, and to which the august term, APHESIS, seems less applicable than to that real forgiveness the ancients enjoyed) I add from Paul. Ixxxv. 2. APHE-

KAS TAS ANOMIAS TO LAO SOU, *Thou hast forgiven the iniquity of thy people.* I deny not, that this psalm was to be sung by the Israelites, when they were to be converted to Christ the Lord ; but I think, it cannot be proved, that it was not sung by believers, when they returned from the Babylonish captivity, with an application to their condition at that time. To omit other considerations, it is beyond all exception, that Christ, before his satisfaction, bestowed his APHESIS, *forgiveness*, on some, Matth. ix. 2. APHEONTAI SOI KAI HAMARTIAI SOU, *Thy sins be forgiven thee.* In like manner, Luke vii. 47.

XXXIX. But we have not yet seen it proved, that PARESIS signifies *passing by, concealing, silence.* Budæus, indeed, in *Comment. ling. Græc.* p. 286. shews, that PARIENAI is sometimes *to pass over* ; but that is in a quite different sense, for he quotes a passage from Xenophon, lib. iv. *Hellen.* EIPON AUTO MEDENA PARIENAI EIS AKROPOLIN, “ commanding him not to pass or send over any into the citadel.” Moreover, he says, that PARIENAI, is to *indulge, to promise, to forgive* : and Hesychius speaks to the same purpose. PARIEMI IS SUNCHORO, *yield*, APHIEMI, *remit* : and he explains PARESIS by APHESIS, *remission*, SUNCHORESIS, *concession, pardon.* So far are these words from being distinguished, that the one may be explained by the other. I am aware, that a certain author says, that “ the authority of Hesychius does not move him, because he had before his eyes this passage of Paul, and explained it from the subject-matter itself, on which Paul is speaking.” *Mor. Nebo.* p. 29. But neither do I imagine, the celebrated person would have us to be moved by his own authority. Hesychius is no contemptible author. Let us hear the judgment of Dan. Heinsius, *Aristarch. Sac.* p. 9. edit. 8vo. “ In

Hesychius is contained not only the learning of all Greece, but also of the east." p. 14. "A grammarian of surprising and profound learning." p. 18. "A grammarian, who is an abyss of the ancient erudition." p. 116. "Hesychius is no mean author, whose glosses are, certainly for the most part, adapted to explain the Greek authors, and especially the Septuagint." And if Hesychius had this passage of Paul before his eyes, and explained it from the subject-matter, and from his acquaintance with a language, which was his mother-tongue, certainly he has not explained it amiss.

XI. The learned author, indeed says, that PARIENAI, answers to HECHÆROSH, *to be silent*; but does not prove it. He quotes Esth. vii. 4. but PARIENAI is not there, in the copies I have. That of Walton and the London in 8vo. an. 1653 have PAREKOUSA. However, that I may not conceal any thing, I have been made to understand, that it is in another copy. But suppose it was in them all, what is it to the purpose? For *I had been silent*, does not there signify, I had passed over that injury unpunished, but I had in silence submitted myself to that indignity, nor troubled the king with any petition of mine. By which our PAREISIS gains nothing. And then also when God, Psal. I. 21. says to the wicked, *These things hast thou done, and I kept silence*, which the Septuagint translate ΤΑΥΤΑ ΕΠΟΙΗΣΑΣ, ΚΑΙ ΕΣΙΓΕΣΑ; there is no such thing intended by that term, like that PAREISIS, *remission*, which Paul describes, and the brethren insist upon. For that is the absolution of believers from the penalty, on account of Christ's suretiship. But this silence is the deferring the punishment of the wicked, in order to compensate its slowness by its severity; things widely different. I cannot conceive, with what judgment the

celebrated author quotes these things here, in which though even the word PAREISIS was to be found, yet certainly not the thing itself, which he would have signified by that term.

XLI. The learned author should have also more fully explained, *in what manner God kept silence* in former times. For *he did not keep silence with respect to sin*, when he demanded the hand-writing of the sinner, and charged him with guilt not yet expiated, which, according to this famous author, was done by the law of Moses ; but, as I think, by the first institution of sacrifices ; and if these were types of Christ's sacrifice, as doubtless they were, they at the same time signified, that the true expiatory sacrifice was not yet offered. *Neither did God keep silence as to pardon*, but proclaimed the testament of grace, whereby he assured believers, that, on account of the Messiah's covenant-engagement, he would never require them to pay a ransom for their own sins. What is then that important silence, on account of which that act of God towards the ancients may be called PAREISIS ?

XLII. We conclude, that the distinction of PAREISIS and APHEISIS, so much commended, is not of that importance, as, on that account, to set on fire the academical chair, the pulpit, and the press now, for so many years past, and the giddy vulgar rent into factions thereby. Since it cannot be denied, that the remission which the fathers enjoyed, may, from the practice of the Greek language, be called, and was actually called by Greek authors APHEISIS : and no passage can be produced, where it is called PAREISIS, in the sense now forced upon us.

XLIII. But the illustration given by the excellent James Altingius, merits our regard ; who, *Heptad. 2. dissert. 2. § 92. seq.* speaks almost to the following pur-



pose : Three things are required to a full and perfect APHEISIS, *forgiveness* ; namely, *the taking away, the transferring, and the expiating of sin.* *The taking away of sin* is that act, whereby the guilt is removed from the offender ; that though he has sinned, yet he is not under the obligation to punishment. This is pointed out by the term NOSE, when it signifies *to remove, and take away*, Exod. xxxiv. 7. Psal. xcix. 8. & xxxii. 5. & lxxxv. 2. & xxv. 18. *The transferring of sin* is that act, whereby the guilt, which is removed from the offender, is transferred to the surety, that he may be obliged to answer for it : as was done in the case of a sacrifice, by the imposition of hands, which then bore and carried the guilt. This, he thinks, was pointed out by the word HÆNGÆBIR, *he caused to pass, he transferred*, 2 Sam. xii. 13. when David said, *I have sinned, or I am guilty, against the Lord* : Nathan answers, *Jehovah also HÆNGÆBIR, hath put away (caused to pass) thy sin, guilt, thou shalt not die.* And the angel, the Lord, Zech. iii. 4. says, *Behold, I have caused thine iniquity to pass from thee.* Which words ascribe this transferring to God, as the *Creditor*, and to Christ, as the *Surety*. But it is also what the *debtor* may claim : whence David prays for it, 2 Sam. xxiv. 10. *And now, I beseech thee, O Lord, take away (cause to pass) the iniquity of thy servant.* And Solomon, Eccl. xi. 10. because we must give an account of all our actions to God at the last judgment, enjoins us to *put away (cause to pass) evil from thy flesh.* Which cannot otherwise be done (as the evil done can on no account be undone) than by transferring or transporting sin. And he imagines, that this transferring is what the apostle calls PAREISIS, *remission.* *The expiation of sin* is that act, by which the guilt, removed from the offender, and transferred to the Surety, is expiated by him who bears

all the punishment, to which the sinner was bound, so that divine justice shall have nothing more to demand, much less to inflict. This is expressed by the word *CAPHAR*, *to expiate, to cover* with the blood of payment, that the writing of sin may be cancelled, and no longer appear. This last act is at length followed by a complete *APHESIS*, *remission*, which absolutely discharges from every demand, either upon the debtor, or the Surety: so that, after this, there is no further any occasion for a sacrifice for sin, Heb. x. 18. all remembrance of it being entirely effaced, ver. 3. compared with ver. 17. Having thus explained these things, the very learned author proceeds as follows: Under the Old Testament, believers were without this last degree of *expiation*, because the time appointed was not yet come, and consequently the *APHESIS*, *forgiveness*, which follows upon it. Their sins were not expiated, and the hand-writing remained in its full force uncanceled, as also the remembrance of transgression was often repeated, &c. All which were at length abolished by the death, cross, and the blood of Christ's cross. But yet these believers were not without the two former degrees, of taking away and transferring; which are elegantly joined together by Job, chap. vii. 20, 21. *I have sinned, what shall I do unto thee, O thou preserver of men? Why hast thou set me as a mark against thee, so that I am a burden to myself? and why dost thou not pardon (take away) my transgression, and take away (cause to pass) mine iniquity? Take away from me the guilt, under the weight of which I shall otherwise faint and sink; and transfer it to another, who is able to bear it; namely, the Surety; seeing by all means satisfaction must be made.* The very learned author prosecutes this subject at further length, which none will repent their having perused. And indeed I always look-

ed upon the subject thus explained to be true and sound doctrine, which I likewise publicly testified. My only scruple was, whether this clear and explicit doctrine relating to the transferring of sin to the score of the Messiah, could agree with the simplicity of the Old Testament, and was generally thus known to the ancient believers; and likewise whether it could be solidly proved by the word HÆNGÆBIR. Should any think me too scrupulous in hesitating about this, I am not now inclined obstinately to contradict him; but have I, on that account, deserved so unkind treatment at the hands of the learned author, as may be seen *Heptad.* 3. dissert. 4. § 27. and *Heptad.* 4. dissert. 3. § 14? I am indeed, sorry, that such resentment dwells in heavenly breasts; however, I think, that I must take care lest either the passions of others, or my own, should at any time cloud my mind in the discernment of truth. Sacred candour! descend, and gently glide into our soul, that, with the greatest cheerfulness, we may receive what is well said, even from those who are displeased with us; and with equal readiness disclaim what we ourselves may have less accurately advanced.

XLIV. *Fifthly*, We dare not deny, that *adoption*, in a certain respect and in some degree of eminence, may be accounted a blessing of the New Testament; so far, namely, as it imports that condition, not whereby believers are distinguished from the children of the devil and of wrath, and constituted heirs of divine grace and glory (which is a dignity common to all believers in all ages) but whereby believers of the New Testament are preferred to children, who differ not much from servants. In which sense the apostle ascribes adoption eminently to the fulness of time, Gal. iv. 4.—7. Where Calvin comments thus on ver. 5. “For even the fathers under the Old Testament were assured of their adop-

tion; but did not then so fully enjoy their privilege. Here therefore adoption is taken, just as redemption, Rom. viii. 23. for possession itself. For as, at the last day, we shall enjoy the fruit of our redemption; so now we enjoy the fruit of adoption, of which the holy fathers, before the coming of Christ, were not partakers." And on ver. 7. "*Wherefore thou art no more a servant, but a son*: that is, in the Christian church there is no longer any state of servitude, but the condition of sons." He again therefore speaks of the difference between the Old and New Testament. "Even the ancients were the sons of God, and heirs through Christ: but we in a quite different manner; because we have Christ present, and therefore enjoy his benefits." Consult what we have more largely explained, book iii. chap. 10. And, if I mistake not, this is the very meaning of the brethren, in commenting on Gal. iv. § 56. "Let it only be observed, that adoption is not said to be so peculiar to the New Testament, as if the Old was entirely destitute of it. For the apostle presupposes, that even those that were in bondage under the elements of the world, were heirs.

XLV. But what is said elsewhere, *de fact.* § 352. is very harsh: "Though the saints under the Old Testament received the sanctifying Spirit, yet he did not work in them that affection, which was either worthy of God, as a Father, or of them, as children; but there was in them a Spirit of bondage to fear. On the contrary, they who are under the New Testament, do, immediately upon believing, receive the promise of the Holy Spirit, Gal. iii. 14. that is, the Spirit of sons, which was promised, and whose it is to cry, *Abba, Father*, Rom. viii. 15."

XLVI. On which I observe, 1. It is supposed without proof, that the Spirit of bondage was peculiar to

the Old Testament. For even under the New, those effects of the Spirit are observable, which are to be referred to fear and to bondage. Even at this day, it engenders terror in the elect, because they look upon themselves to be in very bad condition, while they live in sin, nor can possibly be otherwise, till by a true faith they are reconciled to God, Luke xv. 17. Moreover, by this terror it drives them to lay hold on the fortress of salvation in Christ, 2 Cor. v. 11. By the same terror also it restrains them from sin, and extinguishes the desire of sinning in them. In fine, it very often redoubles this terror, racking their conscience with anguish and pain, and leading them in a way, just by the brink of hell, in which rarely with joy and exultation, generally with a kind of anxiety of a trembling heart, yet in sincerity, they can serve God. Just as at this day those whose office it is familiarly to enquire into their state, find believers very often affected. It cannot be denied, that in all these there is fear; nay, that there is something which proceeds from bondage, and is, in some measure, different from that ingenuous performance of duty, which only arises from the cheerfulness of a heart actuated by love. Why then may not the Spirit who works these things even under the New Testament, be called *the Spirit of bondage to fear*?

XLVII. 2. It is also falsely asserted, that those affections which the Spirit of bondage formerly wrought in the saints, were unworthy of God as a Father, and of the saints as children. For as those affections were holy, and the effects of the sanctifying Spirit, whom God bestows upon none but his own children, nay, as they were most certain signs of their adoption, and of their right to the inheritance, it is to entertain unworthy thoughts of God their Father, and of his children, to account them unworthy of both. True indeed it is,

that, in those affections of the saints, there was a kind of relation, like that of servants to a master ; yet that by no means destroyed, but only in some measure modified, the relation of sons to a Father ; as even at this day God is held forth to us under both these relations.

XLVIII. 3. The sanctifying Spirit, absolutely as sanctifying, which was in the ancient believers, ought to be distinguished from the Spirit of bondage, as it precisely begets fear. Though therefore the affections produced by the Spirit of bondage, as such were inconsistent with the most free condition of sons of God ; yet the effects of the sanctifying Spirit, in all the elect, are a sincere love to God, and obedience arising from that love, with a complacency and delight in his commandments ; now, can there be any reason, why these may not be declared highly worthy of the saints, as sons of God ?

XLIX. 4. It is contrary to all reason to say, that the ancients had not the Spirit of sons, whereby they cried, Abba, Father. For this Spirit is not so contrary to the Spirit of bondage, as if it was not possible for both to reside together. The contrary to which we have proved already, book iii. c. xi. § 9. As this Spirit, therefore, is always operative suitable to its condition ; so it wrought those affections even in the believers of the Old Testament, which were worthy of God, as a Father, and likewise taught them to cry, *My Father*, Job xxxiv. 36. Is. lxiii. 16.

L. *Stathly*, It is not consistent with that divine grace, which was bestowed even on the ancients, to deny, that they had *peace of conscience*. On which head we find written, on Heb. x. § 15. as follows : “ Conscience cannot be easy, before a man is expiated by a sacrifice (with and by which we ought to approach unto God) and knows, that in confidence of that sacrifice he ap-

proaches to God. For it is by this that the conscience is at last calmed and perfected. And till then a man must of necessity have a conscience, both accusing him before God, and separating from all communion with him."

LI. And yet the same person, who speaks thus, openly protests, that he by no means deprives the ancient believers of their assurance of hope, and the joy of a conscience that gloried in God. For he thus speaks elsewhere, on Psal. li. § 15. "This is the wisdom of God, that he suffers not sinful man to perish, and for that purpose, he gives the sinner a testimony of his righteousness, and the assurance of the hope concerning eternal happiness : so as with an uninterrupted joy to bear all crosses and afflictions, and glorify God, and give him thanks, in life and in death.—This wisdom of God, as Nathan had notified to him (David) by the word, so God had sealed it to him in his very inmost soul."

LII. These, indeed, are things very difficult, if at all possible to be reconciled. For where there is a conscience of sin, accusing man before God, and separating from all communion with him, how, in that case, can there be a testimony of righteousness given the sinner by God? Again, where there is the assurance of hope concerning eternal happiness and an uninterrupted joy, what can there be wanting in that case to a calmed and perfected conscience? But let us explain, what we are to determine concerning the former assertion.

LIII. 1. The scripture no where says, that the ancient believers had not peace of conscience; but on the contrary, that, from an assurance of the favor of God towards them, they slept secure, Psal. iii. 5; that, with full assurance of faith, they gloried in their present

grace, Psal. iv. 3. and with the same assurance of hope expected future glory, Ps. xvii. 15. 2. Nor does it any where say, that believers under the Old Testament had the conscience of sin, accusing them before God, and separating from all communion with him ; but, on the contrary, that conscience bore them witness, that sin was forgiven, Psal. xxxii. 5. and Psal. ciii. 3, 10, 12. And how could sin accuse them before God, and separate from his communion, seeing it was charged to the Surety, and was to be exacted of him ? 3. The same scripture testifies, that believers under the Old Testament acted what the redeemed act, and gloried and rejoiced in God : Psal. cxvi. 7, 8. *Return unto thy rest, O my soul, for Jehovah hath dealt bountifully with thee. Thou hast delivered my soul from death, mine eyes from tears, and my feet from falling.*

LIV. Heb. x. 1. is here misapplied : for the apostle does not there deny, that the ancient believers had a conscience perfected ; only denies, that there was perfection from the law, which had but the shadow of good things to come ; denies, that the sacrifices, which were offered year by year continually, could make the comers thereunto perfect, that is, as Pareus says well, “ sanctify and save them.” But what the law could not, the grace of the Surety, of which they were partakers, both could and actually did effect. 5. The conscience of sin, of which ver. 2. is not of sin as accusing before God, and excluding from all communion with him (for the suretiship of Christ apprehended by faith, was a bar to sin’s effecting that) but it is a conscience of sin, as not yet *actually* expiated, and which were not to be expiated by the sacrifices of beasts. These were therefore repeated, that believers might testify, that they only used them as symbols, which God appointed, but did not expect to obtain remission.



but from the suretiship and future sacrifice of the Messiah.

LV. 6. Believers under the Old Testament had not indeed, that calm or peace of conscience, which arises from the ransom being fully paid by the Surety, nor such a discharge as by the resurrection of Christ from the dead. Yet they had in Christ's suretiship-engagement, truly and fully, what was sufficient to calm the conscience; for by that they might be assured, all their sins were blotted out of their account, and laid to the charge of Christ, who had also taken them upon himself, and made himself a debtor to undergo the punishment of them; and indeed, in such a manner, that they should never afterwards be charged to believers, nor God ever "have any will to punish their sins in their own persons," as the learned author speaks, *Sum. Theol.* c. 35. And why were not these things sufficient to produce a like composure of mind, nay, and a tranquillity almost equal to that which arises from the ransom actually paid? For believers are as much exempted from all obligation to personal satisfaction, whether the ransom was to be paid, or was actually paid by the Surety.

LVI. *Seventhly*, It seems likewise to tend to undervalue the Old Testament church, that it is said to have been, in an especial manner, subject to the *dominion of angels*. Concerning this, he says on Heb. ii. § 39. "The former world, that is, the people of the land of Canaan, was subject to angels, being subject to the word spoken by angels, and to the dispositions and appointments of angels, as well the heavenly, as those that sat in Moses's seat, and who, in like manner, are called gods. For the heavenly angels, who assisted at the promulgation of the law, were the avengers or defenders thereof, as they were the guardians of the au-

thority of the elders." Here then they present us with two sorts of angels ; the heavenly, who are spirits ; the earthly, who are men sitting in the seat of Moses. The people of Canaan is said to be subject to both ; to the heavenly, 1. As the law was published by them. 2. As they were constituted the avengers or defenders of the law. 3. As the guardians of the authority of the elders. To the earthly ; as the people was obliged to apply to them, to seek the testimony and the law, and to obey them, just as if God himself in person had published his commands with an audible voice. And on account of this dominion, both the earthly and the heavenly angels were called *gods*.

LVII. I answer, the source of this error is a misinterpretation of what the apostle says, Heb. ii. 5. Where, indeed, it is denied, that this habitable world is put in subjection unto angels ; but this is nowise asserted of the former. And from the denial of the one, the affirmation of the other cannot be concluded. The apostle's whole discourse is with a view, to gain the greatest authority to the doctrine of Christ. For this purpose, he had, in the foregoing chapter, described in magnificent encomiums the excellence of his person : he then established the great pre-eminence of the gospel above the law. And now he urges, that Christ was to be obeyed, because the Father had given him the government of the whole world, which is an honor not at all conferred on angels. He speaks of the world to come, not in contradistinction to the past, as if angels exercised dominion in that, as Christ does in this : but because it is a part of Christ's exaltation, to be appointed Lord of that world by God, a world far more excellent than the past. This then is the apostle's reasoning. We are, with the greatest reverence, to attend to the word of Christ, because he is appointed Lord of

the whole world ; and indeed, especially at that time, wherein the state of all things, and particularly of the church, is the most perfect : but no angel had ever such an honor conferred upon him. How do you torture the word, when you extort the subjection of the ancient church unto angels from this text ?

LVIII. 2. The law published by angels, was the decalogue ; which we are bound to own as the rule of our obedience, equally with the Israelites. Are we, then also on that account subjected to angels ? 3. The part which the angels acted, in promulgating the law, was purely ministerial, and therefore implies no dominion : John was not therefore subject to an angel, because the apocalypse was sent and signified to him by an angel, Rev. i. 1. 4. I cannot see, how it can be proved, that the avenging the law was enjoined upon angels under the Old Testament by any special command, which is revoked under the New. And the brethren themselves will not deny, that the words, Psal. xxxv. 5, 6. belong even to the times of the New Testament, and to the enemies of Christ. The punishment of rebels, the chastisement of the miscarriages of the righteous, the defence of those under unjust oppression, argue indeed the ministry, not the empire of angels. And what peculiar has the Old Testament, in this respect, to which the New cannot shew the like ? For here also the apostle, 1 Cor. xi. 10. 1 Tim. v. 21. urges the observance of decency in the church, because of the presence of the angels. But it is worth while to hear Cocceius himself commenting to this purpose on John i. 52. “ Moreover, that angels were present with the Christian church, appears from the preservation, enlargement, and purging of the Christian church, and from the astonishing protection of those that came out of Babylon.” And a little after : “ As he subjects our

members to our will, and inspires us with a good will ; so he also makes his will known to his angels, and sanctifies their will ; and if there be any thing that regards the good of man, he inclines them to it. Thus, while he reigns in the church, he reigns in the angels ; and the same Spirit is in the angels, which is in the church ; as in the vision of Ezekiel, the same Spirit was in the wheels, which was in the living creatures, Ezek. i. 20." Let us add what he says in *Disput. ad Matth.* xxiv. thes. 38. " The angels assist the preaching of the gospel, no less than they were solicitous, that the law should be observed for the determined time." 5. I know not on what ground it is so confidently asserted, that angels were formerly, in a peculiar manner, guardians of the authority of the elders ; unless perhaps on that general one, that God usually employed them, to keep up the order he had established upon earth ; but they cease not to do this under the New Testament. 6. They are called gods, because of the excellency of their nature and office, and of the image of God in that respect : not because of any empire they had over the people of God, of which they are now deprived : for Paul, in his time, called them *thrones, dominions, principalities, and powers*, Col. i. 16.

LIX. 7. 'Tis scarce needful to mention any thing about men sitting in the seat of Moses, who are called earthly angels. For who will deny, that in the commonwealth of Israel, which was a royal priesthood, God appointed a magistracy, that was both civil and ecclesiastical, with proper authority, in order to see to the due observance of his law ? And I shall easily grant, that this magistracy received authority, to deal somewhat more severely with the church, while she was an infant heir, under tutors and guardians, than can now well suit with an advanced age, and days of greater li-

berly. But I don't see, who can prove, that the apostle, in the quoted passage to the Hebrews, treats of them under the name of angels; especially as in the whole of this discourse he constantly means, by angels, those ministering spirits, whom God commands to be ready to serve his beloved people, Heb. i. 14. And then even the New Testament church hath its angels, of which in the Revelation. Shall we also affirm, that therefore it is subject to angels? 8. and lastly, The name *gods* is common to any civil magistrate, who dispenses justice in God's name, even in pecuniary causes; as appears from Exod. xxi. 6. and xxii. 28. Deut. xix. 7. That notion therefore, about the church of the Old Testament being in a peculiar manner subject to angels, falls to the ground.

LX. *Eighthly*, It also deserves our inquiry, whether we are to reckon the continual *fear* of temporal *death*, to which believers of that time were all their life subject, among the defects of the Old Testament? Concerning this fear the brethren argue to this purpose. They distinguish between a good and an evil fear of death. This last is attended with a horror and hatred of the holiness of God, proceeding from an evil conscience, in every unregenerate sinner, who knows and reflects, that God is judge. The former again is twofold: either common or peculiar in the saints under the Old Testament: common in all those that account this life, and freedom from misery, to be an extraordinary gift of God, and which may be profitable both to themselves and others. This fear is not unbecoming the pious, nor renders them miserable. That which in an especial manner belonged to the Israelites, the inhabitants of the land of Canaan, arose from causes, which were peculiar to them: namely, 1. From an affection for the land of Canaan, which was given them, with a

promise of long life therein, as a pledge of the heavenly inheritance. And therefore it was necessary, that believers should desire to enjoy that pledge. 2. From a desire and hope of seeing, in due time, the Saviour in that land. 3. From the bondage to the elements of the world, to which they were tied down by that law, that if on set purpose they neglected it, they became, as transgressors of the law, obnoxious to temporal and eternal punishments; but if, through infirmity or thoughtlessness, they acted against the ordinances, they had reason to apprehend immediate death to be inflicted upon them by the hand of God: terrible examples of which were sometimes set before their eyes. This fear was good, proceeding from the love of a good conscience and of the grace of God; and made them, with diligence and care, perform the service of the ceremonies: for the godly had this all their life long. But they were delivered from it by the death of Christ. And this Paul is thought to have declared, Heb. ii. 15. This is the sum of what is almost every where repeated, and more summarily explained, *Animadv. ad quest. de V. et N. T. quest. 31.*

LXI. For my own part, I will not disown, that there was something in the rigour of the Mosaic polity, that had a tendency to make them afraid of some dreadful death: Heb. x. 28. *He that despised Moses' law, died without mercy, under two or three witnesses.* God himself commanded, that such as these should be punished with death, Lev. xxiv. 16. Num. xv. 34. and sometimes made examples of those, who had not very carefully observed some circumstantial, by a death altogether extraordinary, Lev. x. 2. 1 Sam. vi. 20. 2 Sam. vi. 7.—9. This, especially if it was just before them, or had lately happened, could not but strike a terror, and excite the righteous to take diligent heed, lest they

should split on that rock. But it is not probable, that they who walked in a good conscience before God, and knew they had to do with a most merciful Father, were tormented, all their life, with the continual dread of death: for examples of such rigour were rare; but instances of paternal indulgence common and conspicuous before their eyes.

LXII. True it is, long life in the land of Canaan was a pledge of eternal life in heaven; and it was necessary to love this pledge, as it pleased God to grant the enjoyment of it. But I cannot conceive, how the taking away of the external and perishing pledge was to be so much dreaded, when they were to obtain an eternal good in its room, of which they had only an earnest in the pledge; since the godly were assured of receiving the heavenly inheritance, immediately upon, and even by death. For the exchange of the typical for the true and heavenly inheritance is not to be dreaded, but rather to be desired and longed for.

LXIII. Pious persons under the Old Testament, who deprecated an untimely death, are not said to have done so from any fond love to the earthly pledge, but from a desire of glorifying God among the living, Psal. vi. 4, 5. Is. xxxviii. 18, 19. This exercise of piety made the psalmist's life agreeable, and truly worthy of the name of life, Psal. xviii. 17. And then they were public persons, who were fond of a longer lease of life, not so much out of a regard to themselves, as to the kingdom and church, whose advantages they watched over. However, it is not to be doubted, but all the saints, whenever they considered themselves separately, and compared the imperfections of this life with the perfections of the future, desired to be dissolved, and be with God in glory. For this was then to them, as it is now to us, far better.

LXIV. The people of Israel, in general, had hopes of seeing Christ in their own land ; but this was not the case of every individual. Nor was it lawful for those who lived in Canaan many ages before the coming of the Messiah, to expect such a long term of life, as to hope to see Christ's day ; nor be struck with horror at the thoughts of a death, that perhaps might cut off all those hopes. Those who were actuated by a higher Spirit, had more exalted apprehensions than the vulgar, longed, indeed, to see those things, which the disciples saw, Matth. xiii. 17. searched diligently what, or what manner of time, the prophetic Spirit, which foretold those things, should happen, 1 Pet. i. 11. But I know not from whence the brethren could have learned, that every one in particular, whom they make subject to the fear of death, or that the generality of believers without distinction, expected perhaps, in their time, the coming of Christ, and hence arose their horror of death. Peter speaks the contrary, ver. 12. *that it was revealed unto them, that not unto themselves, but unto us they did minister those things.* Can the brethren then mention so much as a single instance of any, who, on that account, is said to have been afraid of death ?

LXV. These hypotheses are groundlessly built on the saying of Paul, Heb. ii. 15. where the fruit of Christ's death is said to be *the delivering them, who through fear of death were all their life-time subject to bondage.* For, 1. What reason can persuade, nay admit, that the fruit of that death, for undergoing which it was necessary Christ should become man, should be restrained to the Jews alone, the inhabitants of Canaan ? For the benefit of Christ's death belongs to all the elect from the beginning to the end of the world ; and the apostle is here treating of all those that are



sanctified by Christ, whom Christ calls his brethren, and the children given him by the Father.

LXVI. 2. It is without proof inferred, that those here described are considered as believers already ; since it is more suitable to imagine, that the most miserable state of the elect is here delineated while they were themselves out of Christ. For during all that time they must needs be tormented in a fearful manner with the dread of death, whenever they think of God as a judge : and unless the death of Christ had intervened, that dread would continue upon them all their life long.

LXVII. 3. We are here by bondage under no necessity to understand bondage to the elements of the world ; for as the apostle a little before had said, that the devil is destroyed by the death of Christ, what is more natural than to explain, what he now speaks of bondage, concerning that wretched condition of men, when under the tyranny of the devil ? And surely it is a much greater blessing to be delivered from the bondage of the devil, than from that to the elements of the world ; and as both is a fruit of Christ's death, why shall we restrict the apostle's meaning to the least, and exclude the greatest ? Besides, there is no such difference between the fear of death, and the bondage of the devil, as to make it improbable for them to be joined together in the same discourse ; for the one is cherished by the other : the bondage of the devil begets the fear of death ; and the fear of death, in an unsanctified conscience, heightens the hatred of God, and consequently the bondage of sin and the devil.

LXVIII. 4. The term *death* is most unreasonably restricted to temporal death. The apostle argues in this manner : It was necessary for Christ to become man, because he was to die. He was to die, 1. That,

by his death, he might destroy the devil, who had the power of death. 2. That he might deliver his people from death itself, and from the fear of it. What can be more plain, than that the whole of that death is here meant, over which the devil has power, both temporal and eternal, especially the last? The fear of temporal death, as the brethren describe it, was good and holy in itself, only somewhat troublesome and uneasy: and can it be thought probable, that the apostle, when speaking of the effects of Christ's death, should explain in very magnificent terms the freedom from a thing good and holy in itself, because it produced some uneasiness, and omit the deliverance from that which comprehends all evils and miseries? and yet so form his discourse, as if he seemed to have spoke rather of that which is the greatest, than of that which is the least evil, and what he alone intended?

LXIX. 5. and lastly, I could also wish it was explained, what is that universality of saints, denoted by the term, *οσοι*, which Christ delivered from the fear of losing the pledge by death. Were the saints who died before Christ, of this number? That does not appear; for they are supposed to be troubled by the fear of death all their lifetime. And yet, if I mistake not, they were delivered from this when once they died. What then did the death of Christ profit them in this respect? Are we then to understand those saints who lived at the time of Christ's death? The brethren seem to intend this, when they say, "As many as bore bondage with that disposition, were delivered by Christ when he died," *Ad Heb.* ii. § 89. But who are those? Not believers of the Gentiles, who had no country given them for a pledge. It must then be the Jews. But it could not be all of them. For many of them lived out of the land, in a voluntary exile, without enjoying that

pledge. How greatly then is this fruit of Christ's death limited? Let us suppose, it was they, who, after the death of Christ, received Christ by faith in the land of Canaan, that constituted this universality. But how were these delivered from the fear of losing the pledge? Was it because, after Christ's death, the land ceased to be a pledge, and was shortly to be given up to the Gentiles to a total destruction? Is this the meaning of the brethren? how flat and mean! Well says the celebrated interpreter on Zech. ix. § 23. "They voluntarily renounced the inheritance of the land of Canaan, and exchanged it in order to partake of the heavenly Jerusalem, and the inheritance of the world." But neither will this remove all the difficulty: for Paul speaks of those who *all their lifetime* were subject to the fear of death, which the brethren themselves, at other times, urge; but they whom we suppose to be delivered by Christ cease not to live, when delivered from the fear of death. I beg of these learned persons, again and again to consider, in what intricate perplexity they intangle themselves, while, without any just ground, they quit the trodden and plain road.

LXX. *Ninthly*, It is most of all grievous, and tends to stir up the resentment of the meekest person, that *believers* under the Old Testament are often, and that at great length, said *to have been under wrath and the curse*. And indeed this assertion is shocking to tender ears, and unusual in the reformed churches. The brethren took occasion to speak thus from Gal. iii. 10. *As many as are of the works of the law are under the curse*. Which passage they think is to be explained, as if it was there said, Whoever are subject to the ceremonial law, bear testimony, that the curse is not yet removed by Christ, nor the blessing yet actually obtained. For though they are free from the curse be-

longing to the wicked, and partakers of the blessing of the sons of God, yet, by the use of the ceremonies, they openly avow, that the meritorious cause of the blessing was not yet come. But let us hear their own words; *In comm. ad Gal. iii. § 104.* “The ancient interpreters have here departed a little from the meaning of the apostle, not adverting how believers and the saints of the Old Testament could be said to be under the curse; for they think it necessarily follows, that it is not possible for him who is under the curse, to be saved.—In this they are mistaken. For, according to the apostle, *to be under the curse*, signifies here not to be without the covenant of grace, but to undergo something on account of the curse, which was not yet blotted out by the payment of the price: either for the sake of the hand-writing against themselves on account of sin, and of the curse annexed thereto, and so for the sake of God, who neither did, nor was to punish their sins, as if he was to pardon them; and who had promised life to believers; that he might be sanctified by declaring his righteousness, which he was to manifest in Christ.”

LXXI. But though this explication sufficiently provides for the salvation of the fathers; yet I think it harsh, and very far from *the scope of the apostle*, and *the language of scripture*. *The scope of the apostle* is to refute the opinion of the false apostles, by which they disturbed the quiet of the churches of Galatia, as if faith in Christ alone was not sufficient to justification, but that the Gentiles were bound to observe the Mosaic ceremonies, as a part of that righteousness and holiness commanded by the law. For certainly the Jews were, and still are, at this day, tainted with the heresy, that the ceremonies contribute to justification. The apostle briefly sets the truth in opposition to that false notion, Gal. ii. 16. which he confirms by several argu-

ments. After many others he makes use of this. For as that sanction, by which the curse is threatened against transgressors, is annexed to all God's laws ; and as there is none, who ought not to confess, that they have one time or other transgressed some one law of God ; so far then can any hope for life from any observance of any law, that, on the contrary, *as many as are of the works of the law*, that is, who take part with those, who would be justified by works, *are under the curse*, Gal. iii. 10. This inference is solid and clear, and in Paul's usual manner. See him arguing the same way, Rom. iii. 19, 20.

LXXII. But many things prove, that nothing is meant by the curse, but the curse of the covenant of works, which excludes man from communion with God, and is opposed to the blessing of the covenant of grace. 1. He does not speak of that curse, which hangs over the godly, because and in so far as, by observation of the ceremonial law, they subscribe a handwriting against themselves, but that which hangs over the proud transgressors of the law. For the apostle does not say, that the godly of old confessed, that they were under the curse, because they observed the ceremonial law ; but those who are of works ; justiciary or self-righteous workers, who endeavour to establish their own righteousness ; these are they who are under the curse, because they have not observed the law as prescribed.

LXXIII. 2. Paul means here the same curse that Moses did ; from whom he quotes a passage for establishing his doctrine, Deut. xxvii. 26. But that Mosaic formula, since it undoubtedly contained the sanction of the covenant of works, speaks of that curse, which all sinners naturally are under, because they continue not in all things commanded by the law, and

which is opposed to the favor and saving grace of God. Had the apostle meant another curse, he would have trifled, and not argued; but this is far from his character.

LXXIV. 3. He speaks here of that curse, from which Christ has delivered his people. But he delivered them, not only from the hand-writing, declaring the ransom not yet paid, but from all guilt and condemnation, from all that curse which we deserved on account of sin. 'Tis a bad practice which the celebrated Cocceius every where justly condemns in the Socinians, so to wrest the divine words of scripture, as to put a low and mean sense upon them. And is not this done, when that divine sentence, *Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law*, is brought so low, he freed us from the yoke of the ceremonies? This, certainly, is among the very least of the blessings, which accrue to believers from the redemption of Christ.

LXXV. 4. Moreover, the curse we are delivered from, is of the same kind with that which Christ underwent for us: he therefore underwent it for us, as an expiatory sacrifice in our stead, because it lay upon us on account of sin. But Christ was made a curse for us, not as he observed the ceremonial law, but as he bore the wrath, the fury, the indignation of God against our sins. He complained, that he was forsaken of his Father, grappled hand to hand with dreadful horrors and anguish of soul, and with the infernal powers themselves. In a word, he endured all the curse, that the law threatened against sinners; he was not only accursed, but even a curse; which was shewn by crucifixion, as the symbol.

LXXVI. In the last place, I do not imagine, that either of these can be proved from any passage of scripture: *either* that those can be called the true and spi-

ritual sons of *Abraham, who are of the works of the law*; or that those who, in faith and a good conscience, observe the precepts of the ceremonial law, can on that very account be said to be *under the curse*. I find Rom. iv. 16. is quoted as a proof of the former: *To the end the promise might be sure to all the seed, not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham, who is the father of us all.* - But the case is very different: for, 1. That expression, *to be of the law*, and that, *to be of the works of the law*, are not in all respects the same; for those may simply be said *to be of the law, to whom pertained the giving of the law*, Rom. ix. 4. that is, the Jewish nation, to whom the law of God was delivered, and who, in consequence of that giving of the law, and of the covenant founded thereon, became what they are, a people peculiar to God. But seeing works, in the business of justification, which was the dispute among the Galatians, are always set in direct opposition to faith, those who are of the works of the law, cannot be of justifying faith. If you object, that the law is in like manner opposed to faith; I answer, the law has a twofold *relation*: a *legal*, strictly so called, as it contains the condition of justification, by a personal and proper obedience; and an *evangelical*, as, by its types and shadows, it leads to Christ. Whoever, according to the former relation, are of the law, are not heirs, Rom. iv. 14. but whoever were of the law, so as to discover in it the gracious promises of the gospel, belonged to that seed of Abraham to which the promise was declared. And, according to this different relation of the law, the apostle in a different sense says, that some are of the law; some who, because they want to be of the law, are not heirs; namely, those who reckon their works as a con-

dition of righteousness with God, either for purification or satisfaction : and some again who are of the law, and yet are heirs ; namely, those who suffer themselves to be led by the law, as a schoolmaster, to Christ. But works contradistinguished from faith, can have no other than an opposite relation in justification.

LXXVII. To this purpose I formerly wrote with the generality of interpreters, and even Cocceius himself ; who so explains the words of Paul, that he divides into two classes all that seed, to which he maintains the promise was made sure ; one of which classes is said to be *of the law* ; the other, *of the faith of Abraham* : the one, *of the Israelites*, to whom pertained *the giving of the law* ; the other, of the Gentile believers, who, without circumcision, but only in imitation of his faith, become the seed of Abraham. But I afterwards met with the discourses of James Altingius, who observes, that the Greek of Paul, ΠΑΝΤΙ ΤΟ ΣΠΕΡΜΑΤΙ, ΟΥ ΤΟ ΕΚ ΤΟΥ ΝΟΜΟΥ ΜΟΝΟΝ, ΑΛΛΑ ΚΑΙ ΤΟ ΕΚ ΠΙΣΤΕΟΣ ΑΒΡΑΑΜ, is not necessarily to be translated, *to all the seed, not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham* ; so as to apply the restrictive particle *only*, to the seed ; but is more properly translated *to all the seed, not to that which is of the law only, &c.* So that the restrictive particle should be joined to the law, not to the seed. And he thinks this verse is to be compared with ver. 12. *the father of circumcision to them, who are not of the circumcision only, but also walk in the steps, &c.* That the meaning is, that those are the seed of Abraham, to whom the promise can belong, not who, by circumcision only, or any other carnal precept, in which they vainly glory, may in some measure resemble Abraham ; but who resemble him in faith. Thus both members belong to the Jews, and those are excluded from partaking in the



blessing, who are only of the law, ver. 14. those only being admitted who are of the faith of Abraham. But those descendents of Abraham, who received the covenant proposed to them by God, as a covenant of works, and circumcision as the sacrament of such a covenant, are of the law, and indeed only of the law. These things are at large and with accuracy deduced by the very learned author. But if this interpretation holds, the brethren are so far from finding any support in this passage, that rather every thing is against them.

LXXVIII. For the proof of the latter, it is alledged, that the time of the Old Testament is called the time of *SANGAM*, *wrath* and *severity*, Is. x. 25. Dan. viii. 19. and that Moses, the minister who gave the law, is called *the minister of death and condemnation*, 2 Cor. iii. 7, 9. and that *the law worketh wrath*, Rom. iv. 15. that is, imposeth something, which proceeded from sin and guilt, and so from wrath. But these things are not to the purpose. For, 1. There is nothing there concerning a curse or execration, which constantly in scripture denotes the deplorable condition of the wicked, especially if any one is said to be under it. 2. Isaiah and Daniel speak not of the time of the Old Testament in opposition to that of the New; but represent that period of time, in which God more severely punished the sins of his people; which he likewise does sometimes under the New. 3. Moses is called *the minister of death and condemnation*, because his ministry, for the most part, tended to terrify the sinner, and convince him of his sin and curse. 4. In the same sense *the law* is said to *work wrath*; which is not to be understood of the ceremonial law alone, but also, and indeed, chiefly of the moral law, which, by its most accurate precepts, discovers sin, and, by the dreadful comminations of divine wrath against sinner, raises in

the soul a sense of wrath. But these things are no proof that believers of the Old Testament were under the curse.

---

### C H A P. XIII.

*Of the real Defects of the Old Testament.*

**H**OWEVER the Old Testament had really some peculiar defects, on account of which *it is found fault with*, Heb. viii. 7, 8. and, because of these, it was to make room for the New. When we say this, we do no injury to the divine wisdom, as if it was inconsistent with that, to make the first covenant with his people, such as would afterwards want correction. For as God, in the first creation of the world, began with things that were more rude, and by degrees, as it were, first rough-hewed them, then polished and exactly squared them, till they attained to that beauty, in which he acquiesced: so in like manner, in the formation of his church, he would have the beginnings to be more unpolished, which, in the regular course of things, were to arise, in process of time, to a more beautiful symmetry and proportion, till he should put the last hand to them, at the consummation of the world. And if it was not unworthy of God, to have made something imperfect in the kingdom of grace, which shall be brought to absolute perfection in the kingdom of glory; neither is it unworthy of him, to have granted something more sparingly under the Old Testament, which he most liberally vouchsafed under the New. Nay, by this very thing he displayed his manifold wisdom, in that he distinguished the diversity of times by proper and suitable

marks or signs. Paul represented the Jews, as resembling children ; Christians, grown men. What irregularity is there in God's thus ordering matters, that he should confine the former to the rudiments, as being more suitable to their measure of age, and train up the latter in a more hardy, and as it were manly discipline ?

II. But let us particularly rehearse in order the things, in which the Old Testament was defective. The *first* is, that the fathers under the Old Testament had not the *cause of salvation present*, much less *completed*. They had the figure of Christ in various appearances, as precludes of his future incarnation, in the pillar of cloud and fire, in the tabernacle, the temple, in the pictures of the ceremonies, the riddles of the prophecies : but they had not the privilege of beholding him present among them. The prophets of those times *prophesied of the grace that should come unto us*. And *unto them was revealed, that not unto themselves, but unto us they did minister the things which are now reported unto us concerning the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow*, 1 Pet. i. 10, 11, 12.

III. And as the cause of salvation did not then appear, namely, God manifested in the flesh, neither did *righteousness*, or that on account of which we are justified. Because *the Captain of their salvation* was not yet made *perfect thro' sufferings*, Heb. ii. 10 ; that in which the expiation of our sins consists, did not then exist, and consequently, *everlasting righteousness was not yet brought in*, Dan. ix. 24. For as the ransom was not yet paid, the debts were not actually cancelled ; *that day* had not yet shined, on which God *removed the iniquity of the earth*, Zech. iii. 9. The fathers, indeed, had a true and sufficient remission of sins, yet had not that, for which sins are justly, and in a manner worthy of God, remitted ; namely, the satis-

faction and expiation of Christ. Pareus says well, *ad Heb.* viii. 18. "The expiatory offering was not yet made, in which the remission of sins, wherewith they were favored, was founded."

IV. In this respect it is no absurdity to say, that the sins of believers *remained*, and still *existed*, till they were cancelled by Christ's satisfaction. For they existed in the accounts of the Surety, who was to answer for them; nor were they blotted out, till after the payment was made. We are not to think, they so lay upon believers, as that they went to heaven loaded with the guilt of them; than which nothing can be more absurd; nor are we to maintain, that they were entirely cancelled out of the book of God's accounts: for, in that case, Christ's satisfying for them had been superfluous. But they remained as debts upon the Surety, which he was to pay. And therefore God, who had already beforehand remitted very many sins, exacted them of Christ at the time appointed, *Is.* liii. 7. *to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past*, *Rom.* iii. 25. Pareus again, l. c. "In the mean time therefore, sins, even remitted without true expiation, remained, till they were at length expiated by the death of the Mediator; which expiation being made, both their sins and ours were at last *truly abolished* in the judgment of God." Calvin uses the same way of speaking, *Instit.* lib. ii. c. 7. § 17. "For which reason the apostle writes, that the remission of the sins, which *remained* under the Old Testament, was at length accomplished by the intervention of Christ's death." This then was the first defect of the Old Testament, that it had not the cause of salvation completed, and consequently not a true expiation of sins.

V. The *second* defect was the *obscurity* of the old œconomy. This follows from the preceding. What

can there be at most but twilight before the rising of the sun? The Lord therefore dispensed the light of his word to them, in such a manner, that they could only view it still at a distance and obscurely. Peter has elegantly represented this, by comparing the prophetic language *unto a lamp that shineth in a dark place*, 2 Pet. i. 19. When he calls it a lamp, he intimates the absence of the sun; and when he speaks of a dark place, he represents the condition of the ancients, which, amidst the darkness, had the glimmering small light of a burning taper, and no more than a taper, which is used only in the night-time, not in the full day. To this purpose also is the saying of Christ, Matth. xi. 13. that *the law and the prophets were until John. From that time the kingdom of God was preached.* What did the law and the prophets discover to those who lived in their days? Certainly nothing but a taste of that wisdom, which was afterwards to be clearly displayed, by foretelling it as shining at a distance. Whenever Christ can be pointed out with a finger, the kingdom of God is disclosed.

VI. There was certainly in the ceremonies, an institution concerning Christ's person, offices, and benefits. And therefore it was a distinguishing favor, that God should honor Israel alone, above all other people, with that kind of instruction, as we have formerly intimated. But, as the ceremonial rites were vastly increased, and the repetition of the promises of grace was in the mean time more sparing and uncommon; the very great number of rites was like a veil, by which the naked simplicity of the ancient promise was very much clouded. And the event shewed, that the greatest part of the Israelites cleaved to the ceremonies themselves, sought for justification and expiation of sin in them, and did not penetrate into the spiritual mysteries, which

were hid under the vail, with the eyes of the understanding and of faith. This, indeed, was their own fault; but that method of teaching was not so well adapted and effectual for the correcting of it. This is also represented by the type of Moses, who *put a vail over his face, that the children of Israel could not steadfastly look to the end of that which is now abolished, as useless, 2 Cor. iii. 18.* There the apostle by way of allegory proposes the person of Moses, to represent the œconomy of the Old Testament. It had, indeed, the light of the promises of grace, as the face of Moses had an extraordinary glory, ver. 7. But while Moses spoke with the Israelites, he covered this glory with the vail of the ceremonies, which he had introduced; the end of which, indeed, was Christ and his grace; but Israel, being intent on the contemplation of these, satisfied themselves in them, and forgot to look to that, to which had they turned their mind, as became them, they would have been led by the ceremonies themselves, *And this is that vail, which, in the reading of the Old Testament, not being taken away, still remaineth on Israel, ver. 14.*

VII. To the same purpose, was the vail of the tabernacle and temple, which kept the Israelites from entering and beholding the sacred things. These two vails may be thus compared together. By the vail of the temple they were reminded of something, which they were not yet suffered to behold, because something stood in the way; namely, guilt, which was removed in the flesh of Christ, Heb. x. 19. and that the way to the heavenly sanctuary was not yet set open to them, Heb. ix. 8. By the vail over the face of Moses, they were put in mind, that the eyes of their understanding were weaker, than that they could bear the naked declaration of the truth. For if it was thus at that time

with Christ's apostles, John xvi. 12. how much more with ancient Israel ?

VIII. It is remarkable, that the Lord Jesus himself, in the days of his flesh, suited his doctrine to that more obscure dispensation ; and laid before the promiscuous multitude, the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, scarce in any other manner than under the veil of parables, the meaning of which was to be rather guessed at, than thoroughly understood. And himself gives this reason for it, Matth. xiii. 10, 11. When his disciples asked him, *Why speakest thou unto them in parables ?* he answered, *Because it is given unto you to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it is not given.* And ver. 13. *Therefore speak I to them in parables, because they seeing, see not ; and hearing, they hear not, neither do they understand.* But as the time of his consummation was drawing nearer, he more clearly, and without further circumlocution, proposed the truths of salvation, John xvi. 25. which the disciples themselves observed, ver. 29.

IX. The *third* defect was the great *rigour* and unrelenting severity of that œconomy, on account of the threatenings of the law, which so often occur, and of the promises of grace, which are more seldom and more obscurely repeated. To this purpose is what we have, Heb. xii. 18. that believers are not now come to the mount that might be touched, and that burned with fire, unto blackness, and darkness, and tempest, where nothing was to be heard or seen, but what was apt to strike the mind with dread and terror, so that Moses himself quaked and feared ; where the terrible voice sounded in their ears, which all of them entreated, they might not hear any more : to all which he opposes the mild sweetness of mount Zion, and of the heavenly Je-

rusalem. Neither was that rigour and terror without reason ; for it was scarce possible, by any other means, to conquer the frowardness of the Israelites, whom Moses and the prophets so often reproached as a stiff-necked generation, and a people whose heart was like an adamant.

X. The *fourth* defect of the Old Testament was the *bondage vnder the elements of the world*, of which Paul speaks, Gal. iv. 3, 9. By the *elements of the world*, he understands the ceremonies of the old œconomy ; which he calls *στοιχεῖα*, *elements*, because of their rudeness and imperfection ; by a twofold metaphor ; the one borrowed from nature, the other from art. Nature hath her elements, that is, bodies more simple and rude, from whose various combination and mixture others more perfect are generated. And the rudiments of art, or the first more easy precepts, suited to the capacities of children, are usually called *elements* ; Paul himself using this term in that sense, Heb. v. 12. *the first principles (elements) of the oracles of God*. He adds, the *elements of the world*, either because they were earthly, borrowed from the world, and from those things, which even worldly men have in common with the pious, and which contain not in themselves the blessings and privileges of the inheritance ; or because God being willing to instruct the world, that is, the inhabitants of the world, began, from these slender principles, having first set up a lower form or school, as it were in one corner of the world only. The *Israelites were in bondage* to these elements. For God had also given these elements with a severe commination, lest they should be either neglected, or used any other way, than he had prescribed : and they had princes and elders, with sufficient authority, and sitting in Moses's seat, to keep and constrain them to the observance of the rites.



In fine, the observance itself had an air of servility in consistent with the full liberty of sons.

XI. But let us take a more particular view of what was hard and unpleasant in this bondage. 1. There was, in that vast multitude of rites, which were enjoined upon Israel under such a severe threatening, a grievous *burden*, and a *yoke* hard to be borne, Acts xv. 10. which the apostle calls the *yoke of bondage*, Gal. v. 1. Circumcision, which was, as it were, the first undertaking of the yoke, caused such pain, that even adults were heavily afflicted with it, Gen. xxxiv. 25. The number of the other ceremonies exceedingly fatigued the people, and involved them in difficulties. They were not allowed to light a fire on the Sabbath, nor to sow on the seventh year. All their males were obliged thrice a year to go up to Jerusalem. The paying the first fruits and tithes was to be scrupulously observed. They were put to great expence in all kinds of sacrifices. Moreover, there were many washings, distinctions of meats, legal pollutions from the touch of a dead body, and of any unclean thing whatever, and pollution in sleep. And all these things wherewith they were harassed, were but *weak and beggarly elements*, Gal. iv. 9. which could not *make the comers thereinto perfect*, Heb. x. 1. and, in the observation of which, of themselves, there was no holiness, nor the image of God, nor *a reasonable service*, Rom. xii. 1. However, their mystical signification, and the relation they bore to the Messiah and his grace, made believers cheerfully undertake, and joyfully bear that yoke, grievous in itself, and beggarly and useless separately from Christ.

XII. 2. There was also, in that bondage, *the reproach of childhood*; for it was wholly pedagogical, or adapted to children, Gal. iv. 2. which consisted of little, minute precepts and ordinances, such as are pre-

scribed to young children, *Touch not, taste not, handle not*, Col. ii. 21. On which place Theophylact says elegantly, "See also how he tacitly upbraids them, saying, *Ye are subject to ordinances*, ver. 20. You sit as children," says he, "as just beginning their elements, who require what they ought to do to be said before and prescribed to them."

XIII. 3. There was also *the middle wall of partition*, not only separating them from all other nations, and depriving them of the joy, which, in other respects, would result from the Gentiles being taken into communion with God, but also, in some measure, secluding themselves from familiar access to God, Eph. ii. 14, 15. The apostle seems to allude to the double wall, or inclosure of the temple. The Jews, who were clean, met for worship, within the outermost of these, which had a fence or breast-work, on which small pillars were ranged at equal distances, inscribed with Greek and Latin characters, to signify, that no stranger was allowed, under pain of death, to pass over that breast-work, and break into the inner inclosure. In like manner, there was, in the inner inclosure, another breast-work like the former, whereby the people were excluded from entering into the temple, and the porch of the priests, who were there employed in sacred services; which Lud. Capellus has observed on this passage from Josephus. See what Const. l'Empereur has *ad titul. Middoth, c. 2. § 3.* and Selden *de jure natur. lib. 3. c. 6.* With both those walls or breast-works the apostle ingeniously compares the ceremonies, which separated the Gentiles from the Jews (on which account they resembled the breast-work of the first inclosure) and the Jews themselves, in some measure, from God, and familiar access to him. For they themselves were commanded to stand at a distance while God kept himself,

as it were, concealed in the inner sanctuary, and to treat with him, about the expiation of sins, only by the intervention of a priest. And in this respect the ceremonies are compared with the latter inclosure.

XIV. 4. Besides this, the apostle calls the law of commandments, contained in ordinances, *enmity*, because, in a certain respect, they were a symbol of the enmity both between God and man, and between Israel and the Gentiles. For the ceremonies, in their *legal consideration*, were signs of that hatred, wherewith God, from the righteousness of his nature, pursues sinful man: because our guilt was typified by these, and man behoved to be expiated and purged by those rites, before he could be allowed, with hope of pardon, to have access to God. They also begat a mutual hatred and contempt between Jews and Gentiles. The Jews being proud of the ceremonies of God's institution, despised the Gentiles, who were enslaved to human, or even diabolical superstitions. The Heathen, on the other hand, looked upon many of the Jewish ceremonies, as is plain from Tacitus and others, as hateful, ridiculous, and absurd. And hence arose a mutual and national hatred and enmity; by no means commanded, far be it, but yet, as it were, rivetted by that law of discriminating rites. And this alienation of minds was at such a height, that the godly themselves judged it a crime in a Jew to come near, or approach to a stranger, Acts x. 28.

XV. 5. and lastly, There was a *hand-writing* in the religion of ceremonies *HUPENANTION*, *contrary (in part) to those who loved and observed them*, Col. ii. 14. On which Calvin particularly has learnedly discoursed; as well in other places, as in his *Institutions*, lib. 3. c. 7. § 17. In his commentary on Col. ii. 14. he declares, that no one had given him any satisfaction in explaining

this matter. "But I trust," says he, "I have reached the genuine meaning, if it be only granted me as a truth, what Augustine has somewhere very truly written, nay which he deduced from the plain words of the apostle, that, in the Jewish ceremonies, there was rather a confession, than an expiation of sins; for what else did they by their sacrifices, than confess their being conscious to themselves, that they were worthy of death, who in their own stead substituted despicable animals? what by their purifications, but to testify their uncleanness? So, upon this, they renewed the hand-writing of their guilt and impurity. Yet in that declaration there was no manner of payment. Justly therefore does the apostle call them hand-writings, contrary to those who loved and observed them; since by them they openly declared their own condemnation and uncleanness."

XVI. But this on no account is to be so understood, as if believers were bound, by the exacting of this hand-writing, to satisfy divine justice in their own person; for that would be contrary to the promise of grace, which was founded on the irrevocable suretyship of Christ, and accepted by the Father, whose inseparable fruit is the discharge of the principal debtor. But by this hand-writing they acknowledged two things. 1. That they were unclean, and deserved utter destruction, if considered in themselves, and could not escape destruction, unless satisfaction was made to divine justice. 2. That this satisfaction was not yet accomplished; nor the true expiation, in virtue of which they were to be justified, yet performed: thus far that hand-writing was *contrary* to them. But because, as I have often observed, the ceremonies had, besides a legal, also an evangelical consideration, believers were, at the same time, confirmed, by the use of them, in the faith of the Messiah, who was to come and satisfy for them. And

thus the hand-writing was only *in part contrary* to them, HYPENANTION. For though it shewed, that satisfaction was not yet made, a circumstance which was against them, yet it assured them, that satisfaction was never to be demanded of them, but was certainly to be performed by the Surety; which certainly was very much for them.

XVII. The *fifth* thing, in which the Old Testament was inferior to the New, was a spirit suited to that servile œconomy; which Paul, in his epistle to the Romans, chap. viii. 15. calls the *spirit of bondage*: *For ye have not received the Spirit of bondage again to fear.* Where the particle, *again*, denotes a distinction, by which the present condition of the Christian church is contradistinguished from the preceding condition of the church of Israel, as interpreters generally observe. But they do not by this explain the full force of that particle. I take it in this light. The Romans, having now become believers, were united into one body with believing Israel, Eph. iii. 6. For in Christ there is a gathering together of all in one, Eph. i. 10. *He made both one*, Eph. ii. 14. and would have believers both of the Jews and of the Gentiles *be accounted one seed*, Gal. iii. 16. And therefore what was formerly granted to Israel, was accounted to have been also granted to them. And if the Gentiles, after the liberty of a more joyful testament was proclaimed, should put on the ancient fetters of the Israelites, they were said to return to bondage; *How turn ye (back) again to the weak and beggarly elements, wherunto ye desire*, PALIN ANOTHERN, *returning back to the former, to be in bondage?* as Paul chides the Galatians, chap. iv. 9. In this sense therefore it might also be said to the Romans, *You, who are now believers, living under the New Testament, have not received again the Spirit of bon-*

dage, or the Spirit of bondage *again to fear* ; such as believers of the Old Testament had, with whom you have been incorporated, and such consequently as you had in and with them.

XVIII. Moreover, that Spirit of bondage, as we now consider it, is the good Spirit of God, working in those that belonged to the Old Testament, in a manner suitable to that servile œconomy. It is plain, that, under the Old Testament, the things which regarded the law, and its terrors, were very often and clearly inculcated upon them, and confirmed by extraordinary prodigies, and by fearful judgments, striking the eyes of all ; but the other things, which belong to the gospel, and were adapted to beget filial boldness and alacrity, were proposed more sparingly, and indeed in a riddle. The Spirit therefore, whose province it is to apply to the mind the words of God externally proposed, and to render them internally effectual, suited himself to that dispensation, and *commonly* rather wrought terror by the law, which daily sounded in their ears, than cheerfulness by the doctrine of grace, which was more sparingly and more obscurely preached unto them.

XIX. Besides, as it is a great degree of bondage, to fatigue one's self in carefully keeping the law of a carnal commandment ; the Spirit, who made them undergo with complacency and in faith this bondage, deserves in a peculiar manner to be called the Spirit of bondage. But its operations in believers were these following. 1. He taught them, that it was just in itself, good for them, and glorious to God, suitable to the œconomy of his covenant, willingly to submit to the bondage of the elements of the world, which God commanded them. 2. He stirred them up to dive into the mystery of that bondage, and not to cleave to the outside of the ceremonies. 3. He inclined the wills of

believers, to be thus willingly and faithfully in bondage, and, in the mean time, to long for the liberty of a happier period.

XX. This Spirit, which wrought these things in them, was, indeed, an eminent gift of God, suitable to that age ; yet a much inferior gift, than is the Spirit of pure grace and liberty, which declares, that the yoke is broken, the hand-writing torn ; and excites to a reasonable service, which alone it enjoins to perform with joy and cheerfulness.

XXI. We would again have it remembered, that we speak not these things, as if we thought, that the Spirit of God was only a Spirit of bondage in the believers under the Old Testament, or as if he wrought nothing that may be called servile in its measure, in believers of the New Testament, against which we argued with care in the last chapter. Neither do we imagine, that all the operations of the Spirit of bondage are to be confined to those we just recited ; because these alone made for our present purpose. What we mean, is, that the operations of the Spirit of God, under the Old Testament, compared with the operations of the same Spirit under the New, savoured *commonly* somewhat more of bondage than what can be suitable to the full liberty of the sons of God ; in a word, were accommodated to that condition, in which the infant heir differed not much from a servant. We willingly conclude this point in Calvin's words ; to which we heartily subscribe, *Instit. lib. ii. c. 11. § 9.* " But the whole comes to this, that the Old Testament struck horror and dread into the consciences of men ; but, by the benefit of the New, these are set at liberty, and made to rejoice. That the former bound the consciences to the yoke of bondage ; which, by the bounty of

the latter, were set at liberty. But, if the case of the holy fathers of the people of Israel be objected, who were evidently partakers of the same Spirit of faith with us; it follows, they were partakers of the same liberty and joy: we answer, that neither was from the law. And then, we deny, they were so endowed with the Spirit of liberty and security, as not to experience, in some measure, both a dread and a bondage from the law." See what follows.

XXII. *Sixthly*, There was also, under the Old Testament, *a more scanty measure* of the gifts of *grace*; both with respect to \* *extent* and *degree*. That the extent of these was very much confined, appears from these. 1. Because God communicated himself to the nation of Israel alone, who yielded themselves to him, as *his portion, and the lot of his inheritance*, Deut. xxxii. 9. and in the mean time *suffered* other nations, as if they had no concern or intercourse with him, *to walk in their own ways*, Acts xiv. 16. so that, as they were *aliens from the commonwealth of Israel*, they were also *strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope and without God in the world*, Eph. ii. 12. *Darkness covered the earth, and gross darkness the people*; while Jehovah did arise, and shine upon Israel alone, Is. lx. 2. 2. In that one nation of Israel, very few were partakers of saving grace, 1 Cor. x. 5. *With many of them God was not well pleased*: and therefore Moses said to the whole people, with a reference to the generality of them, Deut. xxix. 4. *Jehovah hath not given you a heart to perceive, and eyes to see, and ears to hear*: for they who were favored with that grace, compared with the rest, were inconsiderable.

\* \* The author's words are, *tam quoad extensionem, tam quoad intensiorem*. Literally, both as to *extension* and *intention*.



XXIII. If we consider the *degree*, the measure of the grace was *commonly* small. 1. With respect to the knowledge of spiritual mysteries. For it was proper, since the Sun of righteousness was not yet risen, that there should be neither that clearness of revelation, nor that quickness of understanding. And therefore Paul expresses this slenderness of conception by the term *childhood*. Instances of gross stupidity are all along obvious in the very disciples of our Lord, Is. xlii. 19. *Who is blind, but my servant? or deaf, as my messenger that I sent? who is blind as he that is perfect, and blind as Jehovah's servant?* 2. With respect to the abundance of spiritual consolations. This is a necessary consequence from that we have said before, concerning the condition and manner of that *æconomy*, and the operations of the Spirit, who suited himself to that dispensation. 3. With respect to holiness: And this also depends on the preceding two. For where there is a smaller degree of spiritual light, a less abundance of the love of God shed abroad in the heart, a less measure of familiarity and friendship with God, it is reasonable to believe, that there was also a smaller degree of holiness.

XXIV. However, we by no means speak thus, as if we would represent the ordinary believers of the New Testament, either as preferable to, or even as on a level with, those ancient heroes. For how few in the Christian church are found comparable to Abraham in excellence of faith? in light of knowledge to the prophets, who, even at this day, enlighten the whole universe? in abundance of consolations, and eminence of holiness, to David, who was both a man according to God's own heart, and so often chanted forth those most delightful odes, with a soul exulting in God? For the question here is not, What measure of grace the Lord

bestowed on a few? but, What ordinary dispensation he observed towards the whole body of the people? It is proper to compare church to church, prophets to apostles, ancient heroes to martyrs of the New Testament, and ordinary believers to their like.

XXV. It will not be from the purpose, to explain, on this occasion, that saying of our Lord, Matth. xi. 11. *Verily I say unto you, Among them that are born of women, there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist: notwithstanding he that is least in the kingdom of heaven, is greater than he.* Little regard is to be had to those, who, with some of the ancients, understand, by the kingdom of heaven, the state of the church triumphant; and tell us, that this is the meaning of Christ's words: The least of the blessed in heaven is greater, that is, more happy, perfect, excellent, and glorious, than John, who was still in a state of mortality, and a traveller. For who can be ignorant, that the state of the heavenly country is far more excellent than that of travellers on the earth? This being so evident in itself, there was no occasion for our Lord to speak it with such solemnity, as if he asserted something extraordinary.

XXVI. They come nearer to our Lord's meaning, who, by the least in the kingdom of heaven, think is intended the least minister in the Christian church, who is intrusted to preach the gospel in its perfect state. He is compared to John, not in respect of knowledge, holiness, and gifts of the like nature; but in respect of his ministry, as John himself was compared to his predecessors the prophets. For John was greater than all of them, because he was the immediate harbinger and brideman of the Messiah; and pointed him out with the finger, as present. or come. Again, any preacher of the gospel is greater than John, in that respect, who

declares, Christ not only born, but also dead and risen, and ascended to heaven, and as sitting at the right hand of God, and as having happily erected the kingdom of liberty. The comparison therefore is not so much of persons in their absolute qualities, as of their ministry. The ministry of Moses, and the other prophets, may not improperly be compared to the night, distinguished by many prophecies concerning Christ, as to many interluculent constellations. The ministry of John to the dawn; when, the sun not being yet risen, yet drawing towards the horizon, the heavens brighten with some light: but the gospel to the day, when the sun, being risen, fills all things with the brightest and purest light.

XXVII. It may, however, seem strange, that the Lord Jesus, who, in the whole of his discourse, speaks so many excellent things concerning John, should presently, when one could have least expected it, represent him as less than the least of his disciples. And therefore some of the ancients think, there is a comparison rather made between John and Christ, who calls himself the least in the kingdom of heaven; either because he was really so, in the opinion of men; or rather, because he was younger than he, and posterior to him in the ministry. In which sense, James, the son of Alpheus, was called *the Less*, Mark xv. 40. that is, the younger, in respect of James, the son of Zebedee, who is called the Elder. What Christ then intended was, that, though John was truly far greater than all the other prophets, yet he was not that great prophet; not the Messiah, which some, but falsely, imagined, Luke iii. 15; but that himself, though inferior to John in age, and posterior to him in preaching the kingdom of heaven, yet very far excelled him in dignity. And thus this saying of Christ would very well agree with the testimony of John concerning himself and Christ,

John i. 15. *He that cometh after me, is preferred before me; for he was before me.* To this same purpose, almost, Epiphanius *adversus Gnosticos*, Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euthymius, Clarius, Zegerus, Salmero, Jansenius, and others, from whose opinion, I own, I am not\* averse.

XXVIII. *Seventhly*, All these things, joined together, excited an ardent desire in the ancient church, and a kind of hunger and thirst after a better condition, which God had promised with the coming of the Messiah. For as most of all the things hitherto bestowed upon them were evidences of their imperfection, and, in the mean time, better things were pointed out to them at a distance, they could not, without throwing contempt on the grace of God, but desire these things. Whatever the mercy of God had thus far bestowed on them, especially when more precious promises were added, tended rather to raise than quench their thirst. Even Abraham, to whom God so familiarly revealed himself, *rejoiced to see Christ's day*, John viii. 56. The whole church cried out, *Oh that thou wouldst rent the heavens, that thou wouldst come down!* Is. lxiv. 1. *O that thou wert as my brother that sucked the breasts of my mother!* Cant. viii. 1. that is, O that thou wast made partaker of flesh and blood, that thou wouldst shew thyself familiarly in the midst of our congregation, in the communion of the same worship! We cannot have a better interpreter of this their desire than our Lord himself, Matth. xiii. 17. *Verily I say unto you, Many prophets and righteous men have desired to see those things which ye see, and have not seen them; and to hear those things which ye hear, and have not heard them.* The ancient fathers certainly enjoyed the grace

\* The generality of our English commentators incline to the sense given in the last section.

of God, with a quiet and joyful heart, knowing, that it was sufficient for their salvation ; they glorified God, and gave him thanks on that account : yet, as a better condition was made known as at a distance, they reached out also in desire after it. *These all died in faith, and therefore calmly and happily ; yet not having received the promises, but seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them,* Heb. xi. 13.

XXIX. I dare not, for this purpose, wrest Deut. xxix. 19. *to add the drunken, or the watered, to the thirsty* : as if a twofold state of the church was intimated here ; that of *thirst*, under the Old ; and of *watering*, under the New Testament : and *to add the watered to the thirsty*, was to reduce the church, when satisfied with the exhibition of the promise, to the order or rank of the thirsting church ; to load the believers of the New Testament with the ancient ceremonies : and, from another signification of the word *SEPHOTH*, *to destroy the satiated with the thirsty* ; to endeavour the destruction of those in covenant with God, first, while they expect the salvation of God ; and then, when they have received the gospel of salvation. To these interpretations, we have a third to this purpose, that *the full shall destroy the thirsty* ; that is, that those who falsely think themselves full, shall, at the time expected, oppress those that are thirsty ; and, afterwards, harass those that are filled. And these things are so joined, as, taken together, to complete the full meaning of the words. See *Ull. Mosis*, § 121.—138. and *Lexicon ad vocem RAVAH*. But I think, that as these things are altogether new ; so they are remote from the meaning of Moses, for the following reasons.

XXX. 1. Because, in these words, Moses describes the language of an idolater, whose heart is turned away from the Lord God, to go after the worship of the gods

of the Gentiles, and who, having renounced all fear of God, slights the solemn engagements of the covenant, and, notwithstanding this, promises peace to himself, ver. 16, 28. such as were those of whom Jer. xlv. 17. But surely such an idolater as this can give himself no trouble to force New Testament believers, who are free, to submit to the yoke of the Mosaic bondage, which he himself has shaken off, and has in abhorrence. 2. The person whom Moses here represents, is one of abandoned impiety, which he himself does not so much as conceal, and an avowed despiser of God and religion: but they whom the celebrated interpreter imagines to be here pointed out, put on a great appearance of sanctity, and, in all their actions, made religion a pretence; as is well known from the gospel-history. 3. If *the thirsty* signifies the church of the Old Testament, and *the watered*, the church of the New; *to add the watered to the thirsty*, can only signify, *to add the New Testament church to that of the Old, and join both together*: which the scripture declares was done by Christ, Eph. ii. 13. and Eph. iii. 6. But it is one thing, *to add the satiated to the thirsty*; another, *to reduce the satiated to the condition of the thirsty*. The obstinate zealots for the ceremonies are no where said to have joined to themselves the free Christians; but rather to have separated them from themselves, and expelled them the synagogues, Is. lxxv. 5. and Is. lxxvi. 5. 4. As there can be only one literal sense, it is asserted, contrary to all rules of right interpretation, that the word *SEPHOTH* can, in the very same proposition, be taken for partly *to destroy*, or *consume*; partly *to join* and *unite*; and the participle *ÆTH*, partly for *NGIM*, *with*; partly for the sign of the accusative. It is one thing, under the general signification of one word, to comprize more things pertaining to the same significa-

tion, which often takes place in explaining scripture : another, to ascribe to the same word, at the same time, different or opposite significations ; which is contrary to all reason. If *SEPHOTH* signifies here *to join*, it cannot signify *to destroy*. If *ÆTH* signifies *with*, it cannot be the sign of the accusative. 5. What is more absurd, than, after having established at large, that the *full* signifies the church of the New Testament, to understand by the *thirsty*, that which is *oppressed with the ceremonies* ; and immediately to undo all this, and turn the words to this meaning, *that the full shall destroy the thirsty* ; that is, the Jews, who are zealous for the discarded ceremonies, who seem to themselves to be full, shall persecute those that pant after Christ ? What is it to put white for black, if this is not ? Can any thing more absurd be devised, than that one word should signify, at the same time, the Christian church, which suffers persecution, and the congregation of the malignant Jews, who persecute her ? And yet learned men fondly please themselves with such inventions.

XXXI. What then, you will say, is the genuine meaning of the words of Moses ? I really think, it is plain and obvious. When any person commits, with pleasure, the crime he has conceived in his mind, he is said, proverbially, *to drink iniquity as water*, Job xv. 16. When a person ruminates on impious projects in his mind, he is as one that thirsteth after evil. But when he executes his premeditated designs, he surfeits himself with diabolical delights, and becomes, as it were, satiated, or drunk. Finely says the celebrated Cocceius, on Zech. ix. § 14. “ Outrageous, savage men are said to thirst after blood, and, while they shed it with pleasure, are said to drink it, Rev. xvi. 6.” What any one is delighted with, is said to be his meat,

and he is said to drink it as water, John iv. 34. Job xv. 16. & xxxiv. 7. To add, therefore, the drunken, or the satiated, to the thirsty, is not only to burn with an eager desire to commit wickedness, but also to accomplish it by abominable actions, and to follow after it, till his mind, which is bent upon evil, is fully satisfied. This the despisers of the Deity do, who, secure in their crimes, call the proud happy, and give way in all things to their unbridled lusts. And these are they whom Moses here describes. Should these things give less satisfaction, I recommend, above others, the discourses of the very learned Lud. de Dieu, who is large on this passage.

XXXIII. They also seem to be as far from the meaning of Zechariah, who think, that he compares the condition of the fathers of the Old Testament, *to the pit wherein is no water*, Zech. ix. 11. For, 1. Those very fathers sung, Psal. xxiii. 2. *He maketh me to lie down in green pastures, he leadeth me beside the still waters.* Which is quite different from the pit wherein is no water. 2. We admit, as a most certain rule of interpretation, which the brethren usually insist upon, that the words, unless any thing should hinder, are to be taken in their full import. But the emphasis is far greater, if, by the pit without water, we understand the condition of an unregenerate sinner; who, while in himself, is without Christ, is wholly destitute of all those things, which can yield him consolation, and quench his thirst after happiness. And there is no reason, why we may not thus explain it. For the prophet speaks concerning what is impetrated by the blood of Christ, which is the blood of the covenant, or New Testament, and shed, not only to remove the yoke of ceremonies, but especially to abolish the bondage of sin. Why shall we confine what is spoken, to that



which is the less, since the words may not only bear, but also persuade, nay almost constrain us, to interpret them of what is greater? 3. The prophet here comforts the mourners in Zion, and promises them deliverance from that evil, with which they were most of all oppressed, and for which they expected a remedy from the Messiah, who was to come. But that evil was not the bondage of ceremonies, which yielded little or no comfort; but rather the abyss of spiritual misery, into which sin had plunged them. The yoke of which, under the devil, who exacts it of them, is infinitely more grievous, than that yoke of ceremonies, that God laid upon them. 4. Though the ceremonies, considered in themselves, and separate from Christ, could not yield so much as a drop of comfort; yet the fathers were not, on that account, in a pit wherein is no water. For what they could not draw from the ceremonies, they drank out of the streams of divine grace, flowing from Christ, an everlasting fountain, to whom they looked by their faith. We therefore dare not say, the ancient condition of the fathers was a pit wherein is no water: though, with scripture, we maintain, that they had a thirst after better things; nevertheless they were not destitute of the waters of saving grace, for their necessary consolation.

---

## C H A P. XIV.

### *Of the Abrogation of the Old Testament.*

**I**T now remains, that we speak of the *abrogation* of the Old Testament, or of those things which were formerly superadded to the covenant of grace, as shadows,

types, and symbols of the Messiah to come. For the more exact prosecution of this subject, we shall proceed in the following order. I. Shew that the ancient ceremonies were of such a nature, that, in a way consistent with the honor of God, *they might be abrogated*. II. Prove, that they were really and actually *to be abrogated*. III. Make it appear, that they *ought*, one time or other, *to be abrogated*; and that it was not possible the case should be otherwise. IV. Explain the *progress* itself, and the *various degrees* of their abrogation.

II. To begin with the *first*: The foundation of the moral laws, whose perpetuity and unchangeableness is an unquestionable truth, is of a quite different nature from that of the ceremonial institutions, as appears from the following considerations. 1. Because the former are founded on the natural and immutable holiness of God, which cannot but be the exemplar to rational creatures; and therefore cannot be abolished, without abolishing the image of God: but the latter are founded on the free and arbitrary will of the Lawgiver: and therefore only good, because commanded; and consequently, according to the different nature of times, may be either prescribed, or otherwise prescribed, or not at all prescribed. This distinction was not unknown to the Jewish doctors; and hence was framed that of Maimonides, *in præfat. ab hot. c. vi. fol. 23. col. 3.* into *intellectual precepts*, whose equity was self-evident to the human understanding; and into those *apprehended by the hearing of the law*, whose entire ground is resolved into the faculty of hearing, which receives them from the mouth of God. Concerning the former, the wise men have said, that *if they were not written, it was just they should*: concerning the latter, Maimonides affirms, that “if the law had not been declared, those

things which are contrary to them, would not have on any account been evil."

III. 2. Because God himself frequently, on many accounts, prefers the moral to the ceremonial precepts; and, as the same Maimonides, *More Nervo.* p. 3. c. 32. has wisely observed, God very often, by the prophets, rebukes men for their too great fondness and excessive diligence in bringing offerings, inculcating upon them, that they are not intended principally, and for themselves, and that himself has no need of them. Thus Samuel speaks, 1 Sam. xv. 22. *Has the Lord as great delight in burnt-offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the Lord?* In like manner, Is. i. 11. *To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? saith the Lord.* And Jer. vii. 22. *For I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt-offerings or sacrifices: but this thing commanded I them, saying, Obey my voice, and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people.* On this place Maimonides observes, It seems strange, how Jeremiah should introduce God speaking in this manner, since the greatest part of the precepts is taken up about sacrifices and burnt-offerings: but he answers, the scope of these words is thus. The first intention certainly is, that ye cleave to me, and not serve another, that I may be your God, and you my people. But this precept concerning offerings and my house, is given you to the end you might learn it hence for your advantage. The parallel places are many, Psal. l. 9, 10, 11. Jer. vi. 2. Hos. vi. 6. Amos v. 22. If God, therefore, when these precepts were still in full force, rebukes men for their too great attachment to them, we speak nothing unworthy of God, when we affirm, that, for very weighty reasons, it was possible, he should entirely abrogate them.

IV. 3. We add, that the church, without any prejudice to religion, was, for many ages, destitute of the greatest part of the ceremonies ; as the Jews themselves reckon two thousand years before the giving of the law. Why then could she not, without detriment to religion, afterwards want the same ceremonies ; in the practice of which there was no intrinsic holiness, nor any part of the image of God ? This at least is evident, that they are not of the essence of religion, and that it was entirely in God's power to have made them either fewer or more in number, with even a stricter obligation ; or again entirely to abolish them.

V. Nor ought this to stand in the way as any prejudice ; that it was indeed convenient, that God should sometimes institute new ceremonies, to render religion more neat, graceful, and pompous ; but not so proper to abrogate what he had once instituted ; because both the institution of rites, which are afterwards wisely abrogated, and the abrogation of rites, which were wisely instituted, equally argue some defect of wisdom. But we are to have quite different conceptions of those things. God, indeed, in this matter, has displayed his manifold, and even his unchangeable wisdom, which is ever most consistent with itself, in suiting himself to every age of his church : a more plain and easy kind of worship became her first and most tender infancy : but a stricter and pedagogical discipline was better suited to her more advanced childhood, but yet a childhood very unruly and headstrong. An adult and manly age required an ingenuous and decent liberty. Our heavenly Father therefore does nothing inconsistent with his wisdom, when he removes the pedagogue, whom yet he had wisely given his son during his nonage ; and treats him, when he is now grown up, in a more free and generous manner.

VI. Moreover, as the ceremonies were not instituted for themselves, but for something else, as we have just heard Maimonides confessing, the same wisdom, wherewith they were instituted, requires, that, when the reason of the institution ceases, they should cease also. But when the Messiah is once manifested, we shall in its proper place make it appear, by invincible arguments, that those reasons ceased, for which the ceremonies were instituted. I am only now shewing, that the ceremonies *may* be abrogated without any, even the least blemish on the wisdom and unchangeableness of God.

VII. But let us now proceed to the *second* head; namely, that God really *intended* they should cease in their appointed time. This is evident from the following arguments. *First*, The very institution of the ceremonies leads us to this: for since they were given to one people, with a limitation to their particular state, country, city, and temple, the Legislator never intended, that they should be binding on *all*, whom he favors with saving communion with himself, *and at all times and in all places*. But this was really the case. And the Jews have always boasted in this, that the body of the Mosaic law was only given to their nation, *even the inheritance of the congregation of Jacob*, Deut. xxxiii. 1. And God confined it *to their generations*, Gen. xvii. 7. Lev. vii. 36. and xxiv. 3. But as these generations are now confounded, and the Levites by no certain marks can be distinguished from the other tribes, or the descendants of Aaron from the other Levites; it follows, that the law ceases, which was confined to the distinction of generations, which almost all depended on the tribe of Levi, and the family of the priests. God also appointed a certain country for the observation of the ceremonies, Deut. iv. 14. vi. 1. and xi. 31, 32. a cer-

tain city and house, Deut. xii. 5, 13, 14, 16. Since therefore the prophets all along foretold, that the church should afterwards be enlarged, by having many nations added to it ; who as they belong not to the generations of Israel, so neither could they inhabit the same country with them, nor meet in the same city, much less house ; it is evident, that the Lawgiver never intended, that his people should, at that time, be bound to the practice of the ceremonies. For, as we shall more fully prove in the sequel, the condition of the Israelites could not then be different from the other nations, since all were to be united in one body with Israel.

VIII. This argument will have further strength, when we shall have observed, that the reasons of most of the ceremonies were altogether peculiar, and taken from the special consideration of those times, and of the countries bordering on that of the descendents of Abraham, from whose errors and worship God would have his own people to keep at the greatest distance. Abraham, the patriarch of the nation of Israel, came forth from among the Zabians. God therefore generally so framed his ceremonies, as to be directly opposite to the rites of the Zabians. Maimonides has frequently insisted upon this, and acknowledges, that he came to know the reason of many laws, from the alone knowledge of the faith, rites, and worship of the Zabians. For instance, these idolaters offered only leavened bread ; made choice of sweet things for their offerings, which they used to anoint with honey, but made no use of salt. God therefore prohibited to offer either leavened bread or honey, but expressly commanded, that salt should be used in all sacrifices, Lev. ii. 13. Again, when these worshippers of the sun were to pray, they turned themselves to the east : and hence the holy of holies was placed in the west. Again, the Zabians did eat

blood, though they looked upon it as a most impure thing; for they imagined it was the food of devils, and, by eating it, one might attain to some familiarity with them: God therefore, under a severe threatening, prohibited the eating of blood, Lev. xvii. 10. Nor did God prescribe rites contrary to the Zabians alone, but also to the other neighbouring nations. The Egyptians worshipped the sign of the ram, and therefore were forbid to kill sheep. But in the sacrifices of the Israelites no beasts were more acceptable, and more frequent than sheep. Plutarch assures us, that rabbits and hares, on account of their swiftness and the perfection of their natural senses, were sacred to the Egyptians. But God would have his people to account all these unclean and profane. The worshippers of Baal-peor adored their idol by uncovering their nakedness: and hence the priests of God are commanded to make to themselves breeches to cover their nakedness, Exod. xxviii. 42. with many other things to the same purpose, which Maimonides has collected in *More p. 3. c. 45, 46.* and after his example Hottinger in *Hist. Oriental. lib. i. c. 8.* And Selden *de jure nat. &c. lib. ii. c. 7.* And we now quote them, to make it appear, that these and the like commandments were given to one nation only, for reasons peculiar to them, and appropriated to those times, without affecting other nations in such a manner, or having now that weight as formerly, the madness of the ancient superstitions being now long since abolished.

IX. *Secondly,* We argue from the prophecies, by which the abrogation of the ceremonies is very clearly foretold: but these are either more general or more special. In general, Moses himself has prophesied concerning this thing, Deut. xviii. 15, 19. Where

God, and Moses, in God's name, promise to Israel a prophet from among their brethren, like unto Moses himself: into whose mouth, God says, he would put his words; with a threatening to take vengeance on the person, who should not hearken to the words of that prophet.

X. For understanding that place, and the force of our argument taken from it, we must observe the following things. 1. Moses forbids Israel to have any communion with soothsayers and diviners, holding forth himself, and recommending the law given by his ministry, which contained every thing necessary to be known for that time. And lest they should pretend, that, upon his removal, something more would be granted them in this matter, he intimates, that his law would be sufficient till God should raise up another prophet, like unto himself, to whose words they were afterwards to give diligent attention. 2. That prophet was to be *like unto Moses*; but it is without all dispute, that there was never any in Israel equal to him, except this, of whom we are now speaking, Deut. xxxiv. 10. Moreover, that likeness and equality was not to consist in some minute circumstances, or such qualities, as the following prophets had in common with Moses; but principally in the authority and exercise of the prophetic office. As Moses by the authority of God had polished the more gross worship of the ancients, and reduced it to a more perfect form; so himself was to change that carnal worship of Moses into another more spiritual. 3. God promises, that he would put *his words* into the mouth of that prophet, not only in that sense, in which all the true prophets spoke the words of God, as his faithful ministers; but those words, which God had reserved to be spoken by himself in the last days, and which none but God can speak; see



John iii. 35. Hence it follows, that prophet was not to be a bare interpreter of the law of Moses, but the true Lord of the law, and to speak those words of God, which were not hitherto spoken in that manner. 4. That prophet can be none but the Messiah, whose prophecy, according to Abarbanel *in Prophet. fol. 27. col. 1.* was in the highest pitch of prophetic degrees; and who, according to the saying of the Rabbins, which he subjoins, “is more exalted than Abraham, higher than Moses, and more sublime than the ministering angels.” Compare Acts iii. 22. 5. The scripture all along insists upon it, see Is. xlii. 4. and the Hebrew doctors do not deny it, that the Messiah was to bring in a new form of doctrine. See Is. xlii. 4. Jonathan thus paraphrases on Is. xii. 3. And “you shall receive a *new doctrine* with joy from the chosen from among the just.” Kimchi gives a remarkable reason, why the paraprast called this doctrine *new*: “Because really that doctrine will be new; and then they shall learn the knowledge of the Lord in such a manner, as none ever learned before that time.” 6. God commands them to hearken to that prophet, and to subdue and captivate every thought, which exalts itself against him. Baal Hatturim has observed, that ver. 15. contains ten words, to set forth, that *he is to be obeyed equally with the decalogue*. Though this observation be a specimen of Jewish fancy, yet the thing is certain: for the words of that prophet are as much the words of God as the decalogue. 7. God threatens to take vengeance on every one who should disobey him. The stubborn and rebellious Jews have experienced this; for they obstinately contended for the discarded ceremonies of Moses against Jesus and his disciples. All this tended to recommend to Israel another prophet,

who was to institute a new form of worship, just as Moses had done before.

XI. Let us now take a view of the principal exceptions of the Jews. 1. This promise contains God's gracious answer to the prayers of the Israelites at Horeb, when they entreated, that God would speak to them by a mediator, lest perhaps the glory of his majesty should overwhelm them. But it is certain, that at Horeb they did not ask for a prophet, to substitute another law, when that of Moses was abrogated. Thus Lipmannus, *Sepher Nitzchan*, No. 137. 2. By the prophet is here understood the whole order of prophets in every age, and who may be said to be like unto Moses in point of authority and faithfulness, as they declared the words of the living God, as Moses had done : and the Israelites had such a number of them, that they had no occasion, in doubtful cases, to consult soothsayers or diviners. *The same author*. 3. If any one is pointed out in particular, he was either Joshua, of whom it is said, Deut. xxxiv. 9. *And the children of Israel hearkened unto him*, as seems to be the opinion of Aben Ezra and Bechai ; or Jeremiah, because the words, *I will raise up a prophet to them*, are, by the Gematria, equal in number to these, *This is Jeremiah*, according to Baal Hatturim. And Aberbanel *de prefat. ad Jeremiam*, lest he should be thought he had nothing to say, runs the parallel between Moses and Jeremiah, in fourteen particulars. 4. Our Jesus cannot be here intended, because, neither according to us, nor to the Jews, was he like unto Moses. Not according to us, because we believe him to be God ; but Moses was a mere man : not according to the Jews, who firmly maintain, that there never afterwards was a prophet equal to Moses. But it is absurd, a less should abrogate the ordinances of a greater.

*Lipmanus.* 5. The same author likewise says, that our explication contradicts the words of Christ, who protested, that he came not to destroy the law, Matth. v. 17.

XII. To the *first* of these we answer, 1. God, indeed, by this prophecy, answers the petition of the Israelites: for tho' they did not directly pray for the abrogation of the Mosaic manner of worship; yet that was no reason, why God might not promise a prophet, who was to do and teach, what they had not once thought of in their petition. For God frequently hears the prayers of his people, so as to grant them more than they had either asked or thought of. The Israelites had prayed, that for the future God would speak to them by a mediator: he promises that he would not only do this, but also,\* by giving the character instead of the proper name, he promises them a certain prophet equal to Moses, who would perform as great, nay greater things for the true Israel. We are to consider well, what was transacted, when the Israelites presented this their petition to God: they certainly expected, after hearing the decalogue, that God would publish more laws and statutes, which they were as yet ignorant of, and in a word, give them a model of a new and complete formulary of religion, Deut. v. 33. They prayed, that these might be declared to them, not as the decalogue was, by an awful and immediate manifestation of the divine majesty, but by the intervening ministry of Moses. God complies with their request, ver. 37. but does not stop there: for he promises to deal with them in a like manner, when a like case should fall out. As in forming the old œconomy he made use of the ministry of Moses; so at the time when the new

\* This, I apprehend, is the sense of the author, whose words are, ANTONOMASTIKOS, pollicetur.

should succeed the old, and be much more glorious than the former, he promises to make use of an interpreter, who should veil the awful majesty of the Deity, and deal with them in a way of grace and mercy. As God therefore constituted Moses a mediator, when he was resolved, in the place of the ancient plain way of religion, to institute a more burdensome kind of worship; so when he promises another prophet equal to Moses, he intimates that by him he would do something, like what he had done by Moses, in reforming the Mosaic œconomy: which remarkable goodness of God Moses here inculcates.

XIII. To the *second* I answer, That indeed, for ordinary, Israel was not without prophets, whom they might more piously and safely consult, than either soothsayers or diviners, or the like impostors: nevertheless this was not absolutely perpetual, 1 Sam. iii. 1. 2 Chron. xv. 3. But there is nothing said here of a mutual succession of prophets; but concerning some prophet eminently so called, and distinguished by his character; since it is allowed, that, in the whole series of prophets, none came up to Moses. But it is unpleasant minutely to pursue feigned resemblances of a person, who puts not a due value on the greatness of God's promise, or, which is still worse, knowingly depreciates it. But I would have the mutual coherence of the context well observed, which represents the matter thus. Moses dissuades the people from giving ear to astrologers and diviners by this argument, because God was to raise up a prophet, equal to himself, to whom they were to hearken in all things. But you will say, that was not to be till after many ages. What then? They had a written law, which was abundantly sufficient for them, till the time of that prophet. This, upon any doubt arising, was to be consulted, Is. viii. 19, 20. For ordi-

nary they were to have prophets, to interpret that law, who were familiar with God. And when the common prophets ceased, and the period of the law was drawing towards its final conclusion, that great prophet was to arise, at whose mouth they were to inquire, and in whose ordinances they were to acquiesce. What probable reason then could make them have recourse to astrologers or diviners?

XIV. I answer to the *third*: The sacred text evidently shews, that the prophet here pointed out is not Joshua, Deut. xxxiv. 9, 10. For, after he had told, that Joshua succeeded upon the death of Moses, it is immediately and expressly subjoined, *And there arose not a prophet since in Israel like unto (as) Moses*: as if God would purposely take care, that none should imagine Joshua to be the prophet he had promised to give them, Deut. xviii. What is added, *And the children of Israel hearkened unto him*, cannot confirm such a considerable point without farther proof. Aberbanch being to prove, that Jeremiah is here meant, contends for it by an argument of a quite contrary nature, and makes the similitude to consist in this, that as his countrymen opposed and resisted Moses, so they also did Jeremiah. But both is absurd. It was the common lot of all the prophets, to be sometimes listened to, but more frequently to be rejected; to have sometimes pious hearers, who trembled at the words of the living God; sometimes profane despisers and scoffers, who made a jest of them. You will no where find a more perfect fulfilment of this word than in the Lord Jesus himself, of whom the Father proclaimed from heaven, *Hear ye him*, Matth. xvii. 5.

XV. Much less are we to explain these things of Jeremiah, to whom the things that have been said before are no more applicable, than to any other of the

prophets. For, 1. The cabbalistical Gematria, which is the entertainment only of idle minds, has perhaps now and then something ingenious, but nothing solid. We may justly say of it, what, in a similar case, Aben Ezra says on Is. vii. 6. *This is vanity*. For the master of the Cabbala expressly contradicts himself: since he had a little before declared, that the prophet here promised would open all the fifty gates of intelligence, because the 15th verse begins and ends with the letter *nun*, which is the numeral character of fifty. But to say this of Jeremiah is altogether contrary to the hypothesis: for, in that case, he would be preferred to Moses, to whom, as they foolishly talk, forty-nine gates of intelligence were set open. The similitudes assigned by Aberbanel are trifling: for either they are common to Jeremiah with the other prophets, or only taken from external circumstances, or even some of them false. And then among the prophets there were others, whom he himself greatly prefers to Jeremiah. In his preface to Isaiah, he at large contends, that he is the next to Moses in the excellence of the prophetic qualifications: nay he even prefers Ezekiel in many respects to Jeremiah. 'Tis therefore astonishing, he should select him from the rest of the prophets rather than some other.

XVI. To the *fourth* I answer: This prophecy is on all accounts to be applied to the Lord Jesus, who was like to Moses in the exact knowledge of divine things, in familiarity with God, in miracles; in fine, in every pre-eminence, by which Moses excelled the other prophets. He was of their brethren; who spoke such words, as God had reserved to be declared in the last times; to whom the Father bore testimony from heaven, with an express charge to hear him in all things. Nor is it any objection, that we affirm him to be greater than Moses. For he who is greater, has every thing that is

in the less, and thus far is like and equal unto the less. Besides, Moses did not intend an absolute equality between himself and that prophet who was promised to be given them ; but that at least he was not to be less than himself. But the greater he is, the stronger is the argument, and the stricter restraint is put upon idle curiosity. The general assertion, that a prophet did not arise like unto Moses, is improperly objected : for what is said of the time past, is not to be understood in prejudice of the future ; and it is self-evident, that saying puts no bar to the excellence of that prophet, who, Moses himself affirms, was in all respects to be equal to himself. 'Tis also improperly urged, that the less cannot abrogate the ordinances of the greater : for, besides that the doctrine of the prophets has not its authority from them, but from God, Christ was so much greater than Moses, by how much the son is greater than the servant, and the builder than the house, Heb. iii. 3, 5, 6.

XVII. I answer to the *fifth* : 1. When Christ says, he came not to destroy the law and the prophets, he principally means the moral law, for this is what he there explains, vindicates, and inculcates : and he subjoins to the sum of it, which he elsewhere publishes, *On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets*, Matth. xxii. 30. Whence we learn, what our Lord means by the law and the prophets. 2. KATALUSAI TON NOMON, does not signify to abrogate the law, when it had performed its part, but to overturn, destroy it, loosen its frame, either by perverting its true meaning, or abolishing its scope, or in fine by falsifying and rendering it ineffectual. In which sense our Lord says, John x. 35. *The scripture cannot be broken* : that is, What the scripture says cannot but be

true. Briefly, to destroy the law and the prophets, is to contradict them, either in doctrine or practice. And it is certain, our Lord came not in this manner to destroy the law and the prophets, not even the ceremonial; since, on the contrary, he accomplished, in the most exact manner, whatever the law commanded, most faithfully explained its genuine sense, and most exactly fulfilled, whatever either the ceremonies pre-signified, or the prophets predicted. 3. That abrogation of the ceremonies, which we say was made by Christ, is their glorious consummation and accomplishment, all their signification being fulfilled; not an ignominious destruction, which our Lord justly disclaims.

XVIII. The prophecy of Jeremiah concerning the abrogation of the Old Testament, Jer. xxxi. 31.—34. is no less remarkable than illustrious. Where observe, 1. That, by the old covenant, is meant, that which God made with the Israelites on their departure out of Egypt, the tenor of which Moses has fully set forth, Exod. xxiv. 3. and following verses. Thus Moses rehearsed not only the decalogue, but also many judicial and ceremonial precepts, which are declared in chap. xx. and the following, at the command of God, to the people, and stipulated obedience from the people. Which stipulation being performed, he proceeded to the solemnity of the covenant, and, on the day following, erected an altar, representing Christ, and twelve pillars, which represented the twelve tribes of Israel. And then, as God's ambassador, he read out of a book, in their hearing, all those precepts, moral, judicial, and ceremonial. The people answered, that they would perform all that was read before them. Then Moses sprinkled both the altar of the Lord, and the twelve pillars of the people, with the blood of the sacrifices. This blood he called the blood of the covenant. Where



we are to observe, that all the solemnities of that covenant were entirely ceremonial ; the altar, the sacrifices, the blood, the sprinkling. And therefore that covenant itself, which consisted in rites, was ceremonial too, Heb. ix. 1.—For though these were only the accidents of the covenant, or at least appendages thereto ; yet, because they were the instruments of its administration, they are called the covenant. And therefore, in sum, the solemn manner of ratifying this covenant, consisting in ceremonies and sacrifices, is, in this place, called the old covenant.

XIX. 2. To that old covenant is contradistinguished the new, which can be no other but God's agreement with Israel, without the vail of ceremonies ; in which there can be nothing typical or shadowy, but all things real and substantial ; the sacrifice not brutal, but rational ; the blood, not of beasts, but of the Messiah ; the sprinkling, not of an altar of earth on the one hand, and of pillars representing the people on the other ; but of heavenly things, which are represented by earthly, on the one, and of the consciences on the other hand. As the apostle sets the one over against the other, Heb. ix. & x.

XX. 3. The old covenant is here found fault with, accused, and charged with defects ; not only because the new is promised, for which there would have been no place, had nothing been deficient in the former, Heb. viii. 7. but also because the former is said to have been made void by Israel. It had not, therefore, at least, as old and shadowy, and as explained by Moses in the said place, the promise of sanctifying grace. It had the decalogue engraven on tables of stone, the rest of the laws written down in a book : but in the whole solemnity of the covenant, there is not the least mention of writing the law on the heart. The old cove-

nant was, therefore, of such a nature, as to leave room for a new, and better.

XXI. 4. The new covenant, that was promised to succeed the old, has the following superior privileges. 1. It shall be sure and stable, because it was not to be external, but spiritual; engraven not on tables of stone, but on the fleshy tables of the heart. 2. Clearly proposed, and made known, by a more plentiful unction of the Spirit, so that there would be no necessity for one to be taught by another, 1 John ii. 27. as formerly; when the mysteries of salvation were exhibited to be guessed at, rather than contemplated. 3. It shall have a true expiation and remission of sins, which the old œconomy, as legal, excluded, and, as typical, could not give. Whence it appears, that the new covenant, which is here promised, consists in mere promises of an *irrevocable* grace, is held forth to us without the vail of ceremonies, and has the reality of those things, of which the types were only the shadows.

XXII. 5. From these things, moreover, it is now easy to conclude, that the new covenant was not promised to stand together with the old, and be superadded, to supply its defects; but to come in the place of the former, when that, as obscure and typical, should be entirely removed; as is plain from these words, *Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, &c. In that he saith, A new covenant, he hath made the first old: now that which decayeth and waxeth old, is ready to vanish away*, Heb. viii. 13.

XXIII. The exceptions of the Jews against this strong argument, are very weak. 1. That the establishment, and not the renewal of that covenant, is here promised: thus Kimchi. 2. That it does not necessarily follow, from the mention of the new covenant,

that the Lord will give a new law, only renew the former on their hearts. For whatsoever was not sufficiently manifest at first, when afterwards more fully declared, is said in scripture to be new. Thus Samuel says to Saul, 1 Sam. xi. 14. *Come and let us go to Gilgal, and renew the kingdom there.* Where it is plain, there was no new kingdom given, but only the old confirmed: Thus Menasse Ben Israel, *Quest. 7. in Levit.*

XXIV. I answer, *to the first*: 1. That it is begging the question. 2. A direct contradiction of God's word. God says, I will make a new covenant, not like the former, which was made void: man ventures to answer, it is not an establishment of a new, but a repetition of the old: and so far the new covenant confirmed the old; yet at the same time this was its abrogation; because the presence of the truth, and of the body, is the removal of the figure, and the shadow. But these things the Jew did not understand.

XXV. *To the other*, we say, That here is no promise of a new law; because none can be better and more perfect than that of the ten commandments: however, we have a promise of a new covenant, not a covenant of works, or of the law, but of grace, promising to write the same law on the heart, which before was written on stone. 2. That the renewal of the covenant does not consist only in a clearer repetition of the law, or inscription on the heart. For the new covenant is opposed to the old, and substituted in its place, and completes it, so as likewise to put an end to it, as we have just now shewn. 3. That the two cases are not parallel: for Samuel says not to Saul, Let us go to Gilgal, and I will give thee a new kingdom, unlike to the former; as God speaks here to Israel. These are things very different, I will renew with thee the covenant

which I made ; and I will make a new covenant, not like unto the former.

XXVI. Let us now descend to *particulars* : Where the first thing that offers, is the prophecy concerning the removal of the *ark of the covenant*, not only out of the world, but also out of the memory and heart of believers ; expressed, Jer. iii. 16, 17. in the following words : *And it shall come to pass, when ye be multiplied and increased in the land ; in those days, saith Jehovah, they shall say no more, The ark of the covenant of Jehovah ; neither shall it come to mind, neither shall they remember it, neither shall they visit it, neither shall that be done any more. At that time they shall call Jerusalem the throne of Jehovah, and all the nations shall be gathered unto it.*

XXVII. On this prophecy we observe, 1. That the ark of the Lord was the centre and compendium of all the ceremonies. It was the holiest of all sacred places, to which they looked in all their ceremonial worship, and before which they were also to adore, 2 Sam. vi. 2. and to sacrifice ; the throne of God, erecting a priestly kingdom : in fine, it was the principal symbol of the whole typical covenant ; whence it is also called *the ark of the covenant*, both here and in many other places ; because in it, at least in its side, was kept the book of the covenant, Deut. xxxi. 26, 27. and *the ark of the testimony*, Exod. xxvi. 33. or also *the testimony* itself, Lev. xvi. 13. because it testified concerning the covenant of God with Israel, of which it was a pledge. 2. That the entire removal of the ark is here foretold, not only out of the world, but also from the memory, love, and desire of believers : all opinion of typical holiness, which formerly the ark was eminently possessed of, being erased out of the minds of God's people. To this purpose is that repetition, by way of climax or gra-

dation, *They shall say no more, neither shall it come to mind, neither shall they remember it, neither shall they visit it, or seek it, neither shall that be done any more.* They shall not make a new one, when the old shall be lost, or have it in any esteem. Poor Aberbanel looks on this repetition with a kind of astonishment. 3. That it is not here foretold in the form of a threatening of misery, such as was the loss of the ark, while the ceremonies were in force; but as a promise of the most happy times, in which the church shall have that in reality, which formerly she had typically in the ark; and while she enjoys the substance, will bear the loss of the shadow, not only with equanimity and composure of mind, but also with gladness of heart. 4. It is added, that all Jerusalem, and not the cover of the ark only, as formerly, should be the throne of glory. "For all Jerusalem shall obtain a degree of the ark in holiness and glory," says Aberbanel. That is, God will manifest himself, by much more glorious indications of his grace, in the whole church of believing Jews, and converted Gentiles united together into one holy city, than he did formerly within the inclosure of the sanctuary: words which overturn the typical holiness of places. 5. That all those benefits accompany the coming of the Messiah, whose distinguishing characters are the multiplying and the increasing of the people in the land, see Deut. xxx. 5. even above their ancestors, after having subdued and incorporated Edom with themselves; the giving of pastors according to God's heart, who, as Kimchi interprets, are "the rulers of Israel, who shall be the attendants on the King Messiah." We call these the apostles of the Lamb, and their faithful assistants and successors; and in fine, the gathering together the Gentiles into the church; who could neither be burthened with ceremonies; as we shall presently shew:

nor, while the religion of ceremonies continued, live peaceably in the same holy city with the Jews without them. The sum of the whole comes to this, that when the Messiah should discover those things, which were signified by the ark and the other ceremonies, he would then abolish all the holiness of the ark and the like types, as well in reality, as out of the minds of believers.

XXVIII. It is excepted, 1. That the ark which was wanting in the second temple, is to be restored by God under the Messiah. Thus Sephar Afkat Rochel, refuted by Hulsius, on the tenth sign of the Messiah's coming. 2. That the meaning of this prophecy is, that, during these prosperous circumstances, Israel would have no reason to fear the envy of the other nations; for they should not make war, so as to be obliged to go out, and take the ark of the covenant with them, as they usually did, in the days of Eli, and as often as war happened to break out. And therefore there was no prediction of the removal of the ark simply, but in some respect, namely, as to its special use in time of war. Thus Jonathan, Kimchi, and Menasse, *Quest. 2. in Levit.* and others. 3. That the abrogation of the ceremonies cannot be inferred from the absence of the ark, since it is without controversy, that these remained in force, though the ark has been wanting ever since the Babylonish captivity. 4. That the ten commandments, formerly inclosed in the ark, are even at this day accounted and regarded by all as eternal. *Menasse, ibid.*

XXIX. I answer to the first, That it is a mere Jewish tradition, without any foundation in scripture, and directly contrary to this prophecy of Jeremiah.

XXX. To the second, 1. That it is supposed without proof, that the principal use of the ark was in time

of war. They took it with them to the field of battle in the time of Eli, but with bad success, being found *to have in vain put their confidence in the ark*, *Joseph. Antiq.* lib. v. c. 11. 2. That, after the dedication of the temple, and the solemn introduction of the ark into it, it was never any more moved from its place, and carried out to the field of battle, 1 Kings viii. 8. 2 Chron. v. 9. Therefore the temple is called *the resting-place of Jehovah, and of the ark of his strength*, 2 Chron. vi. 41. *and an house of rest for the ark of the covenant of Jehovah*, 1 Chron. xxviii. 2. so that the Levites were relieved from the burden of carrying it, 2 Chron. xxxv. 3. What new thing then could Jeremiah foretel here, should he prophesy, that, in the time of the Messiah, the ark was not to be carried out to battle, as all knew, that was prohibited so many ages before? 3. That reiterated repetition of phrases plainly indicates an entire removal of the ark: And justly said Abernethy of this exposition, "All these things are foreign to the purpose; there is not a single word in the text concerning war, and the other things of which they speak; and therefore I cannot be satisfied with this explication."

XXXI. *To the third*: The absence of the ark in the second temple, which was to be honored with the presence of him who was prefigured by it, did even then signify the future abrogation of the types in due time. 2. We don't argue from the bare absence of the ark, but from its being foretold, that it was neither to be in the world, nor so much as have a place in the mind, love, and desire of believers? And this was promised as a great blessing, as a token and evidence of the liberty purchased by the Messiah: which was not the case before the coming of the Messiah, when

the memory of the ark was still dear to the godly among them. 3. We likewise argue from this, namely, that the holiness and glory of the ark may be said to be imparted to all \* Jerusalem, inhabited by Jews as well as Gentiles, in the sense we have just explained. Whence the abrogation of that typical holiness, which the ark formerly had above all, is most evidently concluded.

XXXII. *To the fourth*: 1. The laws of the covenant, of which the ark was the symbol, were not only the ten commandments, but all the laws of Moses. Accordingly the book which contained them, was placed in the side of the ark. That symbol therefore of the covenant being thus abolished, both the covenant itself, and the laws, so far as they comprized the *conditions* of that *covenant*, are abrogated. 2. The case of the laws of the decalogue, is different from the rest: for they were engraven on tables of stone, and laid up in the ark, to represent, that they were to be the perpetual rule of holiness, and continually to be kept in the heart both of the Messiah and of his mystical body; while the others were only written on paper or parchment, and placed in the side of the ark. Their abrogation therefore would be ill concluded from the removal of the typical ark; seeing their being engraven on stone, and kept in the ark, signified their indelible inscription on, and continual preservation in, the hearts of believers.

XXXIII. David prophesied concerning the abrogation of the *priesthood*, Psal. cx. 4. *The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec.* From which place the apostle long ago argued thus, Heb. vii. 11.—13. *If therefore perfection were by the Levitical priesthood (for under it the people received the law) what further need was there,*

\* *i. e.* To the whole church made up of Jews and Gentiles.



*that another priest should rise after the order of Melchisedec, and not be called after the order of Aaron ? For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law. For he of whom these things are spoken, pertaineth to another tribe, of which no man gave attendance at the altar.* The following observations will shew, that this reasoning is solid and conclusive.

XXXIV. 1. The inscription proves, that the author of this psalm was David, *A psalm of David*, which is no where found in the titles of psalms composed by another. 2. The person to whom both the kingdom and priesthood are promised, is not David himself, but the Lord of David, as appears from the connection of ver. 4. with ver. 1. 3. The Lord of David is not Abraham, but the Messiah. Because the things asserted and declared in this psalm, as the sitting at God's right hand, the sending the rod of his strength out of Zion, the making all his enemies his footstool, his eternal priesthood, &c. do not agree to the former, but to the latter. 4. All are agreed, that the Messiah is not of the tribe of Levi, to which, by the law of Moses, the priesthood was limited ; but of Judah, and of the family of David. But, by the Mosaic law, that family was not allowed to exercise the priesthood, 2 Chron. xxvi. 18. 5. A priesthood, even an eternal priesthood, is promised to the Messiah, and that by an oath ; see Zech. vi. 13. Which cannot be, while the Mosaic law concerning the priesthood remains in force. 6. That priesthood is of another order than that of Aaron, namely of Melchisedec : which cannot subsist at the same time with the Levitical, both for other reasons, which it is not to the purpose now to unfold, and especially on account of the diversity of descent. 7. If the Aaronical priesthood had been perfect, and could have

perfected the consciences, there neither had been, nor ought there to be a place for this change. But the weakness and unprofitableness thereof made way for an amendment. 8. With the change of the priesthood is conjoined the change of the law : because the priesthood is not only a great part, but also the foundation of all the ceremonies.

XXXV. The Jewish interpreters wonderfully perplex themselves in darkening this illustrious passage : but it is not worth our while to discuss all their misinterpretations here ; they are both so many and so impertinent. We shall only run over such exceptions, as are more plausible, and directly contrary to what we maintain. It is therefore objected, 1. That this is not a psalm of David's, but composed by some inspired singer in commendation, and on the account of David : and that the inscription is no objection ; for LAMED sometimes, even in the inscription of psalms, is the sign of the dative case, and signifies the same thing as BANGABUR, *for*, as Psal. lxxii. 1. LISHELOMOH, *to, for, or concerning Solomon* : nay, that we have the same inscription LEDAVID prefixed to some psalms, of which he does not seem to be the author, as Psal. xx. and xxi. Where the singer prays for the preservation of the king ; under which name it is not very likely, that David should pray for himself. 2. That therefore the singer means David by his lord : whom he calls not *Adonai*, a sacred name ; but *Adoni*, a human and common appellation. 3. That the term Cohen, does not here signify a *priest*, but a king and prince, as 2 Sam. viii. 18. where the sons of David are called COHANIN, that is, *princes of the court* ; and 2 Sam. xx. 26. where Ira the Jairite is called a *prince of David*. Accordingly even the Chaldee has translated it, *Thou art constituted a prince.* 4. That NGAL DIERATHI

MALKI TZÆDÆK signifies, *because thou art the king of righteousness*, as if the meaning was, Thou shalt be a prince for ever, shalt reign by a long succession of descendents, not as Saul, whose government was execrable and of short continuance ; *because of righteousness, for thou art a righteous king*, as the Chaldee paraphrases. If this be a true explication, nothing is here said about the change of the priesthood.

XXXVI. I answer to the *first*. 1. If you say, that this is not a psalm of David, you cannot prove him to be the author of any psalm, that has the same inscription. 2. The ancients all acknowledge, that it is David's. If it had not been so, Christ would not have asserted it as a thing of undoubted truth, Matth. xxii. 45. and the Pharisees might easily have eluded that argument, by which they were constrained to hold their peace. The Chaldee also has it, *A hymn by the hand of David*. 3. We allow, that the letter LAMED is sometimes the sign of the dative ; but we deny, that here, or elsewhere, when the title runs LIMISMOR LE-DAVID signifies the same with BANGABUR : nor, by any other description, are those psalms distinguished, which we all believe to be David's, in consequence of that inscription. 4. The instances mentioned, do not prove any thing to the contrary : for in Psal. lxxii. we read not, MISMOR LISHELOMOH, A psalm for Solomon, but LISHELOMOH absolutely for Solomon. And then there is no reason, why it may not be a psalm of Solomon's, which he received, as it were, from David's mouth ; since he likewise wrote several proverbs from the mouth of his mother, Prov. xxxi. 1. And there is as little reason, why Psal. xx. & xxi. may not be accounted David's. For as God had appointed him to the office of a prophet, he justly also dictated to the people those forms of prayer, with which they were to

intercede for their king. And that he might sing this in one spirit with them, it is not without reason, that he speaks of himself as king in the third person. And thus he might properly name himself; but he could not call himself *his Lord*, whether singing by himself or with others. Besides, the appellation *king*, even in those psalms, may look further, and be applied to the Messiah. For how could the church in after times, by singing, pray for David and his posterity, when they were extinct? And in what sense should she sing these things of an earthly king, when there was no such king in Israel?

XXXVII. To the *second* we reply, 1. It is affirmed without proof, that these things were foretold concerning David, when David speaks them concerning his Lord. 2. David's Lord is the Messiah; for David was his servant. He sits at God's right hand, having the next degree of honor to God; all the other things, which are declared in the psalm, emphatically belong to him. 3. As he could be called *Adonai* by David, on account of the excellence of the divine essence; so he is also justly called *Adoni*, on account of the eminence of his power and dominion. 4. The more ancient Jews themselves explained this psalm of the Messiah, from whom we have testimonies in Munsterus on this psalm, and in Cocceius on Heb. vii. § 12.

XXXVIII. To the *third* we say, 1. Though the term *Cohen*, may sometimes denote a political dignity, yet royal majesty is never expressed by that word. *Cohen*, as Aben Ezra has well observed, signifies a *minister*, who is next to the king. But there is a king, who has power over conscience, and God only is such a King: and there is a king, who has power over the body, and such are the supreme rulers of this world. Therefore there is a twofold *Cohen*, namely, with re-

spect either to God, or to kings. With respect to God, such are called *Cohanim*, who were over the people, and performed divine service, because they appear to be next to God. With respect to kings, those are *Cohanim*, who are next to them. In that sense, Ira the Jairite is called David's *Cohen*, and David's sons *Cohanim*; that is, as it is explained, 1 Chron. xi. 15. *captains, or principal men next to the king*. And if we may believe the Jews, because Absalom was not admitted to partake of this dignity, he therefore took occasion to form his unnatural conspiracy. But in none of these senses could David be called *Cohen*: not in the former, because the priesthood was confined to the descendants of Aaron alone; nor in the latter, for thus he himself had his *Cohanim*. But the Messiah is in such a manner a king, as at the same time to be priest; just like Melchisedec, who distinctly discharged both offices, for the Holy Spirit directs us to this.

XXXIX. To the *fourth* we answer, there is a mistake, through the misinterpretation of these words, NGAL DIBRATHI MALKI TZÆDÆK. For, 1. MALKI TZÆDÆK, Melchisedec is always in the sacred writings a proper name. The Hebrews should appellatively call, *king of righteousness*, MÆLÆCH TZÆDÆK. 2. NGAL DIBRATHI never signifies *because*, but when it is placed, as here, *according to the order or manner*, Eccl. iii. 18. and viii. 2. if SHUN follows in Hebrew, or DI in Chaldee, it signifies *with that intention, or design*, as Eccl. vii. 14. Dan. ii. 30. and iv. 14. Seeing then neither COHANIM, nor MALKI TZÆDÆK, nor NGAL DIBRATHI signify what the Jews would have, our argument remains in its full force.

XI. And indeed, the event has confirmed this prophecy: for about the time when our true Melchisedec began his priestly office, the Levitical had lost its dig-

nity, till it was at last entirely abolished, without any hopes of a restoration, all the distinction of tribes being confounded. And the Jews themselves have taken notice of this, whose opinion we have in the *Misna*, tit. *Sota*. c. 9. "From the death of Rabbi Ismael, the son of Phabi, the splendor of the priesthood has ceased." But this man was made high priest by Valerius Gratus, president of Judea under Tiberius Cæsar. About that time, this most sacred office was tossed about and sported with like a ball, and any of the most profligate, as he favored and made presents to the Roman president, grasped at it by the foulest ambition and the basest arts. And matters at length came to such a pitch of profaneness and wickedness, that the high priests were not only chosen by lot, but even the high priesthood fell by lot to one Phannias; who not only was "a worthless high priest, but also, thro' his gross ignorance, incapable to distinguish what was the nature of the high priesthood," *Joseph. de bel. Jud. lib. iv. c. 12*. Yet from the utmost contempt and derision they constrained this man, whom they forced even against his will from the country, and brought him on the stage like a kind of actor, and clothed in the sacred vestments, to act the part of high priest, who like a child had prompters always at hand, to remind him how to behave, and maintain his character. Which *impiety*, as Josephus justly calls it, sufficiently shews, that God no longer regarded that office; after the true priest according to the order of Melchisedec had once appeared.

XLI. From the priesthood let us proceed to the *sacrifices*. Daniel speaks of the ceasing of these, chap. ix. ult. *And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week; and in the midst of the week, he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease.*

XLII. We are here to observe, 1. That the prophet speaks concerning the times of the Messiah, who, ver. 25. is called *the Messiah the Prince*, by way of eminence, and with respect to his character and office : compare Is. lv. 4. His office was to *finish* (restrain) the *transgression*, and *make an end of* (seal) *sins*, and to *make reconciliation for* (expiate) *iniquity*, and to *bring in everlasting righteousness*, ver. 24. These are the offices and benefits of the true Messiah alone.

XLIII. 2. That the abolishing of the sacrifice and oblation is foretold to be done by the Messiah : for he, *who confirmed the covenant with many*, whom Paul calls *the Surety of a better covenant*, Heb. vii. 22. even he shall cause the sacrifices to cease. But whatever the Messiah does is undoubtedly right : since at least he is a Prophet, and faithful in the house of God.

XLIV. 3. That this abolishing was both just, and actually took place. It was just, by reason of the introduction of a new covenant, which was confirmed, not by sacrifice and the blood of brute beasts ; but by the offering of the Messiah himself, that Lamb without blemish, whose blood is the blood of the New Testament, shed in order to procure, or obtain, true remission, for many. Accordingly the future abolishing of the sacrifices was foretold to be in the midst of that week, in which the Messiah was to be cut off, when he was to *make his soul an offering for sin*, Is. liii. 10. His sacrifice put an end to typical sacrifices. And the abrogation of the sacrifices is joined with the confirmation of the new covenant : for, that being sealed by the sacrifice of Christ, and preached by the apostles, and confirmed by the effusion of the Holy Ghost, and by very many miracles, the sacrifices of beasts, which constituted a great part of the old covenant, im-

mediately lost all their efficacy and dignity, and so were justly abrogated. It actually took place not long after, on the destruction of the city and temple ; for all the sacrifices ceased upon that. Josephus relates, that Titus answered the priests, who begged for their lives, after the burning of the temple ; that “ that was destroyed, on account of which he would have justly saved them ; but that it was proper for the priests to perish with the temple.” And what Chrysostom relates, *Orat. 3. contra Judeos*, agrees with this, that the Jews should have said to Julian, when he exhorted them to sacrifice in the ancient manner : “ If you would see us sacrifice, restore our city, rebuild our temple, and we will sacrifice even now as before.” As the profane emperor, from the hatred he bore to Christianity, attempted this, and furnished the expence out of the public treasury, God prevented it by his almighty hand ; thereby shewing, that he had no pleasure in new sacrifices. Not only our own writers have this history, but also Ammianus Marcellinus, *lib. xxiii.* among the Gentiles, and Zemach David, p. 2. p. 36. among the Jews. Both these kinds of the abrogation of sacrifices may be ascribed to the Messiah. He had a right to do it, as a Priest, who had offered a better sacrifice ; and as a King, who appoints religious ceremonies for his church. He actually did it, as the asserter of his own majesty and grace, which the rebellious Jews trampled under foot ; for which end, he made use of Titus and his armies, as his ministers.

XLV. 4. That the removal of sacrifices and offerings infers the abrogation of the whole ceremonial worship. Not only because sacrifices constitute a principal part of the ceremonies, and we may say the same of things of a like nature : but also because the whole external worship is sometimes expressed by the name



sacrifice, as Hos. vi. 6. CHES.ED, *for I desired mercy and not sacrifice* : CHES.ED, which the Septuagint here translate by ELEOS, as also Matthew, chap. xii. 7. signifies HOSIOTES (a word very plainly derived from the Hebrew CHESIDOTH, or the Chaldee CHESIDUTHA) or *a diligent love of God*. But HOSIOTES, is that internal purity and holiness of heart, which comprehends all those virtues or graces, wherein the image of God consists. And therefore SÆBACH, in order to a just opposition, will signify the whole external and ceremonial worship. Which Kimchi himself seems to have observed, who explains sacrifice by *the worship of the Lord in the house of his sanctuary*. The interpretations, which the blind and foolish Jews give of this prophecy of Daniel, are so foreign to the words of the text, to the designation of the time, and to the history of the events, that they confute and overthrow themselves. Whoever desires to see them exploded, may consult Const. l'Empereur on Daniel, and the celebrated Cocceius, Hornbeck, and Halsius, in their writings against the Jews.

XLVI. The Spirit, which spoke by the prophets, not thinking it sufficient to foretel the ceasing of the ceremonies, foretold also, that, in the days of the Messiah, such rites should be instituted, as are entirely repugnant to the ancient institutions ; that he would take for himself priests and Levites out of all nations without distinction, Is. lxvi. 20, 21 ; that in all places incense and a pure offering should be offered to his name, Mal. i. 11 ; that there should be an altar, acceptable to himself, in the midst of the land of Egypt, Is. xix. 19 ; that on the bells of the horses should be engraven *Holiness to Jehovah* ; which was formerly engraven only on the golden plate fastened to the mitre of the high priest ; and God has graciously promised, that all

the pots in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, should be holiness unto him, Zech. xiv. 20, 21. These things cannot be reconciled with the ancient privileges of the priests and Levites, and with the earthly sanctuary, and the prerogatives of the land of Canaan, and with the special holiness of the pontifical pomp. God intimates, that he would be worshipped in the use of other sacred ordinances, which should not be confined to any forms of the ancient ceremonies, but be duly performed, in spirit and in truth, by every believer, in all places whatever.

XLVII. Let us now come to the *third* thing proposed, and shew, that the ceremonies *ought* to be abrogated in the time of the Messiah, and that it was not possible the case should be otherwise. This may be shewn two ways : First, if we consider the *material*, or matter of the ceremonies, as they are acts of the obedience prescribed by the law of ordinances : secondly, their *formal*, or essence, as they were types and shadows : but in neither of these ways can they have place in the kingdom of the Messiah. I make the first of these appear thus.

XLVIII. It is evident from the prophecies, that a great multitude of the Gentiles would be called by the Messiah to communion with God and Israel : That God would allure Japheth to dwell in the tents of Shem. Gen. ix. 27 ; that in the seed of Abraham all nations of the earth should be blessed, Gen. xxii. 18 ; that unto the Messiah should the obedience of the people be. Gen. xlix. 10 ; that the Egyptians and Babylonians should be mentioned among those who know Jehovah ; and that it should be said of the Philistine, the Tyrian, and the Ethiopian, they were born in Zion, Psal. lxxxvii. 4 ; and that all nations should flow to the mountain of the house of Jehovah, Is. ii. 2 ; and that

Israel should be the third of Egypt and Assyria ; and that the Lord shall say, *Blessed be my people the Egyptians, and the work of my hands, the Assyrians, and Israel mine inheritance*, Is. xix. 24, 25. and numberless other passages, which frequently occur in scripture to the same purpose.

XLIX. Moreover, Isaiah declares, that both Israel and the converted Gentiles should obey the same laws, and be bound together by the same religious ties, chap. xlii. 4. *And the isles shall wait for his* (the Messiah's) *laws.* Again, Is. ii. 3. *And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob, and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths : for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of Jehovah from Jerusalem.* And he adds, no stranger who hath joined himself to Jehovah, shall say, Jehovah hath utterly separated me from his people : but, on the contrary, even unto the eunuchs shall be given, in the house of God and within his walls, a place, and a name better than that of sons and of daughters, Is. lvi. 3, 5 ; that is, that the converted Gentiles should, in matters of religion, be on an equal footing with the Israelites. To this purpose is that of Zeph. iii. 9, 10. *For then will I turn to the people a pure language, that they may all call upon the name of Jehovah, to serve him with one consent : from beyond the rivers of Ethiopia, my suppliants, even the daughters of my dispersed shall bring mine offering : and Zech. xiv. 9. And Jehovah shall be King over all the earth : in that day shall there be one Jehovah, and his name one : one shall be the worship, and one the veneration of the one God.* The Jews themselves also frequently declare, that, in the time of the Messiah, many nations shall be converted to the God of Israel, and that then they shall walk *in the doctrine of that law*, as

the Chaldee speaks on Is. ii. 3. and *shall embrace one common law with the Israelites*, as Menasse speaks, *de resur.* lib. ii. c. 3. and so shall incorporate into one people with Israel, and be partakers of the same privileges, as being proselytes of righteousness.

L. Whenever this shall come to pass, it is plain, that the ancient ceremonies cannot possibly be observed by all the subjects of the Messiah. For how is it possible, that the paying of vows and tythes, the presenting the first-born, the observation of the passover, pentecost, and feast of tabernacles, which were confined to the place which God had chosen, should be binding on those who are to be at a great distance from Judea? And how can men, who dwell in the utmost parts of the earth, come to Jerusalem, to offer sacrifice for every sin, and every pollution, in order to avoid the curse? How could women, newly delivered, undertake so long a journey, and present themselves in the place chosen by God, to perform the offerings commanded? Where could so many beasts, so many priests, so many altars be found, sufficient for all the sacrifices? What extent of country, much less town, could be large enough to hold such numbers? Menasse, if I rightly remember, idly talks, that then the gates of Jerusalem should be extended to Damascus; but had he extended them, which he might with equal ease, beyond the *Portæ Caspiæ*, or pass of Tefis, he would have more commodiously provided for so prodigious a conflux of people, flocking from all parts to the sacrifices. Put the case of the leprosy, and of a house infected with that plague, of which Lev. xiii. must the priests make incursions to the Scythians, the Samaritans, and the Indians; to the Britons separated from the rest of the world, and to the utmost Thule, to form a judgment of the scab or scall? To omit many other considerations, which might

with equal propriety be urged; and which Eusebius among the ancients, *Demonstr. Evangel.* lib. i. and among the moderns, Spanhemius, *Dubior. Exang.* p. 3. dub. 112. have fully and learnedly done.

LI. You may possibly alledge, that God will grant a kind of dispensation of, and relax these impossible laws. But where is there any promise to that purpose? Have not these laws been made by the same authority with the others? Is not their duration in like manner extended *LENGOLAM, for ever*, which in other respects is so much objected to us? Do not these, and the like laws, constitute the principal part of the ceremonial? And if the conscience can be set free from the obligation of these, why not also from that to the others, which are of the same nature?

LII. Shall they not cease to bind, because the observation of them is impossible, any more than we teach that the moral law is binding, though we allow the perfect performance thereof to be a thing impossible? But who does not see a very wide difference here? That the moral law cannot now be perfectly performed, is a thing accidental, owing to our corruption. That these other laws cannot be observed under the kingdom of the Messiah, arises from the nature of the laws themselves, without any default of man. And thus we have demonstrated, that the ceremonies, in so far as they are acts of the obedience prescribed by the old law, cannot be observed in the universal church, gathered together from among Jews and Gentiles, under the King Messiah.

LIII. This will be more manifest, if we, moreover, consider the *formal* of the ceremonies: thus there was a yoke in them, that must be broken off; a pedagogy, and an accusation of childhood, which cannot take place in a more advanced age. There was a partition-

wall to be broken down, when, on removing all distinction of nations, the Messiah is to be all in all; an enmity to be abolished at the time, in which the Messiah is to publish to the Gentiles, that they should have peace both with Israel and with God. There was, in fine, a hand-writing, bearing testimony concerning guilt not yet expiated, and payment not yet made. This, when all things are fulfilled by the Messiah, is to be taken out of the way, lest any institution of God should be found to testify against the truth and Son of God. Such are either ignorant of, or do overturn all the signification of the ceremonies and their true efficacy, who bind the obligation of them on the consciences, after the Messiah had perfected all things.

LIV. There now remains the *fourth* head, namely, to explain the progress and the various degrees of this abrogation, which we digest in the following order. 1. When Christ came and was manifested to Israel, the ceremonies lost much of their splendor, as when the sun in the heavens extinguisheth the stars. Nevertheless they were binding, while Christ was not yet made perfect by sufferings, but yet their abrogation was drawing near: *Jesus saith unto her, Woman, believe me, the hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem worship the Father. But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth, John iv. 21, 23.* To this purpose is that proclamation, which John several times published, that the kingdom of heaven is at hand. 2. They were abrogated in point of right by the death of Christ; for, all their typical presignification being fulfilled in Christ, and the blood of the New Testament being shed, and the guilt expiated, which they were appointed to be a charge of, with what right could ceremonies lately discarded claim any longer to

keep their former station? Hence Christ is said *to have taken the hand-writing out of the way, nailing it to his cross*, Col. ii. 14. and *to have abolished in his flesh* (on his flesh being broken by death) *the law of commandments, contained in ordinances*, Eph. ii. 15. Certainly the flesh of Christ was the veil; and while that was still entire, a new and living way was not opened to the heavenly sanctuary, Heb. x. 20. For, while Christ was not yet made perfect by sufferings, the ceremonies which required that perfection or consummation, were in full force. But whenever the utmost farthing was paid by the death of Christ, the veil and inclosure of the ceremonies being taken down, there was a free access to God; which was signified and confirmed by the renting the veil of the temple upon the death of Christ. 3. God declared, confirmed, and sealed this abrogation by the resurrection of Christ from the dead, and his ascension into heaven, and the plentiful effusion of the Holy Spirit. For the hand-writing was then discharged. He who hitherto was in bondage to the elements of the world, equally with the other worshippers of God, was placed with his people in heavenly places, where no such bondage takes place; and the Spirit was given, as the seal of a more delightful dispensation of the covenant. 4. But this liberty was for some time not sufficiently known, even to the apostles themselves, till Peter was instructed therein by a heavenly vision, Acts x. 11. 5. Then by a solemn decree of a synod of the apostles, under the presidency of the Holy Spirit, it was ordained, that a yoke was not to be put on the neck of the disciples, besides those few things necessary for that time; namely, *to abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled*; to which was subjoined, though of a

different kind, *fornication*, Acts xv. 10, 28, 29. 6. Afterwards Paul preached freedom from these things also, excepting fornication, that being contrary to the moral law, 1 Cor. viii. 4, 8. and 1 Cor. x. 25.—29. 7. Yet because the Jews, who were converted to Christ, having been accustomed to the ceremonies, were with very great difficulty drawn from them, the apostles and other believers with them, that they might not offend the weak, according to the rules of Christian charity and prudence, freely used those ceremonies, not with any opinion of holiness; but in order not to wound tender consciences, accommodating themselves to all, to gain some to Christ, see Acts xxi. 22. 8. But after that the church seemed now to be sufficiently instructed in her liberty, and the fondness for the ceremonies was no longer a degree of weakness, but of obstinacy, Paul would not give place by subjection, no not for an hour, and sharply rebuked Peter, whose conduct was rather too remiss, Gal. ii. 5, 14. and exhorted every one in particular to stand fast in the liberty, wherewith Christ had made him free, and not to be entangled again with the yoke of bondage, nor to make Christ of no effect to themselves, Gal. v. 1, 2. 9. and lastly, All the ceremonies were actually taken away at the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple, and buried as it were in their ruins, never to be revived any more. See what we have said concerning circumcision, chap. viii. § 21, &c.



## C H A P. XV.

*Of the Benefits of the New Testament.*

**A**S the darkness of the night is only dispelled by the beams of the rising morn, so the Old Testament was abrogated only by the introduction of the New. But at what time this first began to take place, by what degrees it advanced, by what intervals of time it was confirmed and completed, we have explained in the third chapter of the foregoing book. We are now, in the first place, to treat of the *benefits* of the New Testament: then of the *Sacraments*: the other particulars are obvious, from what we have spoken concerning the covenant of grace, simply considered, and by comparing with them, what we have more largely treated of concerning the Old Testament.

II. We rehearse the benefits of the New Testament in the following order. I. The first is the exhibition of the Messiah made perfect. II. The gospel under another name or designation. III. The calling of the Gentiles. IV. A more abundant and delightful measure of the Spirit. V. A greater and better liberty. VI. The restoration of Israel. VII. The revival of the whole church, as from the dead.

III. The *first* spring of our glorying, and the sum of our felicity, beyond those that expected the consolation of Israel, is, that *Christ Jesus came into the world*, 1 Tim. i. 15. He, who was promised from the beginning, shadowed forth by so many types, so ardently longed for, and for so many ages expected, came forth in the fulness of time, in that place, from that tribe and family, in that manner from a virgin, and appeared in

the flesh, just as the holy prophets had long before prophesied he should come: *Through the tender mercy of our God, whereby the day-spring from on high hath visited us, Luke i. 78. We have found him, of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph, John i. 45.* This, as the angels told the shepherds of Bethlehem, was matter of great joy; and not only Mary, and Zacharias, and Simeon, but also the whole choir of the heavenly angels celebrated this in their songs: see *Zech. ix. 9.*

IV. And the Messiah was not only exhibited, but also *made perfect through sufferings, Heb. ii. 10.* and thus being *made perfect, he became the Author of eternal salvation unto all, Heb. v. 9.* For, in the sufferings and death of Christ, there is a true expiation, a cancelling, a blotting out of our sins, a bringing in of everlasting righteousness, a tearing and removing of the hand-writing, nay, there is an eternal redemption.

V. But this was not all: for *he was also received up into glory,* and being placed in the throne of his majesty, he brought the kingdom of heaven to us, having removed every thing, by which the spiritual and mystical government of God over the conscience, which is the government of liberty, was formerly obscured. While David in spirit had this kingdom of the Messiah before him, as in a figure, he joyfully sung, *Jehovah reigneth, let the earth rejoice, let the multitude of isles be glad, Psal. xcvi. 1. Jehovah reigneth, let the people tremble, Psal. xcix. 1.* This is that kingdom of heaven, which the Baptist so often proclaimed was at hand; and concerning which our Lord declared, that there were some of his hearers, *which should not taste of death, till they saw the Son of man coming in his kingdom, Matth. xvi. 28.* It cannot but be most delightful to all that love the Lord Jesus, *to see him crowned with glory*

and honor, who was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death, Heb. ii. 9. This great benefit the apostle has set forth in these important words, 1 Tim. iii. 6. *God made manifest in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory.* And our Saviour himself has taught us, that a great part of our happiness consists in the enjoyment of this blessing, Matth. xiii. 16, 17.

VI. The second benefit is the gospel of the kingdom, which God had promised afore by his prophets in the holy scriptures, Rom. i. 2. Namely, the gospel as completed, which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him, Heb. ii. 3. For this mystery was kept secret since the world began: but now is made manifest, and, by the scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to all nations for the obedience of faith, Rom. xvi. 25, 26. Not that they had no gospel before: for even unto the ancients was the gospel formerly preached, Heb. iv. 2; but that this proclamation of future grace was *PROCUAGGELISMOS*, the gospel preached before, Gal. iii. 8. And the preaching of the present grace is eminently the gospel now. Hence it is mentioned as an argument of the presence of the Messiah, that *the poor have the gospel preached to them*, Matth. xi. 5.

VII. Moreover, the gospel of the New Testament has the following excellencies above the old. 1. That it sets forth Christ as come, and declares that all those things are fulfilled, which were formerly foretold to come to pass long after, 1 Cor. ii. 7.—10. 2. That it declares, in clear terms, every thing relating to the common salvation, without the covering of figures, or the labyrinths of dark saying, 2 Cor. iii. 14. 3. That it

now allures the hearts of believers with the sweetest and most abundant consolations, and without that severity, which, according to the old legal dispensation, mixed the words of grace with so much rigour, whence it is called *the ministration of righteousness*, 2 Cor. iii. 9. and *the word of reconciliation*, 2 Cor. v. 18. *The mouth of our beloved is most sweet*, Cant. v. 16. And Isaiah prophesied concerning his servants, chap. lii. 7. *How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings!* &c. Add Is. xl. 1. lxi. 1. & lxvi. 10.—12. 4. That it dwells now more abundantly in us, and is preached more fully and frequently, and with a greater demonstration of the Spirit, and a deeper insinuation or sinking into the conscience, Rom. x. 8.

VIII. The *third* benefit is the calling of the Gentiles by the gospel, which followed upon the Messiah's being made perfect: according to the promise, Psal. ii. 8. *Ask of me, and I shall give thee the Heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession*: likewise Is. xlix. 6. Luke ii. 40. Paul, as in other places, so especially Eph. ii. & iii. has, in a magnificent manner, set forth the perfections of God, as being illustriously displayed in this admirable work, and, above all, the unsearchable riches of the patience, goodness, and manifold wisdom of God in Christ. "And, indeed, who can but stand amazed at such a surprising thing," (we may justly exclaim with Eusebius) "to see those, who, from the beginning, paid divine honor and worship to stocks, and stones, and devils, to ravenous beasts feeding on human flesh, and to venomous reptiles, to fire and to earth, to the very inanimate elements of the universe; to see, I say, such calling on the most high God, the Creator of heaven and earth, the very Lord of the prophets, the God of Abraham and his ancestors, after the coming of our Sa-

vour?" *Demonst. Evang.* l. i. c. 6. Pray, read what follows, as it is too long to be here transcribed. This very circumstance assures us, that the Lord Jesus is the true and only Messiah, by whose word, Spirit, and ministry, so astonishing a work was accomplished; the like, or equal to which was never seen or heard, were we to go back to the remotest antiquity.

IX. But we are to observe, 1. That these things were accomplished by the apostles of Christ, and their fellow-labourers, who were not remarkable, either for any excellence of worldly wisdom, or furnished with any charms of Greek or Roman eloquence, or supported by any human assistance; but by the naked demonstration of an admirable and almost incredible truth to the conscience, while the gates of hell raged, the lords and dreaded tyrants of the world opposed, and the schools of conceited philosophers clamoured: that the glory of God and his Christ might shine forth with the greater lustre and brightness, the meaner and less adapted for the work, were the instruments he used, 1 Cor. ii. 4, 5.

X. 2. That the kingdom of Christ was set up among the Gentiles with an astonishing quickness. For *as the lightning that lighteneth out of the one part under heaven, shineth unto the other part under heaven; so shall also the Son of man be in his day*, Luke xvii. 24. Isaiah had foretold this with a kind of astonishment, chap. lxvi. 7, 8. *Before she travailed, she brought forth; before her pain came, she was delivered of a man-child. Who hath heard such a thing? who hath seen such things? shall the earth be made to bring forth in one day, or shall a nation be born at once? for as soon as Zion travailed, she brought forth her children.*

XI. 3. That this calling extended very far: Rom. x. 18. *Their sound went into all the earth, and their*

*words unto the ends of the world.* Col. i. 6, 24. Mark xvi. 20. Tertullian *adversus Judeos* says, c. 7. "In what other person besides have all the Gentiles believed but in Christ, who is now come? On whom else have the Parthians believed, the Medes, Elamites, the inhabitants of Mesopotamia, Armenia, Phrygia, Egypt, that part of Africa beyond Cyrene; the Romans; the Jews then in Jerusalem, and other nations; and at this day, the various tribes of Getulians, many parts of Mesopotamia, Spain in all its extent, the different nations of Gaul, and the parts of Britain inaccessible to the Roman arms, made subject to Christ; the Sarmatians, Dacians, Germans, and Scythians, many nations yet undiscovered, many provinces and islands unknown to you, and which we cannot enumerate? among which the name of Christ, who is now come, prevails." In a like strain has Jerome celebrated this abundance of heavenly grace, *in epitaphio Nepotiani ad Heliodorum*, and *in epist. ad Letam*; and in general, the other fathers, exulting in so great a happiness of the New Testament. Yet we are not to think, that there was no corner of the world, where the name of Christ was not preached; nor to believe, that the apostles sailed over to America, and to countries then unknown to the rest of the world: these universal expressions only intimate, that the gospel of Christ was extensively propagated, without any distinction of countries or people, on each side of the sun's course. See the expressions, Rom. i. 8. Luke ii. 5.

XII. 4. The gospel did not reach to the Gentiles, till after it was rejected and despised by the Jews: *Through their fall salvation came to the Gentiles. The fall of them was the riches of the world*, Rom. xi. 11, 12. We have an exposition of this passage, Acts xiii. 46, 47. where Paul and Barnabas speak thus: *It was*

*necessary that the word of God should first have been spoken to you (the Jews :) but seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles. For so hath the Lord commanded us, &c.* We may add Acts xviii. 6.

XIII. 5. However the polity of the Jews was not overturned, before the kingdom of the Messiah was made illustrious among the Gentiles : Matth. xxiv. 14. *And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world, for a witness unto all nations, and then shall the end come,* namely, of Jerusalem and the temple : which was very wisely so ordered. For by this means, 1. The ungrateful Jews had not the least shadow of excuse left ; for what excuse could they have for continuing in their hardness, who had seen his power, in a very short space of time, shining like lightning through the whole world ? This is Chrysostom's observation, *Serm. 76. in Mattheum.* 2. By the preaching of the gospel, he would have all the world know the crimes of the Jews, the guilt they had contracted by the parricide of Christ, and their obstinate and invincible malice, in stubbornly rejecting all offers of mercy ; before he would execute so terrible a vengeance on a people, who were under so many obligations to him ; that all nations might be obliged to adore his justice with trembling. 3. He would not cast off his ancient people by an ultimate destruction, before he had gathered, from among the Gentiles, another people for himself ; nor make the material temple an anathema, till he had built a spiritual temple of lively stones. For it was never intended, that Christ should be a King without a kingdom.

XIV. The *fourth* benefit is a more abundant and delightful measure of the Spirit, frequently foretold by

the prophets, to be sent together with, and poured out on the church by Christ. To this purpose, if I mistake not, is Zech. ix. 12. *Even to-day MAGGID MISHNEH,\* another declarer do I render unto thee. That day* is meant, on which the King of Zion had, by the blood of the covenant, set at liberty, those who were bound in Zion, and was delivered from death. At that time, MAGGID, a declarer, discoverer, or shewer forth, is promised, the participle being used as a noun : and he is indeed *another discoverer*. The first is the Son of God ; and who is the other, but the Holy Spirit ? who is also a *discoverer*, as he teaches the elect, and brings all things to their remembrance, John xiv. 26. *the next to Christ, or another comforter*, ver. 16. Him God promises *to give*, that is, in place of the Son, after he was gone to the Father, John xvi. 7. To this likewise I apply, what the Messiah says, Is. xlviii. 16. ADONAI JEHOVAH SHELACHANI VERUCHO, which is very properly translated, *The Lord God hath sent me and his Spirit*. Add the like promises, Is. xlv. 2, 3. & xxxv. 7. Joel ii. 28. The fulfilment of which is in Christ, who *baptizeth* his people *with the Holy Ghost and with fire*, Matth. iii. 11. compare John vii. 38, 39. of which passages we have spoken elsewhere.

XV. The effects of this Spirit are, 1. A more clear and distinct knowledge of the mysteries of faith, Is. xi. 9. & liv. 13. Jer. xxxi. 34. 1 John ii. 27. 2. A more generous, a more sublime, and cheerful degree of holiness, Is. xxxiii. 24. xxxv. 9. & lx. 21, 22. Zech. x. 5. & xii. 3. 3. A more delightful consolation, Is. xl. 1, 2. lx. 1, 2. lv. 11. & lxvi. 12, 13, 14. John xiv. 16. Acts

\* Our version renders, *will I render double unto thee*. Double, says a modern commentator, signifies any thing large, sufficient, plentiful, Is. xl. 2. and lxi. 7. particularly the Spirit and his grace. See Gill *in loc.* Our author here follows Cocceius.



ix. 31. Eph. i. 13. 2 Cor. i. 22. 4. A filial boldness, which is now the greater, as adoption itself, and its effects are more conspicuous, Gal. iv. 6. 5. The extraordinary and altogether miraculous gifts, which were plentifully bestowed at the beginning of the gospel, not only on the apostles, but also often on other ministers, nay, on common believers, and even virgins, Mark xvi. 16.—18. Acts x. 45, 46. xix. 6. & xxi. 8. 1 Cor. xii. 7.—11. But in what manner the New Testament is to be compared with the Old, we have frequently shewn already.

XVI. The *fifth* benefit is *Christian liberty*, which Paul, the most diligent interpreter of, and warmest advocate for, usually so considers, that he makes it generally to consist in a freedom from that bondage which the Jews were under; and he rarely treats of it, unless when he compares Christians with Jews, and sets the old dispensation in opposition to the new. Yet divines have prudently observed from Paul himself, that Christian liberty may be considered, either as common to believers in every age; or as a special immunity of the children of God, who live under the New Testament dispensation.

XVII. This common liberty consists in a manumission or freedom, 1. From the tyranny of the *devil*, whose destruction was promised, as early as in paradise, Col. i. 13. 2. From *the reigning and condemning power* of sin, Rom. vi. 14. & viii. 1. 3. From the rigour of *the law*, so far as it is contradistinguished from grace, Rom. vi. 14. For thus far it is to the sinner *the law of sin and death*, opposite to *the law of the Spirit and of life in Christ Jesus*, Rom. viii. 2. Moreover, this rigour consists, 1. In the severe demand it makes of obedience, without a promise of sanctifying grace. 2. In requiring a most perfect holiness, to be perform-

ed by man himself, as the condition of eternal life. 3. In threatening the curse for the least deviation. For so far the law belongs to the covenant of works, which, in regard to all believers, is abrogated, by the introduction of the covenant of grace. 4. In a freedom from an accursed *death*, both of *body* and *soul*. For though the *body* of believers is *dead because of sin*, Rom. viii. 10. yet death has lost its sting, 1 Cor. xv. 55. and is become the period of sin and misery, and the passage to eternal life, John v. 24. And thus far believers are freed from that death, with which God threatened sinful man, as a punishment properly so called, and the effect of his dreadful displeasure, John viii. 51, 52. Nor is the *formal* nature of punishment only removed from the death of believers; but whatever belongs to the remains of death, will at last be destroyed by a glorious resurrection, 1 Cor. xv. 54. As therefore liberty with respect to sin, as to its right, is adjudged to believers in justification, and as to its power, performed gradually and by some certain steps; the same also is the case with respect to corporal death; the curse and penalty of which, so to speak, are removed, as soon as the person is ingrafted into Christ by faith, who is the fountain of life, but at the last day all its powers will be swallowed up in victory. 5. From *human empire*, or constraint, with respect to divine worship, and the actions of religion, as such: for God alone has dominion over the conscience, James iv. 12. Nor is it lawful for the sons of God, who know themselves to be bought with a price, to become the servants of men, 1 Cor. vii. 23. Matth. xv. 9. Col. ii. 18, 22, 23. Though formerly the scribes and Pharisees sat in Moses's chair, yet God never gave them a power, to load the conscience with new institutions, beyond and besides the law of God, to which all were equally bound, Deut. iv. 2.

& xii. 34. All the authority of the doctors of the law tended to keep the people to the observance of the law of Moses; Christ justly rebuked them, when they went beyond that. Whatever man has devised from his own invention, in matters of religion, has ever been displeasing to God. 6. From the obligation to things *indifferent*, which are neither good nor bad in themselves, and which God has neither commanded nor forbidden. When the knowledge and sense of this liberty is wanting, the conscience, in that case, is disquieted, and superstition has neither measure nor end, Rom. xiv. 5, 14, 23. The *possession*, however, is to be distinguished from the *use*; the *right* from the *exercise* of it: the former ought ever to remain inviolable to the conscience, the latter to be circumscribed by the rules of prudence and charity, to avoid giving offence to weak brethren, 1 Cor. vi. 12. 2 Cor. x. 13. Rom. xiv. 19.

XVIII. The liberty we have thus described, absolutely belongs to the benefits of the covenant of grace; and should not be reckoned among those which are peculiar to the New Testament; unless so far as it is more clearly explained, more frequently insisted upon, more effectually and abundantly applied by the Spirit of Christ, and insinuated into the conscience for the greater consolation and joy, and finally demonstrated by more glorious effects. For, as I imagine, none will question, that the rigour of the old œconomy greatly obscured the sense and joy of that liberty, which believers in other respects enjoyed. At least none will deny, that the liberty, as to things in their own nature indifferent, was greatly diminished by the institutions of Moses.

XIX. That liberty, therefore, which is peculiar to the New Testament is, 1. A discharge from *the bondage of the elements of the world*, or of the ancient cere-

monies, from whose religious obligation, as of things necessary, the consciences of men were first set free, Acts xv. 10. though their arbitrary use continued for some time, and might with prudence be advised, Acts xxi. 24. Afterwards their use was entirely forbid, so that now we are to abstain from them altogether, Gal. iii. 25. iv. 5, 26. & v. 1. For, from being in force, first losing their vigour, they of necessity become arbitrary: afterwards, from being dead they become hurtful and deadly; and from being arbitrary become unlawful, never to be revived, after the full promulgation of the gospel, and the destruction of the temple of Jerusalem, which was the seat of the ceremonies. 2. Liberty with respect to many *things indifferent in their own nature*, the use of or abstinence from which was formerly enjoined the Israelites, Tit. i. 15. Col. i. 20, 21. 1 Cor. x. 25. 3. Immunity from the *forensic or judicial laws of the Israelites*; not as they were of universal, but as of particular right or obligation, made for the Jews as such, distinguishing them from other nations, adapted to the genius of the people and country, and subservient, for the greatest part, to the Levitical priesthood, with which almost the whole polity was interwoven. 4. There is a clearer and more perfect promulgation, knowledge, and practice of Christian liberty, in all its parts and degrees.

XX. *Sixthly*, We may reckon among the benefits of the New Testament the restoration of the Israelites, who were formerly rejected, and the bringing them back to the communion of God in Christ. Paul has unfolded this mystery to the Gentiles, Rom. xi. 25, 26, 27. *For I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery (lest ye should be wise in your own conceits) that blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in. And so all Is-*

*rael shall be saved : as it is written, There shall come out of Sion the deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob. For this is my covenant unto them, when I shall take away their sins.*

XXI. On this place observe, 1. That the apostle here explains some *mystery* ; that is, a secret thing, not known but by revelation, and taken notice of by few, and happening beyond the expectation and judgment of reason ; in fine, the whole method and manner of executing which lies in a great measure concealed : see 1 Cor. ii. 7. & xv. 51. and Eph. iii. 3. 2. That it is the interest of the Gentiles to be acquainted with this mystery, to prevent their entertaining higher thoughts concerning themselves, and lower concerning the Israelites : we are therefore to take care, to inquire diligently, and with attention, into what the prophets have foretold concerning this matter. 3. The apostle here speaks of the people of Israel, not figuratively, but properly so called ; who were at this time blind, obdurate, stupid, and hardened, of which ver. 7. Isaiah foretold this judgment of God against Israel at large, chap. vi. 9, 10. compared with Acts xxviii. 26. Is. xxix. 10, 11. To this also seems applicable, *that whirlwind of the Lord, that fury, and continuing whirlwind, which shall abide on the head of the wicked,* of which, Jer. xxx. 23. In short, this is that forlorn condition of the blinded nation of Jews, which, taking its rise in the apostles time, continues to this our day. 4. That this blindness is *in part* happened to Israel. The whole nation, from its first origin even to the end of the world, is considered as one whole ; a certain part of which are those, who either have, or now do, or hereafter shall live in the days of the wrath and indignation of God, *Blindness has seized that part only.* 5. That blindness is to continue upon them no longer

*that till the fulness of the Gentiles be come in ; that is, till the gospel is preached among all nations of the world whatever. Which, indeed, began to be done by the apostles and their fellow-labourers ; but could not be done perfectly, both on account of the extent of the world, and the shortness of human life, and likewise because many nations (as all the American) were at that time unknown. This therefore still remains to be done successively ; God in his admirable providence paving the way for his word. The offer of grace was first made to the Israelites. When they refused it, it was sent to the Gentiles ; but when the fulness of them shall be brought in, it will be again given to the Israelites ; that the last may be first, and the first last, Luke xiii. 30. see Luke xxi. 24. 6. That when the fulness of the Gentiles is brought in, all Israel shall be saved : that is, as our Dutch commentators well observe, not a few, but a very great number, and in a manner the whole Jewish nation, in a full body. Peter Martyr has judiciously explained the fulness of the Gentiles, and the whole body of Israel, in the following words : “ But we are to understand a limited fulness, and a fixed or determined collection : which is therefore called fulness, because there will be an exact and a very great number of believers, so that the church shall be publicly owned, and had in great esteem among the Gentiles : just as all Israel is to be taken for a great number of Jews, among whom Christ should be publicly acknowledged : not that some, as well of the Gentiles as Jews, shall not be lost.”*

XXII. From what we have said before, it appears, that they depart from the apostle's meaning, who, by *all Israel*, understand the *mystical Israel*, or the people of God, consisting both of Jews and Gentiles, without admitting the conversion of the whole Jewish na-

tion to Christ, in the sense we have mentioned. Notwithstanding this may be confirmed by the following arguments. 1. The apostle speaks of that Israel, to whom he ascribes his own pedigree, ver. 1. whom he calls his flesh, that is, his kindred, ver. 14. and the natural branches, ver. 21. whom he constantly distinguishes from the Gentiles; to whom, he testifies, blindness has happened. All this is applicable to Israel properly so called. 2. He lays before us a mystery: but it was no mystery, that a very few Jews were converted to Christ together with the Gentiles; for we have daily instances of that. 3. He reminds the Gentiles, not to exult over, or despise the Jews, from this argument, that, as they themselves were now taken in among the people of God, so, in like manner, the Jews were in due time to be taken in again. But if the apostle meant, that the body of the Jewish nation was to continue in their hardness; and but a few of them to be saved, who, joined to the Gentiles, should form a mystical Israel, the whole of that discourse would be more adapted to the commendation of the Gentiles, than of the Israelites; and encourage rather than repress the pride of the Gentiles. 4. As the fall and diminishing of Israel, ver. 12. and their casting away, ver. 15. are to be understood; so likewise the receiving and saving them; for here the rules of a just opposition must be observed. But the fall, diminishing, and casting away of Israel are to be understood of the generality of the Jewish nation; therefore the receiving and saving of Israel in like manner.

XXIII. From which it is evident, that Grotius trifles, when he is positive, that this prophecy was fulfilled at that time when the idols and military ensigns of the Romans were openly seen in the temple; because

that then many, who had embraced Christianity, together with those who had been Christians before, were exempted from the following calamities. To which was added, the conversion of many Jews, upon the destruction of the city and temple, since now the truth of Christ's predictions appeared in a much clearer light, and the galling yoke of personal bondage had broke the obstinacy of many, as Vespasian and Titus put no bar in the way : for proving this he quotes a passage from Justin, *adversus Tryphonem*. But such absurd imaginations are contrary to the light of all history. For, during the siege, the whole of the Jewish nation, which was all over plunged in their guilt and perfidy, were made to suffer the just punishment of their sins. Which is very far from that salvation, which Paul here assures us of. If any joined the Christians at that time, their number was so inconsiderable, compared with the rest, as that it is ridiculous to give them the name of *all* Israel. Justin says nothing, but that "*some* of them being daily instructed in the name of Christ, had quitted the way of error : " which differs very much from all Israel. We may add, that, by that fancy of Grotius, the times of casting away and receiving are entirely confounded. For never was the breaking off and cutting away the natural branches more palpably seen, according to the Baptist's prophecy, Matth. iii. 10. than at the time that Grotius imagines they were grafted in.

XXIV. In fine, the prophetic testimony alledged by the apostle from Is. lix. 20. confirms our explanation : where the Hebrew words properly denote, *The Redeemer shall come LETZION, to Zion*, or, according to the Septuagint, HENEKEN SION, *on account of Zion, and unto them that turn from defection in Jacob*. Paul, generally following the Septuagint, has rendered the



words somewhat differently, but to the same purpose and meaning.

XXV. Observe, 1. That the apostle here very justly explains Zion and Jacob of the Jews; for these are the natural sons of Jacob, natives, citizens of Zion; the others are only naturalized: that name therefore primarily and of itself agrees to them. And then also he speaks of those with whom the covenant was made; as it is said in the text, ver. 21. *This is my covenant with them*: but that testament and covenant belong to Israel, *whose are the covenants and promises*, Rom. ix. 4. see Lev. xxvi. 44, 45. Moreover, Zion and Jacob denote, not some few of Israel, but the whole body of that nation, as Gen. xlix. 7. For in Zion all the tribes had a right, Psal. cxxii. 4.

XXVI. 2. The *Goel*, is promised to Zion, that is, the Kinsman Redeemer, who can justly say, *These are mine*, and that in right of consanguinity, for I am the nearest kinsman. True it is, Christ may be called the *Goel* and near kinsman of all nations, on account of his being of the same human nature with them, which he assumed: yet he is chiefly and first of all the *Goel* of Israel, because of them are the fathers, of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, Rom. ix. 5. And therefore, perhaps, the apostle said, the Redeemer shall come *out of Zion*: for as the relation, which is expressed by the term, *Goel*, could not be set forth by the Greek, *RUOMENOS*, he was willing, by this means, to make up the imperfection of the Greek language, by intimating, that the Redeemer was in such a manner to come to Zion, as at the same time, with respect to his human nature, to come out of Zion. The advent of the Deliverer supposes also such a time, in which other lords, besides Jehovah, were to rule over Zion, Is. xxvi. 13. from

whose illegal dominion he was, with a stretched-out arm, to set free and deliver his people.

XXVII. 3. The work of this Redeemer will be *to turn away iniquity from Jacob*. In the Hebrew it runs, *He shall come to those that return from defection*. The meaning is the same : he will impart his grace and salvation to those, who, by a true faith and repentance, shall return unto God. And as they cannot give this repentance to themselves, the Redeemer will bestow it upon them ; see Acts v. 31. Not only the Greeks have thus rendered the words of the prophet, but also the Chaldee, *and to turn the rebellious of the house of Jacob to the law*. And to this purpose is what follows in Is. lix. 21. concerning giving the Spirit of God in Israel, and the putting his word in their mouth. The sum of the whole is, that, by the efficacy of the Redeemer, the Jews are in due time to be converted from their rebellion and transgressions.

XXVIII. 4. As this is not yet accomplished, as to the whole body of the Israelites, and yet the scripture must be fulfilled, the apostle has justly inferred, that in the last times it will be perfectly fulfilled. For seeing the foundation thereof is God's covenant with Israel, and this a firm covenant, stable, immutable, and suspended on no ambiguous condition (for what condition could that covenant admit, which allots both remission of sins and repentance to Israel?) it is not possible, but that every thing shall happen exactly according to the promise and prediction : *And this is my covenant with them, saith God*. But concerning this covenant he speaks as follows, Is. liv. 10. *For the mountains shall depart, and the hills be removed, but my kindness shall not depart from thee, neither shall the covenant of my peace be removed, saith Jehovah, that hath mercy on thee*. And again Jer. xxxiii. 25, 26. *Thus saith Jehovah, If my co-*

*venant be not with day and night, and if I have not appointed the ordinances of heaven and earth: then will I cast away the seed of Jacob, and David my servant.* Add Psal. cv. 8, 9. and Deut. iv. 31. All this being addressed to the whole body of the nation, it must of necessity be fulfilled at the appointed time.

XXIX. 5. But because some perhaps might think that those horrid crimes, of which the Israelites had been guilty, might hinder that blessing of God from coming to them; the apostle adds a testimony, whereby God promises to take away their sins; which cannot but be accompanied with repentance and faith in the Messiah, and the communication of his grace. True, indeed, it is, we have not those words in Is. liv. But yet they are in Is. xxvii. 9. where the Greek version has the very words, *HOFAN APHELOMAI TAS HAMARTIAS AUTON.* It is not unusual with the apostle to collect several testimonies into one, and to explain the words of one passage by those of another. And indeed this observation was of great importance: for, if any thing should seem to stand in the way of the restoration of the Jews, it was their extreme impiety. Wherefore there are frequent promises concerning the expiation of the crimes they had committed, as Deut. xxxii. 19. Jer. xxxiii. 8. & l. 20.

XXX. Some perhaps may say, Are there not clearer expressions in proof of this matter in the prophets? Why then does the apostle pitch upon these, the force and cogency of which does not at first sight appear? I answer, there are such, which we shall presently produce: but here the supreme and admirable wisdom of the Holy Spirit shines forth, partly, because, by selecting these, he would bring us to consider entire prophecies, which, as it were, he points out to us, and of such a nature as to give full conviction of this matter;

partly, that, by arguing from prophecies less evident, he might constrain us to give credit to such as are more clear and express. For who will take upon him to wrest to a different meaning such evident testimonies, as by the very sound of their words lead to this sense, when he observes, that Paul draws his reasons from such as seemed much more remote from the purpose?

XXXI. Should any one desire clearer testimonies, we offer the following to his consideration: from Moses, Lev. xxvi. 41.—45. Deut. iv. 30, 31. xxx. 1.—6. & xxxii. 43. From the Psalms, Psal. cii. 14.—18. & lxxxv. 9, 10. From Isaiah, Is. xi. 11, 12. xix. 24, 25. xlix. 14, &c. & lxii. throughout. From Jeremiah, Jer. iii. 18, &c. xxxi. 1. and ver. 31. to the end, xxxii. 37, &c. & xxxiii. 24.—26. From Ezekiel, Ezek. xxxvi. 24. to the end, xxxvii. throughout, especially from ver. 15. & xxxix. 25. to the end. Add Hosea, chap. iii. 5. All these promises are more sublime, than that the time can be assigned, in which they can be supposed to have been as yet fulfilled. From the New Testament, add Matth. xxiii. 29. Luke xxi. 24. 2 Cor. iii. 16. The reader may please to see what we have said on this head in a particular book concerning the ten tribes of Israel, from chap. ix. to the end;—where he will find most of those prophecies carefully, and at greater length explained.

XXXII. As from all this it is evident, we are to expect the general conversion of the Israelites in time to come, not indeed of every individual, but of the whole body of the nation, and of the twelve tribes; we chuse not to multiply minute questions, either out of curiosity, or incredulity, concerning the time, place, manner, means, and the like circumstances of this mystery, which God has reserved in his own power. Let us maintain the thing itself, and leave the manner of it to

God. We shall then best of all understand those obscure prophecies which describe it, when we shall be able to compare the event with them. Our Calvin, as his manner is, speaks with prudence and gravity : “ Whenever the longer delay is apt to throw us into despair, let us recollect the name *mystery*, by which Paul clearly puts us in mind, that this conversion is not to be in the ordinary or usual manner : and therefore they act amiss, who attempt to measure it by their own private sentiments. For what more perverse, than to account incredible, what falls not in with our opinion? being therefore called a *mystery*, because incomprehensible, until the time of its revelation. Moreover, it is revealed to us, as it was to the Romans, that our faith, acquiescing in the word, may support our expectation, until the effect itself be made manifest.” We shall conclude these things with the wish and words of Maimonides at the end of his *More Necochim* : “ But may the great and good God himself purify all Israel, according to his promise : then the eyes of the blind will be opened. The people sitting in darkness have seen a great light : to those who sat in the shadow of death, the light is arisen.”

XXXIII. *Lastly*, To this restoration of Israel shall be joined the riches of the whole church, and, as it were, life from the dead, Rom. xi. 12. *Now, if the fall of them be the riches of the world, and the diminishing of them the riches of the Gentiles ; how much more their fulness ?* and ver. 15. *For if the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be, but life from the dead ?* The apostle intimates, that much greater and more extensive benefits shall rebound to the Christian church from the fulness and restoration of the Jews, than did to the Gentiles, from their fall and diminution : greater, I

say, *intensively*, or with respect to degrees, and larger with respect to *extent*.

XXXIV. As to *intenseness* or degrees, it is supposed, that, about the time of the conversion of the Jews, the Gentile world will be like a *dead person*, in a manner almost as Christ describes the church of Sardis, Rev. iii. 1, 2. namely, both that light of saving knowledge, and that fervent piety, and that lively and vigorous simplicity of ancient Christianity, will, in a course of years, be very much impaired. Many nations, who had formerly embraced the gospel with much zeal, afterwards almost extinguished by the venom of Mahometanism, Popery, Libertinism, and Atheism, verify this prophecy. But, upon the restoration of the Jews, these will suddenly arise, as out of the grave : a new light will shine upon them, a new zeal be kindled up ; the life of Christ be again manifested in his mystical body, more lively, perhaps, and vigorous than ever. Then, doubtless, many scripture-prophecies will, after their accomplishment, be better understood ; and such as now appear dark riddles, shall then be found to contain a most distinct description of facts. Many candles joined together give a greater light : a new fire laid near another, gives a greater heat. And such will the accession of the Jews be to the church of the Gentiles.

XXXV. And not only so, but also many nations, among whom the name of Christ had long before been forgotten, shall be seen to flock again to the standard of salvation then erected. For there is a certain fullness of the Gentiles, to be gathered together by the successive preaching of the gospel, which goes before the restoration of Israel, of which ver. 25. and another richness of the Gentiles, that comes after the recovery of Israel. For while the gospel, for many ages, was published now to this, then to that nation, others gra-

dually departed from Christ : but when the fulness of the Jews is come in, it is altogether probable, that these nations will, in great numbers, return to Christ. An almost innumerable multitude of Jews reside in Asia and Africa, among the Persians, Turks, Indians, Chinese, Japonnese, and Tartars. When therefore, by the almighty hand of God, these shall be brought to the communion of the Messiah, their love to him will be the more ardent, as their hatred against him had been formerly more bitter. And is it not more than probable, that the nations, among whom they live, being excited by their example and admonitions, shall come into the fellowship of the same faith ? Certainly the words of the apostle leads us to this.

XXXVI. Agreeably to which James has said, Acts xv. 15, 17. *And to this agree the words of the prophets ; as it is written, After this I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down ; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up : that the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord, who doth all these things.* The reparation of the fallen tabernacle of David, signifies the restoration of true and spiritual worship among the Israelites. And when that shall come to pass, the rest of mankind, who never gave up their names to Christ, and the nations, upon whom his name was formerly called, but who, by their thoughtlessness, lost the benefit of the gospel, will then with emulation seek the Lord.

XXXVII. And what is more evident than that prophecy in Isaiah ? The prophet, chap. lix. 20, 21. having foretold the restoration of Israel, according to the apostle's commentary, immediately, chap. lx. 1. exclaims, *Arise, shine, for thy light is come, and the glory*

of Jehovah is risen upon thee. ver. 3. *And the Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising, &c.* Moreover, the riches of the church at that time are described, ver. 17. *For brass I will bring gold, and for iron I will bring silver, and for wood brass, and for stones iron.* The most magnificent words to the same purpose follow these. From the consideration of which Peter Martyr has said, “that, indeed, according to almost all the prophets, especially Isaiah, the happiness of the church will be great : which it has not yet attained to, but it is probable that it will then” (on the conversion of the Jews) “attain to it.” We have not indeed the least doubt, that there are many prophecies both in the Old and New Testament to this purpose, the full meaning of which we ardently pray the Supreme Being may teach his people by the event, the only undoubted interpreter of prophecies. ’Tis however our duty to be modest on the head, and not rashly intrude into the secrets of providence, nor boldly abuse what we are neither allowed to know, nor suffered to search into.

---

## C H A P. XVI.

### *Of Baptism.*

**T**HE ordinary *sacraments* of the New Testament are only two ; *baptism* and the *Lord’s supper*. These are signalized by the express institution of our King. These were made use of by our Lord himself, to set us an example, and by this use they were consecrated to the elect. These are recommended to the Corinthians, as excellent privileges of the New Testament church ;



and two like them, but of an extraordinary nature, were granted to Israel in the wilderness, 1 Cor. x. 1.—4. These are held forth by the apostle, 1 Cor. xii. 13. as sacred seals of the union and communion of believers, both with Christ, and with one another; and if there were any more of the kind, the apostle, according to his usual accuracy and diligence, would not have passed them over in silence. These, in short, are sufficient to signify and seal the fulness of grace we have in Christ. For as two things are requisite to complete our happiness; first, that we being absolved from our sins, and washed from our pollution, may be regenerated by the communication of the Spirit of Christ to a new life of grace; and then that we may be nourished in that life of grace, that is, sustained, strengthened, and increased therein, until we be promoted to the life of glory: both these are sufficiently confirmed to us by these two sacraments. Our first ingrafting into Christ, and our regeneration by his Spirit, are set forth by baptism; and the nourishment of our spiritual life by the holy supper.

II. Concerning both these sacraments of the New Testament, we are to observe, that something corresponding to them, but only of ecclesiastical use, not of divine institution, was practised by the ancient Israelites. And herein the Lord Jesus discovers his exceeding great wisdom and goodness, that he would not discompose the weak minds of his people, by too much innovation, but retained the ancient rites, established them by his own authority, and rendered them more illustrious, by their signifying the most noble and mystical things, which depended wholly on his own institution.

III. And with respect to *baptism*, of which we are first to speak; it appears, that there was a twofold

baptism in use among the Jews; the one of which they called *the baptism of uncleanness, or of lustration*, whereby legal uncleanness was washed away; the other, *the baptism of proselytism or initiation*, whereby those of the Gentiles who were converted to Judaism, were initiated into the church of Israel. Omitting the former, which is not so material to the present subject, we shall mention a few things concerning the latter.

IV. When a Gentile was received into the Israelitish covenant, and, as the Jews speak, became a proselyte of righteousness, three ceremonies of initiation were used, without which even the Israelites themselves, according to their received notion, could not enter into that covenant; to wit, *circumcision, baptism, and sacrifice*. And the Jewish masters have fixed it as a law, that this baptism is so necessary, that without it, as much as without circumcision, there can be no proselytism; but this along with sacrifice is all the initiation that is necessary in the case of a female proselyte.

V. The manner of baptism among the Israelites was this. 1. They examined the proselyte, who was to be initiated, with respect to the sincerity of his conversion to Judaism: whether he desired to make a profession thereof, from the hopes of riches or honors in a flourishing republic; or from fear; or from an affection for an Israelitess; or any other such like motive that was not good. And after he declared, that his motive was the alone regard he had for God, and an unfeigned love to the divine law, they instructed him in the several articles thereof; as concerning the unity of God, the abominable nature of idolatry, the reward of obedience, and concerning the future world, and other heads of their divinity. Which after he solemnly professed to receive without the least exception, he was directly circumcised. 2. After the wound of circumcision was

perfectly healed, he was led to baptism ; which was not performed, but in the presence of triumvirs, or three men, who were the disciples of the wise *who could exercise judgments*, that is, Israelites of the purest blood. It was their business not only to take care, that every thing was duly performed, and to testify concerning this due performance, according to the practice of their ancestors ; but further to instruct the person to be baptized, and already placed in the water, concerning some more, and some less, important precepts of the law. Such triumvirs are generally in scripture called *Elohim*. Christ in like manner declares, that, in the baptism of the New Testament, the *Elohim* are present, Matth. xxviii. 19. who are called the three witnesses in heaven, 1 John v. 7. 3. It was unlawful to administer baptism but in a natural *current or collection of waters* ; as a river, lake, fountain : because, according to them, none could be duly baptized in water fetched from any place, and received in artificial receptacles. 4. The entire body was to be plunged at once : for if but the tip of a finger was undipt, such a person was accounted to remain still in his uncleanness. Yet it was not necessary, that the person to be baptized should put off all his cloaths, provided they were such as the water could easily penetrate. 5. But we are especially to observe, that even little children were baptized, generally at the same time with their parents. For thus it is said in *Talmud Babylon. tit. Erub. fol. 11. c. 1.* “ They baptize the little young proselyte, in consequence of the mind of the sanhedrim.”

VI. The effect of this initiation was, 1. That a person so baptized, *being taken out from among the body of the Gentiles*, was accounted *a son of the covenant* who was permitted to come, and have a safe retreat, under the wings of the Divine Majesty. 2. He was look

ed upon as one that was new born. Hence that common saying in the Talmud, “Whenever one becomes a proselyte, he is accounted an infant newly born.” For they suppose, that some new soul, instead of his Gentile soul, is sent down, from some palace in heaven, into the body of the proselyte, after he is once come under the wings of the Divine Majesty, and honored with his kiss. Assertions, which either have no meaning, or enigmatically signify regeneration by the Spirit of God. 3. The consequence of this regeneration was a new kindred ; so that he was not to look upon his former relatives (as brothers, sisters, parents, children) as belonging to him ; nay, after this regeneration, he was to have no more any Heathen kindred, or stand related to those born in the time of Gentilism ; just as, by the imperial law, all servile relation ceased upon manumission. Hence Tacitus says, *Hist. lib. v.* “Nor do they entertain any notion more than that of making no account of their parents, children, brethren.” With which may be compared Luke xiv. 26.

VII. They make the first practice of this baptism to be very ancient. Some ascribe it to the patriarch Jacob, when he received into his family and domestic church the Shechemite young women and other Gentiles, who resided with him : because it is said, Gen. xxxv. 2. *Then Jacob said unto his household, and to all that were with him, Put away the strange gods that are among you, and be clean, and change your garments.* Where Aben Ezra explains the words, *Be clean*, by the *washing of the body*. Others derive the first testimony, or practice, of this baptism, from what is said to Moses, Exod. xix. 10. *Go unto the people, and sanctify them to-day, and to-morrow, and let them wash their cloaths.* And again, ver. 14. *And he sanctified the people, and they washed their cloaths.* Thus they

would have the washing of the persons to be included in, or set forth by the washing of their cloaths. But these things are uncertain. They would have spoken more to the purpose, had they observed with Paul, that the Israelites *were baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea*, 1 Cor. x. 1, 2. of which we have formerly spoken at large. It is more probable, what they say elsewhere, that in the time of David and Solomon, when the republic of Israel was in its most flourishing state, a great number of proselytes was initiated by baptism. Whoever would know more of this baptism, and learn the testimonies of the Jews themselves, may consult Selden *de jure nat. & gent.* lib. ii. c. 2. & 4. as also *de successionibus adleges Hebræor.* c. 26; and again, *de synedriis*, lib. i. c. 3. and Lightfoot on Matth. iii. 6; also *Altingii dissertat. de proselytis*, thes. 27. seq.

VIII. But whatever be the case as to the antiquity of that rite, no divine institution can be assigned for it prior to John, the harbinger of Christ, who was sent by God to baptize. For this was expressly given him in charge, *The word of the Lord came unto John*, Luke iii. 2. John i. 33. From this, however, it appears, whence it came, that the Scribes and Pharisees are never said to have found fault with John for his baptism, but that they only asked him, by what and whose authority he baptized? John i. 25. hence also it was, that such numbers of people flocked to his baptism: for he was celebrated both for his piety and doctrine; nor did he use a new rite; he taught, that the kingdom of heaven, which was ardently longed for and expected by all at that time, was at hand; exhorted every one that came to him, to suffer himself to be initiated therein, as it was now at the door, by taking upon him his baptism, and by a profession of repentance. From that time baptism was of divine institution among the Jews.

IX. But it was not yet a sacrament of the New Testament : for as the whole of John's ministry was, as it were, something intermediate between both testaments, and tended to prepare the way for the Lord, the author and herald of the New Testament ; so, in like manner, his baptism initiated the penitent and believing into the kingdom of heaven ; which, indeed, was near, but not yet actually come, Mark i. 2.—8. Hence Tertullian, *adv. Marcionem*, lib. iv. c. 33. calls “ John the boundary set between the old and new, at which Judaism should terminate, and from which Christianity should begin.” Nazianzenus also, *Orat.* 39. *quæ est in sancta lumina*, calls him “ the middle person between the Old and New Testaments.” Yet his ministry belonged rather to the New, than to the Old Testament : as a forerunner is rightly judged to be of and with that king, whom he precedes. Whence the baptism of John is by the author of *Quæst. ad orthodoxos*, which we have in Justin Martyr's works, *quæst.* 37. called the *proem* or introduction to the *gospel of grace*. To which that baptism came nearest, which John administered unto the faith of the Messiah, now present, and manifesting himself to Israel, John i. 29, 31.

X. I take the first baptism of the New Testament to have been that which was administered by Christ's disciples, at the command of their Master, for a confession of the presence of the Messiah, John iii. 22. Yet at that time it was confined, for the most part, to the Jews. But it was made a sacrament of the universal church, after the New Testament was sealed by Christ's blood, and confirmed by his resurrection, to be preached all over the world by the apostles, who were very soon to be baptized with the Holy Ghost, *Matth.* xxviii. 19.

XI. John's baptism differed from that administered by Christ's disciples, not in essence, but in circumstances only. For, 1. Both were from heaven, and grounded on God's command: which we are sure of with respect to Christ's baptism, and as to John's appears from John i. 33. Luke vii. 30. Matth. xxi. 25. 2. In both there was a dipping in water, Matth. iii. 11. Acts viii. 26. 3. Both administered into the faith and confession of Christ, Acts xiv. 4, 5. 4. Both were a sign and seal of the remission of sins, Matth. iii. 6. Luke iii. 3. Acts ii. 28. 5. In the participation of both, there was an obligation to repentance on the person: see the last text. Nevertheless they differ, 1. In that John's baptism was indeed from God, but not from Christ, as the incarnate Mediator, acting as the King of his church. 2. In that, as we have said, it was rather a preparation for, than a sacrament of the New Testament. Basil in his treatise, "How a person is baptized with the baptism, which is in the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ," distinguishing between John's and Christ's baptism, ingeniously writes, "The baptism of the former was introductory," or initiatory; "that of the latter perfective." 3. In that God communicated therein a more sparing measure of the Spirit; whereas, in the beginning of the gospel, the gift of tongues and prophecy, which in scripture comes under the appellation *Spirit*, was conferred on very many who were baptized with Christ's baptism.

XII. But we are principally to treat concerning this baptism, which has Christ for its author. For the fuller understanding of which, we are distinctly to explain, I. The external *sign*. II. The spiritual *thing signified*. In the *sign* we are to distinguish between the *element* and the *ceremony*, or sacred rite employed about the

element. The *element* here to be used, is true, plain, natural *water* : such as John baptized with, Matth. iii. 6, 16. John iii. 23. the apostles and others, as Acts viii. 28. & x. 40. Accordingly, Eph. v. 26. it is called *the washing of water*. The sacred rite consists, I. In the application of the water to the body of the person to be baptized. II. In pronouncing a certain form of words.

XIII. Concerning the former it is queried, whether baptism may be duly administered by *immersion* only, or also by *effusion* of the water out of a vessel, or by *aspersion* or sprinkling? To which we answer in the following positions. 1. It is certain, that both John and the disciples of Christ ordinarily used dipping; whose example was followed by the ancient church: as Vossius, *disput 1. de baptismo, thes. 6.* and Hoornbeck *de baptismo veterum, sect. 4.* have shewn from many testimonies both of the Greeks and Latins. 2. It cannot be denied, but the native signification of the words BAPTEIN and BAPTIZEIN, is to *plunge* or *dip*: so as to be altogether something more than EPIPOLAZEIN, *to float on the surface*; but less than DUNEIN, *to go to the bottom* and perish; as Vossius remarks, *thes. 1. ibid.* However, I have observed, that the term KATADUSIS, *going to the bottom*, is frequently used by the ancients in the matter of baptism. Athanasius, *Quest. 94. TO KATADUSAI TO PAIDION EN TE KOLUMBETHRA, &c.* “The going down or dipping of the child in the bath.” And Sozomen, *lib. vi. c. 26.* has charged Eunomius with a heresy, for teaching, that “the sacrament of baptism ought to be performed by once dipping.” Similar examples are every where to be met with. Salmasius, in his observations on Sulpitius Severus, *de vita Martini, c. 15.* has made the following observation: “BAPTEIN, from which BAPTIZEIN, sig-



nifics immersion, not aspersion; nor did the ancients baptize any but by dipping, either once or thrice, except clinics, or persons confined to a sick-bed, because these were baptized in a manner they could bear; not in an entire font, as they who put their head under water, but their body was sprinkled all over, *Cypr. iv. epist. 7.* Thus when Novatus, in his sickness, received baptism, he was but sprinkled all over, *Euseb. vi. hist. c. 43.* Nor are we to conceal, 3. That there is a greater copiousness of signification, and a fuller similitude between the sign and the thing signified in immersion; as we shall shew, when we come to that point.

4. Nay, that immersion may be performed in cold countries, without any great danger of health and life, appears from the example of the Russians, who plunge the children that are to be baptized three times all over: not believing, that baptism can be duly performed any other way; and never use lukewarm water, but for persons infirm. As the Muscovite writers relate at large, in Georgius Fehlavius, *Annotationes ad enchiridion Christophori Angeli de statu hodiernorum Græcorum, p. 470. seq.*

5. But that if cold water should be thought more inconvenient or dangerous, it may be warmed: which the said Christophorus Angelus testifies, c. 24. is done among the Greeks. “The Greeks,” says he, “keep in their churches a kind of large vessels called *baptisteries*, that is, vessels so large as are sufficient to admit the infant to be plunged all over therein.” When therefore any child is to be dipt in this font, “the relations of the infant first of all warm the water with some odoriferous herbs.” And if the water was in like manner warmed in our climate, there would seem to be no such great hazard in the dipping of persons to be baptized.

XIV. 6. But then we are not to imagine, that immersion is so necessary to baptism, as that it cannot be duly performed by pouring water all over, or by aspersion; for both the method of pouring, and that of aspersion, are not without arguments for them. 1. Tho' we find the apostles dipped, it does not follow they always observed this method. It is more probable, the three thousand, who were baptized in one day, Acts ii. 41. had the water poured or sprinkled on them, rather than that they were dipt. For it is not likely, that men, who were so much employed in preaching, as the apostles were, could have leisure for so tedious an immersion of so many thousands. Nor is it probable, that Cornelius, Lydia, and the jailor, who were baptized in private houses, with their families, had baptisteries at hand, in which they could be plunged all over. Instances of pouring the water over persons are brought from antiquity by Vossius, *Disput. 1. de baptis. th. 9.* Which Joshua Arndius, without mentioning Vossius, has inserted in the same order in his *Lexicon antiquitat. ecclesiast. p. 66.* 2. Though BAPTIZEIN properly signifies to plunge or dip, yet it is also more generally used for any washing, as Luke xi. 38. Well therefore says Dominicus, a Soto, *Distinct. 3. quest. un. art. 7.* "In baptism there is something essential, as the washing, according to Eph. v. 26. where the apostle calls baptism *the washing of water*: something accidental, namely, the washing in this or the other manner." 3. The thing signified by baptism is explained both in the Old and New Testament by the terms of pouring water over, and of aspersion. Concerning pouring water over see Is. xlv. 3. concerning aspersion, Is. lii. 15. Ezek. xxxvi. 25. Heb. xii. 24. 1 Pet. i. 2. I deny not, that, in these quotations, there is an allusion to the Levitical sprinklings; yet from them it appears that the applica-

tion of the blood and Spirit of Christ, which believers of the New Testament enjoy, is properly shadowed forth by the rite of aspersion. To this the apostle leads us in express terms, Heb. ix. 13, 14. *For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer, sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ purge your conscience from dead works?* 4. We add, that the whole nature of the New Testament, which is wholly made up of mildness and liberty, frees the tender age of infants to be baptized, especially in northernly climates, from the necessity of being stripped naked and plunged all over. Though that possibly might be done without hazard of life, yet not without some other inconvenience. 5. Others add, that, in ancient times, in which candour and simplicity flourished more, the persons to be baptized were, without any indecency, stripped naked: yet afterwards, as the lewdness of others, so of those on whom it was incumbent to administer baptism, increased, experience clearly testifying it to the whole world, this could no longer be done with decency: and therefore, for five centuries back, that custom has been gradually discontinued almost all over the West. See Vossius in the place already quoted; who has this from Josephus Vicecomes, *de ritibus baptismi*, lib. iv. c. 10, 15. To whom, however, Gisbert Voetius, a divine of immortal memory, opposes his learned considerations. *Polit. Eccles. l. 1. p. 690.* proving, by no contemptible arguments against Vicecomes and Vossius, that persons to be baptized quite naked, did not obtain in the ancient church. But though this act of stripping should be more reserved and modest, than is usually represented by painters; yet, on account of the depravity of men, the rite of affusion or aspersion seems to be safer, for which no such naked exposure

of the body is requisite. From all which we conclude, that the Latins were very unkindly, and therefore, without reason, called by some Greeks in the council of Florence, *Abaptists*, because they did not go into the water and were plunged. See the history of that council, *sect. 9. c. 9.*

XV. Whether immersion or aspersion be done once or thrice, I take not to be material; as we have no precept of our Lord concerning this. Yet the trine immersion was more usual among the ancients; who also therein placed some mystery. For thereby they would have it to signify, 1. A confession of the adorable Trinity, in whose name baptism was submitted to. 2. "The death and resurrection of Christ after three days," as Athanasius speaks, *Quest. 94.* 3. Ambrose adds a third reason, but of less weight, lib. ii. *de sacram. c. 7.* "Thou hast plunged for the third time, that the third confession might wipe away the manifold failures of thy former life." But afterwards in Spain, while the Arians numbered the immersions, in order to divide the Divinity, Leander, bishop of Seville, consulted Gregory II. bishop of Rome, about the question concerning the trine or single immersion; who answered, that though the church of Rome dipt thrice, yet the church of Spain would rather be content with a single immersion: and it was decreed in the fourth council of Toledo in the year 683, that it should be so; where, *canon 5.* or, according to another edition, *canon 6.* "both is accounted right, and both irreprovable in the holy church of God." Yet one religious ceremony of a single sacrament is preferable; that every one may see the unity of the Godhead, and the trinity of persons, therein: "The unity, when we dip once; the trinity, while we baptize in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy

Ghost." See Vossius, *Disput. 2. de baptis.* and Forbes, lib. x. c. 5. § 48. seq.

XVI. Indeed, it is not proper to administer baptism without some words, by which the mystery of it may be briefly explained: according to that well-known saying of Augustine, "Take away the word, and what is the water, but water only?" Yet we are far from thinking, that Christ prescribed a form of words, which all were to make use of at all times, and in all places. Christ, indeed, commanded to baptize in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, but not precisely to say, I baptize thee in the name of the Father, &c. The apostles are said to have baptized in the name of Jesus, Acts ii. 38. viii. 16. & xix. 5: and yet it does not follow, that they used this form, *I baptize thee in the name of Jesus.* But as baptism ought by all means to be performed in the name of the sacred Trinity, to whose obedience and worship we are consecrated by the washing of water, it also seems necessary, in the administration of it, to make either an explicit, or at least an implicit mention of the Trinity. Nor is it to be doubted, but he maintains some mischievous error, who refuses to follow a custom received by all the Christian world, and probably derived from apostolic example. But I dare not absolutely condemn the baptism administered and received in the name of Christ, without any mention of the Father and Holy Spirit, both because the baptism of the apostles is described in those words by Luke, and because, as Basil has ingeniously observed, *de Spiritu Sancto*, "to name Christ is to confess the whole Trinity: for this sets forth both God who anoints, the Son who is anointed, and the unction, even the Holy Ghost." We have something like this in Ambrose, *de Spir. Sancto*, lib. i. c. 3. quoted also by Peter Lombard, *Sentent.* lib. iv. distinct. 3. where he treats

of the form of baptism. Neither is it an improper observation, that there is some difference in the case of baptized persons, who from Judaism, and of those who from Gentilism embraced Christianity : for it is proper, that the Gentiles, who are converted from idols to the true God ; to that God, I say, who, by the distinction of the three persons in one essence, is discriminated from those that are not gods, should be baptized into the express confession of the Trinity : but as the God of the ancient Israelites and of the Christians is one and the same, the professing the Lord Jesus seems to have been sufficient in the baptism of the Israelites. And it is possibly for this reason, enjoined Matth. xxviii. that the Gentiles should be baptized in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost ; but the Jews either such by birth, or formerly become such by professing the Jewish religion, are said to be baptized in the name of Jesus.

XVII. Peter, 1 ep. iii. 21. gives us to know, that baptism is a kind of type or figure, which signifies to commemorate and teach something more heavenly and sublime. And therefore having explained what is external and sensible, we are now to treat of the *spiritual thing signified* ; which may be considered either *generally* or *particularly*.

XVIII. The thing signified by baptism *in general*, is the *reception into the covenant* of grace, as administered under the *New Testament*. As circumcision was the sign and seal of the Old Testament, Gen. xvii. 11. so baptism, which succeeds circumcision, Col. ii. 11. is the sign of the new covenant, and, as Basil speaks, *the inviolable seal* thereof. Moreover, that reception into the covenant of grace imports two things. 1. Communion with Christ, and his mystical body, and consequently a participation of all his benefits. 2. An engagement to

incumbent duty. Both are signified and sealed by baptism. In respect of the former, we are said *to be baptized into one body*, 1 Cor. xii. 13. and *saved by baptism*, Tit. iii. 5. 1 Pet. iii. 27. With respect to the latter, baptism is called *SUNEIDESEOS AGATHES EPEROTEMA EIS THEON*, *the answer of a good conscience towards God*, 1 Pet. iii. 21.

XIX. A passage certainly that merits an accurate explication. Therefore we shall first shew what is *a good conscience*: then what *EPEROTEMA*, *answer*, imports: lastly, to what the words *EIS THEON*, *towards God*, are to be referred, whether to *EPEROTEMA*, *answer*, or to *a good conscience*. *A conscience is good* in a two-fold respect: 1. *Sincerely good*, when it faithfully, in God's name, lays before a man what is to be done, and what to be avoided, and continually excites him to the careful practice of holiness. 2. *Cheerfully good*, when it makes him joyful, by giving him the testimony of a sincere holiness. And therefore to have a good conscience, as our apostle speaks, ver. 16. is to live according to the dictates of the mind in such a manner, that you may be assured that you do well and please God. This Paul calls *APROSKOPON SUNEIDESIN*, *a conscience void of offence*, Acts xxiv. 16.

XX. The word *EPEROTEMA* (which we translate *answer*) is variously explained by the learned. Oecumenius explains it by *ARRABON*, *ENECHURON*, and *APODEIXIS*, *earnest*, *pledge*, and *demonstration*. Which the celebrated Cocceius has adopted; who generally insists, that *EPEROTEMA* denotes an argument, a ground of asking God as a Father: and a sign and seal, which we may use with boldness, and when we draw near to God, may beg his saving graces without fear. But this explication does not seem to agree with the origin of

the word : and I doubt, whether any example of such a signification can be produced from any approved author. Vossius, in my opinion, observes much better, that *EPEROTEMA* does not simply signify an interrogation, but that which is answered to another interrogation. For the persons to be baptized ask of God, whether he will be their God ; and God, on the other hand, asks and restipulates, whether they themselves will maintain a good conscience towards him. Grotius's annotations here are very learned : He observes, that *EPEROTEMA* is a law-term, and generally used in Theophilus, and the other Greek interpreters of the Roman law, for a *stipulation* : as also in the Glossary, *EPEROTO*, *I stipulate*. But he adds, that by a metonymy, as is often the case in the law, an *answer*, or *promise* is comprehended under the name, *stipulation*. Hence in the same Glossary, *EPEROTOMAI*, *I promise*, *I engage*. If Beza had attended to this, possibly he would not have said, that it was harsh to translate *EPEROTAN*, *to answer*, as Erasmus has done.

XXI. But which of these significations, whether that of stipulating, or of promising, should here take place, depends very much on the construing the words *towards God*. Which may either be so connected, as that *a good conscience* may be said to be *towards God*, that is, before God, or respecting him in all its actions, as Acts xxiv. 16. or so, that *EPEROTEMA* may be said to be *towards God*. If the former, it seems more agreeable to translate *EPEROTEMA*, *stipulation*, as Beza has learnedly done. For it is God who stipulates with, or requires of the Christian, that he maintain a good conscience towards him. But should the latter be more agreeable, and the conscience itself, or the Christian, considered as *EPEROTON*, giving an answer to God concerning a good conscience, it is plain, *answer* or



*promise* is the more proper signification. And both so beautifully agree with the apostle's design, that I can scarce tell which to prefer.

XXII. For there are these two things in baptism. God *stipulates*, or requires a good conscience *towards* himself; and the conscience *answers and promises to God*, that it will endeavour to be so; or, which seems more plain, man engages to keep a good conscience. Formerly the bishop, or some other person in his name, interrogated thus, or, which is the same thing, stipulated, *ΑΠΟΤΑΣΣΕ ΤΟ ΣΑΤΑΝΑ, Dost thou renounce the devil?* The person to be baptized made answer, *ΑΠΟΤΑΣΣΟΜΑΙ, I do renounce.* Again being asked, *Dost thou consent to Christ?* he answered, *I do consent.* Tertullian *de baptismo* calls this “the engagement of salvation;” and *de resurrectione carnis* says, “The soul is established not by washing, but by the answer.” Cyprian called it the “interrogation of baptism,” Epist. 76. & 80. To the very same purpose are the words of Peter: for it is probable, that if not the very same, yet at least a similar form of asking and engaging, and of the same import, was used in the susception of baptism, even from the days of the apostles. And though there had been no express form of this; yet baptism being the first entering into covenant, virtually contains such a stipulation and engagement.

XXIII. But we are likewise more particularly to explain, first, what may be signified by the *water* in baptism; and then what by the *rites*, commonly used about the water. And the *water* certainly denotes both the *blood* and *Spirit* of Christ. It is plain, such effects are, in the sacred writings, ascribed to these, as to the mystical water, that signify and seal the communication of them by baptism: namely, to the *blood*, as the *impetrating cause*; to the *Spirit*, as the *applying cause*.

Paul, Heb. xii. 24. and Peter, 1 epist. i. 2. speak of the blood of Christ, with which we are sprinkled. But the Spirit is expressly represented by the term *water*, Is. xlv. 3. Ezek. xxxvi. 25.—27.

XXIV. The analogy or signification of this sacrament principally consists in these three things. 1. Water is of all things most proper, either from the nitre with which it is replete, or from some other quality, to wash away the filth of the body. But the blood of Christ washes the soul from all the pollution of sin, 1 John i. 7. because by his sufferings he certainly merited, that we should be presented pure before God, Eph. v. 25, 26. And the Spirit of Christ, who applies the merits of his blood, actually cleanses us, 1 Cor. vi. 11. 2. Water also has a power to *drown* and to *suffocate*: the same efficacy is exerted by the blood and Spirit of Christ, for the mortification of the old man; of which we shall hear more presently; and, on this account, Gregory Nazianzen called baptism the *deluge of sin*. With which Ambrose agrees, *de initiandis*, c. 3. “The water is that in which the flesh is drowned, in order to wash away all sin.” 3. Water is the *principle* of very many *living things*, and in their creation the Spirit brooded on the waters, Gen. i. 3. The earth scarce produces any living thing, either of the vegetable or reptile kind, unless impregnated with water, Psal. lxxv. 10. The very generation of the human fœtus is said to be from water, Is. xlviii. 1. Psal. lxxviii. 27. Thus, in like manner, the blood and Spirit of Christ, as the mystical water, are the principles of our regeneration and new creation, John iii. 5. And as that is signified by the water of baptism, so baptism itself is called, Tit. iii. 5. *the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost.*

XXV. With respect to the ceremonies in the administration, we are distinctly to take notice, I. Of the immersion into the water, and the washing that is the consequence of it. II. The continuing under the water. III. The emersion out of the water. These rites referred either to the *remembrance* of those things which Christ underwent, or signify the *benefits* which Christ bestows upon us, or put us in mind of our duty.

XXVI. First, therefore, the *immersion* into the water, represents to us that tremendous *abyss of divine justice*, in which Christ was plunged for a time, in some measure, in consequence of his undertaking for our sins : as he complained under the type of David, Psal. lxi. 2. *I sink in deep mire, where there is no standing : I am come into deep waters, where the floods overflow me.* But more particularly, an immersion of this kind deprives us of the benefit of the light, and the other enjoyments of this world ; so it is a very fit representation of the *death* of Christ. *The continuing* how short so ever *under the water*, represents his *burial*, and the lowest degree of humiliation, when he was thought to be wholly cut off, while in the grave, that was both sealed and guarded. *The emersion, or coming out of the water*, gives us some resemblance of his *resurrection*, or victory, obtained in his death over death, which he vanquished within its inmost recesses, even the grave. All these particulars, the apostle intimates, Rom. vi. 3, 4.

XXVII. Moreover, baptism also signifies those *benefits* which believers obtain in Christ : and these are either *present* or *future*. Among the *present*, the principal is fellowship in the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ ; and the consequence of it, viz. the mortification and burying of our old man, and the raising of the new by the efficacy of the blood and Spirit of Christ.

For the *immersion* into the water, represents the *death of the old man*, even in such a manner, that it can neither stand in judgment to our condemnation, nor exercise dominion over our bodies, that we should serve it in the lusts thereof. In the former respect, the death of the old man appertains to justification; in the latter, to sanctification. The *continuing* under the water, represents the *burying* of the body of sin, whereby all hopes of a revival are cut off; so that, after this, it is neither able to condemn, nor rule over the elect. For as, in burying, the dead body, which is covered over with earth, is removed from the sight of men, and so weighed down by the earth thrown upon it, that, should we suppose some life to have remained in the buried person, to be bestowed upon him anew by a miracle, yet it cannot fail to be stifled by the load of earth lying upon it, nor recover to any degree of permanence: in the same manner, when in baptism the person sunk under the water, is for some time detained therein; this signifies and seals to us, that our sins are removed from the view of the divine justice, never to be imputed to our condemnation: or as Micah speaks, chap. vii. 19. *He will subdue our iniquities, and cast all our sins into the depths of the sea*; likewise that the power of sin is so depressed and weakened, that it can no longer drive us at its pleasure, or hinder our salvation, or be able to resume the power, which it has once lost, in order to bring us again under its dominion. The *emersion* out of the water is a symbol of the revival of the new man, after our sins are now sunk, to a spiritual life by the resurrection of Christ. And this also the apostle declares, Rom. vi. 3.—6. and Col. ii. 11, 12. where he intimates, that our baptism is such a memorial of the things that happened to Christ, as at the

same time to seal our communion with him in all these things, and our union as it were into one plant.

XXVIII. But *future blessings* are also signified by baptism. For as in baptism, after we are immersed in the water, we directly come out of it in safety; so, in like manner, it shall be, that though we may be pressed with afflictions in this life, yet we shall not be overwhelmed by them, but being at last delivered from them, shall be translated into everlasting joys. That calamities in scripture are compared to waters, appears from many passages, as Psal. xviii. 4. xxxii. 6. xlii. 7. & cxliv. 7. And afflictions are sometimes called by the name of *baptism*, Matth. xx. 22. Mark x. 32. Luke xii. 30. Therefore the coming out of the water, or the wiping off the water, signifies, that we shall happily surmount all the difficulties of this life. See 1 Pet. iii. 20, 21. *Wher*in (in the ark of Noah) *few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water. The like figure whereunto, even baptism, doth also now save us.* And as the Israelites when they entered the Red Sea, under great apprehensions of danger, were, upon the Egyptians being drowned, amazed, that at length they came safe to land; so in like manner, believers having surmounted all the miseries of this life, and standing on the sea of glass, shall sing *the song of the Lamb*, Rev. xv. 3. saying, *He brought me up also out of an horrible pit, out of the miry clay, and set my feet upon a rock, and established my goings,* Psal. xl. 2.

XXIX. Moreover, as in baptism are set forth the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ; but his resurrection is a pledge of our glorious resurrection: we may learn from our baptism, that after being buried as it were in the water, we directly rise out of it, so at the last day we shall be raised out of our graves, to eternal life. Hence Theodoret says of baptism, “It is an ear-

nest of good things to come, a type of the future resurrection, a communion in the sufferings, and a participation of the resurrection of our Lord : agreeable to the words of Christ, Mark xvi. 16. *He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved.*"

XXX. From what we have said, it appears, that the rite of immersion into the water, upon which emersion follows, as was generally the practice among the ancients, has some significancy and analogy to represent both the effect and the cause of that effect : yet we are not to imagine, that all analogy is destroyed by the practice of aspersion, or pouring on the water. For the pouring out, or aspersion of the water, answers to the immersion into it ; and perhaps it would be better, if it was so copious as to run over the whole face, and as it were cover it : by which means, the emersion out of the water would be answered by the dissipation of it. But the face and head represent, as it were, the whole person ; so that what things are done in that part, may be accounted as done in the whole body ; and as the face is covered with the water, the whole person may seem to be immersed ; and with the running off of the water on every side, the whole person may be accounted as taken out of it ; and the communion in the thing signified should not be rated by the quantity of the external sign. A very small portion of water may no less seal the abundance of the divine grace in baptism, than a small morsel of bread, and a more sparing draught of wine, in the holy supper.

XXXI. Thus far concerning the rites of immersion and emersion ; let us now consider the ablution or washing, which is the effect of the water applied to the body. In external baptism there is *the putting away the filth of the flesh*, 1 Pet. iii. 21. which represents the ablu- tion, or washing away the filth of the soul contracted

by sin, Acts xxii. 16. *Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord.* But the filth of sin may be considered, either with respect to the *guilt*, which is annexed to the filth or stain, and so it is removed by remission, which is a part of justification; or with respect to the *stain* itself, or spiritual deformity and dissimilitude to the image of God, and so it is taken away by the grace of the sanctifying Spirit: and both are sealed by baptism. Of the former Peter speaks, Acts ii. 38. *Be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins.* Concerning the latter Paul writes, Eph. v. 25, 26. *Christ loved the church, and gave himself for it: that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water, by the word.* And they are laid before us both together, 1 Cor. vi. 11. *But ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God.* Ye are washed, sacramentally in baptism, which washing is a symbol of the mystical washing: but the mystical washing comprehends both *justification* and *sanctification*; both which are performed *in the name of the Lord Jesus*, that is, by the efficacy of his merits, and *by the Spirit of our God*, which effectually applies the merits of Christ to the elect.

XXXII. But because we, who, while polluted with sins, were plunged in the water, come out cleansed, and encompassed with the light of the Holy Spirit, as with a skining garment; we are said in that baptism to put on Christ, Gal. iii. 26, 27. *For we are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus: for as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ.* This putting on of Christ may be explained two ways; either as by the Spirit we are ingrafted into Christ, and so, by

this our union with the only begotten and natural Son of God, we become the sons of God by grace ; or also by the Spirit of God we are inwardly renewed to a new life, and therewith encompassed as with a shining garment, so that the native stains and wrinkles of the old man may be covered, and instead of them piety and holiness shine forth in our conversation and lives. Thus the baptized are *like a flock of sheep, that are even shorn, which come up from the washing*, Cant. iv. 2. And their case is the same, as was formerly that of Joshua the priest, whose filthy garments were, at the command of God, changed for splendid raiment : adding, *Behold, I have caused thine iniquity to pass from thee*, Zech. iii. 3.—5. In token of this, the newly baptized among the ancients put on white garments, which they wore the whole week after baptism, and did not put them off, till the eighth day after Easter or Whitsuntide ; which was therefore called *dominica in albis*, as the *candidates*, or those in white, were called *albat*. Most of what we have said, Basil, bishop of Cæsarea, has emphatically and briefly comprised in *exhortatione ad baptismum*, where he calls baptism, “ the remission of our debts, the death of sin, the regeneration of the soul, the shining garment, the inviolable seal, the chariot conveying up to heaven, the procurement of the kingdom, the grace of adoption.”

XXXIII. There now remains the third signification of baptism, which is to admonish us of our *duty* : and that is threefold, towards God and Christ, ourselves, and our neighbour.

XXXIV. And as we are baptized in the name, so we are consecrated to the worship and service of the holy Trinity, and renouncing the devil, the world, and the lusts of the flesh, are taught to devote ourselves wholly to God. Hence these things are joined toge-



ther, Matth. xxviii. 19, 20. *Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.*

XXXV. And as we are especially baptized into Christ, we are also commanded to acknowledge him for our Lord, Husband, and Head, and to frame the whole of our lives, in such a manner, that we may not be found a disgrace to him, with whom we are so closely united, nor to his Spirit, the bond of that union : but, on the contrary, that the sanctifying efficacy both of his blood and Spirit may appear in the whole tenor of our conversation. In fine, as we are most especially baptized into the communion of the death and resurrection of Christ, both these set before us an extraordinary pattern, to the likeness of which we should be conformed. For as Christ, when he suffered death, was deprived of the enjoyment of the light, and of the function of his senses, and of all the other operations of life, and thus was broke off from all commerce with the world, that he might have nothing farther to do with it ; in like manner, it behoveth us, if we would have any true union with Christ, to cease from all those works, to which we were formerly addicted, and to renounce the world, almost as if we were dead. And as Christ, when he arose, commenced a new kind of life, quite different from that natural life, which he enjoyed in this world before his death ; so it becomes us, if we would have any communion with him in his resurrection, to rise to a new life, and altogether different from that life, which was corrupted and stained with sin, to which we were given before our calling : as those things are urged by the apostle, Rom. vi. 3.—6.

XXXVI. As to ourselves, we are reminded in baptism, that, being once washed, we do not again pol-

lute ourselves with the filth of sins ; and being baptized into Christ, that we do not again mix with, or immerse ourselves in the world : lest *it should happen unto us according to the true proverb, The dog is turned to his own vomit again ; and the sow that was washed, to her wallowing in the mire,* 2 Pet. ii. 22.

XXXVII. Besides, seeing *by one Spirit we are all baptized into one body,* 1 Cor. xii. 13. we are also reminded, as members of one body, to love one another, and keep up brotherly concord ; being careful to maintain the unity of the Spirit, in the bond of peace : for there is one baptism, Eph. iv. 3, 5. In a word, as baptism is the seal of God's covenant, by the susception thereof we bind ourselves to that holiness of life, which becomes God's covenant people.

XXXVIII. To all these things very great weight is added, in that baptism is administered in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. For thereby God the Father promises to those who are truly baptized, that, with respect to them, he will suffer nothing to be wanting, which they can reasonably expect from a most affectionate Father : God the Son, in like manner, promises to execute in their behalf all the offices of a most perfect Saviour : the Holy Ghost likewise appoints for them, both sanctification, consolation, indwelling, and perpetual conservation. And they who are thus baptized, not only profess their faith in the mystery of a Trinity, which we have treated of more fully elsewhere ; but also bind themselves to filial obedience to God the Father ; give up themselves to Christ, as a Prophet, to be his disciples ; as a King, to serve him ; and as a Priest, for the expiation of their sins. In fine, they bind themselves to the Holy Spirit, not to grieve him, but reverently to obey all his inspirations and motions.

XXXIX. What we have thus far said concerning the signification of baptism, we have borrowed for the most part from Vossius's disputations, which we have already often commended ; as I likewise observe others have done before me. Things also similar to these, and sometimes almost in the very same words, I find in *Gomari Theses*. But which of these learned men first led the way to such very accurate and solid conceptions, I cannot now say. The other usual disputes about baptism, have been fully discussed by our writers, and are generally to be met with in their *Loci Communes*, and unnecessary to be repeated here. Should any be desirous to know the rites of the ancient church about baptism, they may consult *Josephi Vicecomitis observationes ecclesiasticas de antiquis baptismi ritibus* ; and among our writers, Vossius and Voetus's *polit. eccl.* p. 1. lib. ii. tr. 2. Forbesius, lib. x. and Hoornbeck in *disput. de baptismo veterum*. Georgius Fehlavius, *ad cap. 24. Christophori Angeli de statu hodiernorum Græcorum*, has collected from different authors, the ceremonies used by the Greeks and Muscovites in baptism.

XL. There is one thing, that, I think, ought not to be omitted here, seeing it is of very great moment to our consolation ; namely, that baptism is, by the will of God, to be administered not only to adult believers, but also to their children. The grounds for this, and those beyond all exceptions, are to be met with in scripture : so that there is no necessity, with the Papists, who shamefully prevaricate in a good cause, to have recourse in this matter to unwritten tradition.

XLI. We readily acknowledge, that there is no express and special command of God, or of Christ, concerning infant-baptism : yet there are general commands from which this special command is deduced by evident consequence. For to begin with what is most ge-

neral : God declared to Abraham, that it was his constant and unchangeable will, that the sign of the covenant should not be denied to those in covenant with him, when he said, Gen. xvii. 13. *And my covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant.* By these words, he commands the sign of his covenant to be in the flesh of all the posterity of Abraham, with which he had entered into a covenant of grace. From this general injunction, he infers, ver. 14. the necessity of circumcision, because he then gave it as a sign of the covenant. When therefore, upon the change of the œconomy, he substituted, in the place of circumcision, another sign of the covenant, in consequence of that general command, all those in covenant are bound to take upon them the new sign. Moreover, believers under the New Testament belong to the spiritual posterity of Abraham, and are, if we consider its substance, partakers of the same gracious covenant, Rom. iv. 16, 17 ; not adults only, but also their children, as we shall presently shew. Whence it follows, that the sign of the covenant in their body, is not to be denied to the young children of believers, any more than to believers themselves.

XLII. There is another command of Christ, Matth. xxviii. 19. *Go ye therefore, and MATHETEUSATE, disciple all nations, baptizing them, &c.* There Christ commands disciples to be gathered into his school, and sealed, as persons in covenant with him, with the seal of baptism. But it is evident, when parents become the disciples of Christ, their children are also accounted in the number of disciples. Just as among the Jews, together with the proselyte parents, their young children were initiated in the Jewish rites. It was not therefore necessary, that Christ should expressly mention the baptism of infants. For as it was a received

custom among the Jews, that, together with the parents, who gave up their names to the God of Israel, their young children should be baptized (as we have shewn above) the apostles being sent to baptize the nations, and accustomed to the rites of their own country, could not but think, that, together with the parents, who made a profession of the faith of Christ, they ought to baptize their infants, unless Christ had repealed the received custom by a contrary command. Which as we no where read he did, we are absolutely to conclude, that what we have now explained was our Lord's intention.

XLIII. Peter supplies us with another argument, Acts ii. 38, 39. *Be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the promise is unto you, and to your children, &c.* Where the apostle argues thus: They to whom the promise of grace was made, are to be baptized; we subsume, but the promise of grace was made not only to parents, but also to their children: it therefore follows, that not only parents, but also their children are to be baptized. Both propositions are the apostle Peter's. Now the whole difficulty consists in this; Who are we here to understand by the children, who partake of the promise of grace; whether adults only actually called, who are capable of making a profession of their faith; or also younger children and infants? The orthodox justly affirm the last: not only because mention simply is made of children, without distinction of age; but also because God expressly promised to Abraham, to be the God of his seed, which he applies to an infant eight days old, Gen. xvii. 7, 12. We add, that Christ permitted *little children* to come to him, laid his hands upon them, and declared, that of such was the kingdom

of heaven, Matth. xvi. 13.—15. But whom Matthew calls PAIDIA, *little children*, Luke, chap. xviii. 15. calls BREPHE, *infants*; which word, according to Eustathius, properly signifies *a new-born child at the breast*. Hence also Peter says, HOS ARTIGENNETA BREPHE, *as new-born babes*, 1 Pet. ii. 2. And here it appears we are, by all means, to keep to the propriety of the terms, both in the noun BREPHE, and the verb, PROSPHEREIN; when it is said, PROSPHERON DE AUTOTA BREPHE, *and they brought unto him also infants*, they appear to have been carried in arms. It is therefore evident, that to infants are also made the promises of grace and salvation.

XLIV. Let the fourth argument stand thus: It is unjustifiable to exclude from baptism, those who are made partakers of the Holy Spirit: for thus Peter, Acts x. 47. *Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost, as well as we?* True indeed it is, that the Holy Spirit discovered himself in those of whom Peter there speaks, by some extraordinary gifts, which of themselves were not saving: yet the principal argument for the right to baptism cannot be drawn from hence. The apostle therefore considers those extraordinary gifts, as the effects of the sanctifying Spirit, bestowed on all the elect; and as special indications of the divine bounty towards them: whereby the truth of the gospel was sealed in them, and the sincerity of their faith adorned; compare Gal. iii. 2; and thence, as from the thing signified, he argues to the participation of the sign. We moreover subsume: Even the children of believers have received the Holy Spirit: for otherwise they could neither be *holy*, which yet Paul declares them to be, 1 Cor. vii. 14. nor be *Christ's*, to whom none belongs, who has not his Spirit, Rom, viii. 9. nor see the king-

dom of heaven, to which none is admitted, but he who is born of water and of the Spirit, John iii. 5. Whence it follows, that water cannot be forbid, that infants should not be baptized.

XLV. Fifthly, They who belong to the church of God, have a right to baptism. The reason is, because baptism is the sign of association with, and seal of initiation into the church, Acts ii. 41. *They were baptized; and the same day there were added, namely, to the church, about three thousand souls.* And then it is represented as the privilege of the whole church, that she is *cleansed by Christ with the washing of water, by the word*, Eph. v. 26. But that infants belong to the church, appears from this, that when God commanded his church to be gathered together, he did not suffer their *little ones, and those that sucked the breasts, to be absent*, Deut. xxix. 10, 11. Joel ii. 16. and protests that *they were born unto him*, Ezek. xvi. 20.

XLVI. Sixthly, We argue from this, that baptism has succeeded in the room of circumcision. The apostle declares this, Col. ii. 11, 12. where he proves the abrogation of the ceremonial law, and especially of circumcision with respect to believers of the New Testament, from this consideration, that the spiritual thing formerly signified and sealed by circumcision, is now signified and sealed by baptism; intimating, that what circumcision was to the Old Testament church, the same now is baptism to the New, and indeed in a far more eminent and perfect manner, because baptism is an introduction at once into the liberty and grace of the New Testament, whereas circumcision contained the profession of a bondage and yoke. But it is evident, that circumcision was administered to infants: it therefore follows, that we are to have the same sentiment

concerning baptism. And indeed nothing can be advanced against the baptism of infants, which may not equally militate against their circumcision.

XLVII. Here certainly appears the extraordinary love of our God, in that as soon as we are born, and just as we come from our mother, he hath commanded us to be solemnly brought from her bosom, as it were into his own arms ; that he should bestow upon us, in the very cradle, the tokens of our dignity and future kingdom ; that he should put that song in our mouth, *Thou didst make me hope, when I was upon my mother's breast : I was cast upon thee from the womb : thou art my God from my mother's belly*, Psal. xxii. 9, 10 ; that, in a word, he should join us to himself in the most solemn covenant from our most tender years : the remembrance of which, as it is glorious and full of consolation to us, so in like manner it tends to promote Christian virtues, and the strictest holiness, through the whole course of our lives.

XLVIII. Nothing ought to be dearer to us than to keep sacred and inviolable that covenant of our youth, that first and most solemn engagement, that was made to God in our name. Nor is it any objection, that we were first bound in that covenant without our knowledge. For no adult person, when he is informed of the excellency of that holy sacrament, which was bestowed in infancy, can be offended, that, according to the will of God, he was devoted so early by his pious parents to the Supreme Being ; unless, at the same time, he is resolved to renounce entirely the name of a Christian, and all his hopes of eternal salvation.

XLIX. It cannot also fail to be very delightful to godly parents, to present to God and his Christ their dearest pledges, just begun to enjoy the light, and consecrated in the water of the mystical font, or, as *Dio-*



*ysius* the *Pseudarcopagite* elegantly expressed it, *in the divine symbols of a divine birth*, and recommended to the grace of God by the prayer of the whole church. Let this be the first care of their piety. Gregory Nazianzen, *Orat.* 40. *in sanctum baptisma*, speaks as follows: “Hast thou a child? give not time to vice to gain upon him: let him be sanctified from a child, and consecrated to the Spirit from his tender years.” And certainly, if no other benefit accrued from infant-baptism, every prudent person will own it to be very great, that it lays the most inviolable necessity on parents, carefully to train up their children, which they have so early devoted to God, in the mysteries of the Christian religion, and the practice of true piety, both by instruction, admonition, and good example. “They incur the guilt of an impious robber or thief,” as Bucer has gravely observed, *de regno Christi, lib. ii. c. 9.* “who are not at the greatest pains to bring up and form those they have consecrated by baptism, to the Lord Christ, to the obedience of Christ. For, by this neglect, as much as in them lies, they again rob God of the children they gave up to him, betray them, and enslave them to the devil.” See what we have more fully written on *infant-baptism* in a particular dissertation.

L. And therefore it was a very laudable practice of the Bohemian brethren, who were wont to present their children at about twelve years old, in the church to the pastor, in order to make a public profession of their faith, and to shew, whether the parents had done their duty in instructing them, to which they had bound themselves at the baptism of their children, as Lasitius relates, *de moribus & institutis fratrum Bohemorum, c. 12. § 28, 29.* Which, with the solemnity they usually performed this, is related at large *in ratione disciplinæ ordin. frat. Bohem. p. 46.* Calvin, *Instit. lib. iv. c. 19.*

§ 4. has hinted that a like practice obtained in the ancient church, and that from hence, in later times, arose the imaginary sacrament of confirmation. And Durel, *in vindiciis ecclesie Anglicanæ*, observes, that the like custom is still retained in the church of England.

---

## C H A P. XVII.

### *Of the Lord's Supper.*

**T**HE other sacrament of the New Testament is the *holy supper of the Lord*; which the Lord Jesus instituted immediately after his last passover, because it was to succeed the passover, from which he transferred also to this most of the rites and phrases, used by the ancient Jews in their passover. As this has long ago been observed by the learned, so it will appear from the brief explication we are now to give of this sacred symbol.

II. This sacrament is called **DEIPNON**, the *supper*, 1 Cor. xi. 20. not because its celebration is necessarily confined to the evening or night. For, though in the ancient church this was frequently done; yet that was owing not so much to the religion of Christians, as to the cruelty of persecutors, who, by their tyranny, obliged believers to meet together privately, and in the night-time: but because the Lord instituted this feast after the passover, which was to be slain between the two evenings, and eaten in the night. It was likewise instituted in the *very night in which he was betrayed*, 1 Cor. xi. 23. and which was the last before his death; hence this most sacred feast was constantly called the *supper*. Besides, the most sumptuous entertainments

among the ancients, especially in the Jewish nation, at least their nuptial feasts, were generally in the evening; as appears from the parable of the ten virgins, Matth. xxv. And therefore it was proper, that that feast, which represents the unspeakable dainties of heaven, and is an earnest of the *marriage-supper of the Lamb*, Rev. xix. 9. should be held forth to us under the name and emblem of a supper. Nor is it for nothing, that Paul observes, that Christ gave the supper to the church, in that night *in which he was betrayed*. For, besides that we have in this an illustrious display of Christ's infinite love to men, in that he should vouchsafe to have such an anxious concern for us, especially at that time, when his mind was otherwise so much taken up, and distressed with the horror of his approaching sufferings; what above all ought to make it sacred to us, and very highly valuable, is, that it was instituted by our Lord, just as he was preparing himself to die.

III. Again, It is called **KURIAKON DEIPNON**, the *Lord's supper*, 1 Cor. xi. 20. both because the Lord was the author of it, and because the whole of it agrees to the Lord, and to the remembrance of him; so that the Lord himself, in the right use of it, is exhibited to believers: and lastly, because it ought to be celebrated by us, according to the will and prescription of the Lord.

IV. But the Lord's supper, to pass on from the name to the thing, is the sacrament of education, or nourishment, in the New Testament church, wherein, by the symbols of bread broken, and wine poured out, the dreadful sufferings of Christ are represented to believers; and the promises of the New Testament, and enlivening communion with Christ, made perfect by sufferings, both in grace and glory, are signified and sealed to them.

V. For the illustration of this description, it will be useful, we first distinctly consider the external *signs*; then the *things signified* by them. The *signs* are either the \**symbols* themselves, or certain *actions* about the symbols. The *symbol* is twofold, *bread* and *wine*; and both of them are joined together, to signify the superabundant fulness we have in Christ. Here we are to adore the divine providence, which hath given to his church things so simply and easily obtained, as pledges of things heavenly: and several reasons may be assigned. 1. That this sacrament might, in all places, even to the end of the world, be in perpetual use among the faithful, it was suitable, such symbols should be instituted, as might, in all places and at all times, be ready at hand for the church's use. 2. It is more consistent with the spiritual œconomy of the New Testament, to be led by some plain and ordinary symbol, which should neither detain the eye nor the mind, presently to behold, meditate on, receive the thing signified, than to be dazzled by some illustrious and miraculous sign, like what was granted to the Israelites in the wilderness, as to be made to give less attention to the mystical signification. 3. And then, the danger of superstition, which can scarcely be altogether avoided in the case of bread and wine, would have been far greater in that of a more illustrious sign. 4. Nor is it from the purpose, that Christ has not again given us the flesh of slain animals, nor bloody meals, such as the fathers formerly eat in their sacred feasts; but has furnished out his table with plain bread and wine. For Christ's blood, by which all our debts are cancelled, and the fire of divine wrath is quenched, being once shed, it became a crime

\* These are frequently called, with us, the sacramental elements and the sacramental actions.

any longer to shed any blood in the sacred rites of Christians.

VI. Common and ordinary *bread* is to be made use of, as Christ used that which lay before him, Matth. xxvi. 26. But it was an old subject of debate between the Greek and Latin churches, whether it ought to be leavened or unleavened, both of them appealing to the example of our Lord. The Latins insist, that Christ used unleavened bread, because immediately after the paschal feast he instituted the supper; at which time it was altogether unlawful for any leaven to be seen among the Israelites. The Greeks, on the other hand, contend, that Christ eat the paschal lamb, the day before the Jews celebrated their passover; from which they infer, that the days of unleavened bread were not yet come, when our Lord celebrated the first supper, and therefore it is most probable, that our Lord used leavened bread, which, before the days of unleavened bread came, was most commonly made use of. And indeed, as to Christ's example, we make no manner of doubt, but the Latins have the better of the Greeks in this argument. For whether our Lord celebrated the passover on the same, or on a different day from the other Jews; what was the day of the passover to him, was also to him the day of unleavened bread: which the evangelists expressly affirm, Matth. xxvi. 17. Mark xiv. 12. Luke xxii. 7. Nor is it so certain, that Christ celebrated the passover before the Jews, as Gerard Vossius imagines with the Greeks. The disputes of the celebrated John Cloppenburgh and Lud. Capellus have already laid before the learned world, what probably may be said on both sides of the question. Nay, the opposite opinion seems to be much better founded, as Bochar, whom we have already so often quoted, has made out by cogent arguments, who seems to have ta-

ken off all the difficulty of this question, *Hierozoic.* lib. ii. c. 1. However, we agree not with the Latins, who would have the example of Christ, in so slender a circumstance, to retain the force of a perpetual law. For as this is no part of the essence of the sacrament, so the use of either sort of bread at this sacred feast, as occasion shall offer, is indifferent and arbitrary; since Christ, without any decision of this question on either side, used that bread which was then at hand. Wherefore it is a matter both of astonishment and grief, that the Greek and Latin churches should have disputed, with so much eagerness and warmth, now for above five hundred years, about such a trifling matter. Du Plessis, *de eucharistia*, lib. ii. c. 5. may be consulted on this subject.

VII. But we can by no means approve of the small round things, made of meal, commonly called *hosts* or *wafers*, such as now the Romish church is pleased to make use of. 1. Because they are most disagreeable to the institution and practice of Christ. For it is very probable, that Christ used such an unleavened cake, as the master of the family, in whose house he kept the passover, laid before him, according to the custom of the Jews. But these cakes were something large, in order to be distributed in pieces among the guests at the table; they were also thin and broad, but yet of a moderate thickness like our sweet and round cakes, that they might be adapted for the nourishment of the body. As to their matter, form, and preparation, see Buxtorf's *Synagoga Judaica*, c. 12. 2. Because, in that case, there is either no analogy, or an obscure one, between the sign and thing signified. Neither is there that serviceableness for supporting life, nor that nourishing quality, nor that sweetness of flavour in those wafers, as in common bread: by which both the ser-

viceableness, and nourishing efficacy and grateful sweetness of the grace of Christ are represented. 3. Because they were unknown in the church for near a thousand years. Vossius, in his *Theses de s. cœnæ Dominicæ symbolis*, has laid open their origin from Honorius Augustodunensis. His words are these, "It is said, that formerly the priests received from every house or family, a quantity of meal, which custom at this day the Greeks still observe, and of that made the Lord's bread, which they offered for the people, and, after consecration, distributed among them. But after the church really increased in numbers, but abated in holiness; it was decreed, on account of the carnal, that such as could, should communicate every Lord's day, or every third Lord's day, or on the high festivals, or thrice a year. And because the people did not communicate, there was no occasion to make so large a cake, it was decreed to make it in the form of a penny." This is the true reason, why the host has the form of a penny: but afterwards men of subtilty sought, as is usual in such cases, for a mystery, where there was none: whence he immediately subjoins; "and that the people, instead of offering meal, should offer a penny, as an acquittance for receiving the Lord." Durandus in *Rationali*, lib. iv. c. 14. has words also to the same purpose. "It is prepared in the form of a penny, both because the bread of life was betrayed for pennies, and because a penny was given as wages to the labourers in the vineyard." These are foolish conceits, and foreign to the august mystery of the holy supper.

VIII. The other symbol is *wine*: which the evangelists call GENNEMA TES AMPELOU, the *fruit of the vine*, in conformity to the Hebrew phraseology, PERI HEGLPHEN, Matth. xxvi. 29. Mark xiv. 25. Luke

xxii. 18. But it does not certainly appear, whether it was red or white. The Jews ordered the best and most generous wine to be purchased for celebrating the passover. But in that country the red was generally accounted such, Prov. xxiii. 31. Is. xxvii. 3. Hence in the Jerusalem Talmud, *Tractat. de Sabbato, fol. 11. it is commanded, that red wine be used for that purpose.* But if it appeared, that the white was better than the red, the preference was given to that. It is therefore probable, and only probable, that Christ used red wine. And it seems we should not altogether overlook the similitude there is between the blood of the grape, by which name red wine is chiefly intended, and the blood of Christ.

IX. And with no greater certainty can we determine, whether Christ used pure neat wines, or wine mixed with water. Those speak too freely, who affirm, that it was the custom of that country, in order to moderate the strength of their wine, to mix it with water, that all might drink of it. For that this was left to the discretion of the Jews, as a matter of indifference, on the very solemnity of the passover, appears from *Sepher Mizvoth Haggadol, fol. 118. col. 1.* “The measure of the cup is a quart of wine, either new or old, either neat or diluted.” On the other hand, the argument of those is also weak, who contend, that Christ used pure wine, because it is called *the fruit of the vine*: but the vine produces wine, not water. We have shewn above that Christ speaks after the manner of his country. But the Jews called the wine, even that mixed with water, in their solemn blessings over it, *the fruit of the vine*, having a regard to the greater and better part of it. Thus the Jewish masters expressly write in *Talm. Babylon. tit. Berachot, fol. 50. col. 2.* “They pronounce not the blessing on the wine in which no water is mix-



ed, saying, Blessed be he who created the fruit of the vine-tree, but, Blessed be he who created the fruit of the tree."

X. Nothing therefore can here with any certainty be affirmed concerning Christ's practice. Yet it has been the prevailing custom of the ancients, as well the western as eastern church, if we except the Armenian, to mix the wine with the water; because, after the supper, they kept their *Agape*, or love-feasts, with the same wine, not chusing to give any handle to the Gentiles, as if they used pure wine to excess. They add a threefold mystery in this, in framing which they have given too much scope to their own fancy. 1. That by the wine and water might be held forth the blood and water, which flowed from the pierced side of Christ. 2. That by that mixture the union of the two natures in Christ might be represented. 3. That since, in the Revelation of John, the people are called water, the union of the same faithful people with Christ the Head is exhibited by that mixture. And as it is the way of human nature, to be fond of its own fancies, the Greeks put not only water, but also boiling water into the wine; and lest it should, on any account, cool before they receive it, they do not pour it in till after the elevation; to signify, say they, that from the side of our Lord on the cross, flowed hot blood and water, as quickening things from a quickening body: or even (adds Cabasilas in *Exposit. liturg.* c. 37.) "to sanctify the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the church, who is otherwise compared to fire." Nor did the rashness of their determining and allegorizing stop here. In the synod of Tribur, under the Emperor Arnulphus, in the year 895, or, according to others, 899, it was provided, that "none should perform the holy mysteries, without mixing wine and water; but that two parts

should be wine : because the majesty of the blood of Christ is greater than the weakness of the people."

XI. Our judgment is this : It does not appear, whether Christ mixed the wine, or drank it pure. Yet we grant the former to be probable ; because it was a more frequent practice among the Jews, on account of the generousness of their wines : hence, in the rubric of the festivals, when they speak of the wine, they always use the phrase, *They mix him a cup*. There are also those who forbid pronouncing a blessing over the cup, before the wine is mixed with water. It is probable, Christ did what seemed to be most suitable to the rules of sobriety. However, we imagine it cannot thence be proved, that Christ would prescribe any thing by this his example, especially to those people, whose wines are not so generous, as to require mixing in common use. For every thing that Christ did, according to the custom of his nation, and on occasion of the passover, does not belong to the essence of the sacrament, nor has a mystical signification, nor in all its circumstances obtains the force of a perpetual law. The allegorical interpretations of the ancients appear somewhat insipid, and without any foundation in the sacred writings. Nor is the practice of the ancient church to be too much insisted upon in this case : for, as the thing is indifferent, the modern church has the same right, that the ancient had. In such things, the liberty which Christ has left his people, ought to remain inviolable ; who are to look on nothing as binding and necessary, but his word only. Nay, after the rite of mixing began to be accounted necessary, it was prudently done in the reformed churches, for the preservation of liberty, to prefer pure wine. Just as if ever the necessity of pure wine should begin to be established, it would be perhaps better to return to the practice of mixing it.

Certainly, those plainly shew, that they put a greater value on their own imaginations, than on the very institution of Christ, who have thought it superfluous to use wine in the holy supper, which, by the command and prescription of our Lord, is a necessary part ; but, on the contrary, have judged water necessary, which is of human appointment, as if we were left to our own liberty by the divine institution.

XII. But as it is possible, nay, frequently happens, that, in some countries, neither bread nor wine are used, as in America, and other parts of the world, where, instead of bread, they have a food prepared of pulse, or herbs, or of the fruits or even the bark of trees ; and instead of wine, their drink is made of honey, or sugar, or other aromatics, or even the juice of the coco tree : it is justly queried, whether, in those countries, they are wholly to abstain from the Lord's supper, or whether, instead of bread and wine, it may be lawful to use that food in the supper, which answers the purposes of bread and wine, and is adapted for strengthening the body and cheering the heart. Indeed, we think, that no rash innovations should be made in the use of the sacraments : but then necessity has no law. And it seems very hard, should any one take upon him to order, that the natives and the foreigners in those spacious countries of the world, should be deprived of the Lord's supper, and their Christianity maimed without the sacramental food. Especially, as the principal thing in the analogy is retained, when that food and drink is made use of, by which the body may be properly nourished, and the heart made glad. Thus much for the *symbols* or elements.

XIII. Let us now consider the *actions* with respect to the symbols. And they are either those of *Christ*, to be performed, after his example, by his *ministers* ;

or of the *disciples*, to be imitated by the *guests* or communicants. The *actions* of *Christ* are either *words* or *deeds*; and both these again either about the *bread*, or about the *wine*.

XIV. With respect to the *bread*, there are four things mentioned, which *Christ* did. 1. *He took* the bread; namely, into his hand. For it was provided by an express canon of the Jewish law, that the master was not to pronounce the blessing, till he took the bread into his hand, that all might see, over what he pronounced the blessing.

XV. 2. *He blessed it*. This action is in the evangelists called *EULOGIA*, blessing, Matth. xxvi. 26. Mark xiv. 22. at other times *EUCHARISTIA*, giving of thanks, Luke xxii. 19. It is a fine saying of the Jews, mentioned by Buxtorf on this occasion: "Man is forbid to enjoy any thing in this world without a blessing." But the usual form of blessing pronounced over the bread, was this: "Blessed be thou, O Lord our God, King of the world, who producest bread out of the earth." Yet it is more probable, *Christ* used a peculiar form, and one adapted to the present case, whereby he consecrated the bread to be a sacred symbol of his body. For as, in other respects, *Christ* sanctified, by blessing and giving of thanks, bread and other food for natural use, Matth. xiv. 19. Luke ix. 16; so, by this blessing and giving of thanks, he dedicated the bread, as he did afterwards also the wine, set apart from their natural use, to be sacraments of his body and blood.

XVI. 3. *He broke* the bread. And this also after the manner of the Jews. For thus in the Talmud, *tit. Berachot, fol. 59. col. 22. He* (the master of the family) *blesses, and afterwards breaks*. This the apostles also carefully observed. Hence, 1 Cor. x. 16. *The bread,*

*which we break.* And therefore this is a mystical rite, and, as it were, essential to the holy supper; at least so necessary to the purity and compleatness of it, that this whole feast is therefore called *the breaking of bread*, Acts ii. 42. & xx. 7. Nor do they sufficiently clear themselves of a violation of the Lord's institution, who, keeping their bread (if it may deserve that name) whole, maintain, that they have fulfilled its purport, because with them the lump is divided into many small wafers. For that breaking of the lump is culinary, not mystical, being performed in the kitchen, not in the church, and done before the sacrament, not at the administration of it. It is to no purpose objected, that breaking among the Jews is sometimes equivalent to distributing, as Is. lviii. 7. *Deal (break) thy bread to the hungry*; and Lam. iv. 4. *The young children ask bread, and no man breaketh unto them.* For to break is by a *metalepsis* taken for that distribution, which is made after the breaking. But that none should feign any such *metalepsis* in the words of the supper, these two actions of Christ are distinctly mention'd, *He broke*, and *He gave*.

XVII. 4. The bread broken *he gave to the disciples*, Matth. xxvi. 26. And this also was according to the ancient custom of the Jews, of whom there is an express canon on this head in Maimonides: "Breaking it, he sets a piece before each, and the other," (to whom it is given) "takes it up in his hand: nor is it allowed to put it into the hand of the eater, unless he is mourning." If therefore it was not a Jewish custom to put the piece broken off into the hand of the eater, but to lay it before him, that he might take it up with his own hand; how much less probable is it, that Christ put that morsel into the mouths of his disciples? They who at this day observe that custom, depart both from the practice of Christ and from the purer antiquity: For

believers were formerly wont *to reach out their hands to take the sacred food*, as Dionysius Alexandrinus speaks in *Eusebius, lib. vii. c. 8.* But the other custom of putting the bread into the mouth, seems to have begun about the year 600; and was owing to nothing but a superstitious veneration for the signs, which at length dégenerated into *artolatry*, or bread-worship. See Vossius *de s. cæn. symbol. disput. 3. § 4, 5.*

XVIII. These then are the *actions* of Christ about the bread. Let us now consider his *words*. And they are twofold; either *preceptive* or *explicatory*. The preceptive either simply enjoin some acts, or at the same time point out the end of those acts. The former are contained in these words: *Take*, namely, that which is broken, and set before you on the table. *Eat*: exactly as in the paschal solemnity; *Whoever is hungry, let him come and eat of this bread of affliction*. The latter, in which the end is set forth, are these: *Do this in remembrance of me*. *To do* does not here signify, to make the body of Christ, or to sacrifice, as in Virgil, *Cum faciam vitula*, as some ridiculously contend for: but is to be referred, partly to what our Lord did; the like to which was to be done by the apostles in discharge of their office; partly to what he commanded the disciples, as communicants, to do; and regards both the dispensing and the receiving. And this command ought to be compared with that concerning the passover, *Exod. xii. 24. And ye shall observe this thing for an ordinance to thee and to thy sons for ever*. Moreover, what he recommends concerning the remembrance of himself, is also borrowed from the paschal ceremonies. For the whole passover was celebrated *for a memorial* of their miraculous deliverance out of Egypt, *Exod. xii. 14.* And almost every circumstance, even what the latter Jews added to the divine institution,

had their peculiar *memorial*. But how the supper is a memorial of our Lord, shall be afterwards considered.

XIX. The *explicatory* words, in which the mystery of the sacrament is explained, are these : *This is my body*, Matth. xxvi. 26. Mark xiv. 22. *which is given for you*, Luke xxii. 19. and *broken for you*, 1 Cor. xi. 24. And these things are also borrowed from the Jewish antiquities and the paschal phrases. For when the Israelites did eat their paschal bread, they were wont to say, *This is that bread of affliction, which your fathers did eat in the land of Egypt*. And what seems to come nearer the purpose, they called the roasted lamb, which was served up in the paschal supper, *the body of the passover*. But no one understood, or even could understand it otherwise, but that the bread, which they yearly eat on the festival day, was a symbol and memorial of that bread, which their ancestors were formerly fed with in Egypt. In the same sense, therefore, the bread of the holy supper is called the body of Christ. Hitherto they had slain and eat the body of the paschal lamb, which was a type of the body of Christ, afterwards to be delivered up to death for them : at present, Christ, instead of the paschal lamb, gave them bread for a symbol of his body ; in the partaking of which holy bread, they were to have, for the future, not a kind of type of things to come, or a memorial of a typical deliverance, but the body of Christ, Col. ii. 14. the very substance, as it were, of things already done, and of a solid and eternal deliverance. It is therefore evident, that they have wandered a great distance from the scope of our Lord's words, who would infer from them a change of the substance of the bread into the body of Christ : because as this is most contrary to all reason, so also to the nature of sacraments

and sacramental language. Thus much concerning the actions and words of Christ, with respect to the bread.

XX. Now follows what he both *did* and *said* with respect to the *cup*. There are three things Christ did with respect to this. 1. *He took* the cup, as the master of the family usually did among the Jews, *taking it in both his hands*, before he pronounced the blessing over it.

XXI. 2. *He gave thanks* : separately over the cup. For though blessing the bread consecrates all other kinds of food and liquors without any further consecration ; yet, according to the doctors of the Jewish law, that does not serve for the wine ; but a *peculiar blessing* is appointed for it *on account of its singular excellency*. The ordinary form of blessing was thus : *Blessed be thou, O Lord our God, King of the world, who createst the fruit of the vine*. But we are here to maintain, what we asserted concerning blessing the bread, that it is consistent with truth, that Christ, at this time, made use of a peculiar form of consecration. On account of this blessing, Paul calls it the *cup of blessing*, 1 Cor. x. 16. probably in imitation of that cup, which the Jews called the *cup of blessing the table*, or of thanksgiving, with which the feast was closed. And this cup Christ also took *after supper*, 1 Cor. xi. 25.

XXII. 3. *He gave it to them* ; namely, his disciples. For it was the custom of the Jews, that all the guests, after the master of the family had tasted it, should drink some of it. Hence it is probable, that Christ, after blessing, first drank of the cup ; which those words seem to intimate, which we have in Matth. xxvi. 29. *I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, &c.* and then distributed it among his disciples.

XXIII. We might here inquire, why nothing is said of *pouring out* the wine, which, in other respects, an-



swers to breaking the bread. But Buxtorf in *Exercit. de primæ cene ritibus et forma*, by which I gratefully own I have profited very much on this subject, learnedly assigns the reason of that, namely, that the Jews, in their ordinary entertainments, observed no peculiar rite about pouring out the wine. This was done promiscuously by a servant, or any other person, as occasion offered. But in the feast of the passover, they order, that, if by any means it can be done, the master of the family do not pour it out himself, but endeavour to get it done by another; because every thing at this feast ought to be done with an air of magnificence, to denote their liberty from Egyptian bondage, to which they were restored. And therefore it is very probable, that neither our Lord himself, nor his apostles, but some servant attending at the feast, belonging to the family of him, who gave the furnished room to Christ, poured out the wine at the command of our Lord. Whence it appears, that our churches also in this respect come nearest to antiquity, in which the elders or deacons perform that office.

XXIV. Christ's words with respect to the cup, correspond with those he had spoken about the bread, and they are, first, simply *preceptive*, *Drink ye all of it*, Matth. xxvi. 27. where that universal particle has its peculiar emphasis: then he shews the *end*, *This do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me*, 1 Cor. xi. 25. all which is clear from what was before said. The *explicatory* words are, *This is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many, for the remission of sins*, Matth. xxvi. 28: that is, the wine contained in this cup, is the symbol of blood, not the typical blood, as was that of the paschal lamb, but of my blood; by which is ratified, not that same Old Testament, which the blood of the lamb, they had now eaten, did ratify

and confirm ; but a new and a better testament, which brings not a typical, but a real remission ; conjoined, not with the rigorous demands of the hand-writing, but with the giving a discharge in virtue of my blood, very soon to be shed, not to a few among the Israelites, but to very many nations all over the world. Thus much concerning the *actions of Christ* about the symbols.

XXV. Next follow the *actions of the disciples*, and consequently of the other guests. And these, according to Christ's appointment, are three : first, *to receive* both the bread and the cup : but each separately : for so Christ distributed them : in this manner he commanded his people to take them : thus the body of Christ, as broken for us ; his blood as poured out of his body, are more distinctly represented : and in fine, as a complete entertainment requires both meat and drink, so this most complete spiritual repast, which we have in Christ, is thus most excellently represented. And therefore we cannot so well approve of that custom, which prevailed in Cyprian's time, to give a piece of bread dipt in wine, to infants and the sick : which was the practice in some places, about the year of Christ 340, in the public and ordinary celebration of the sacrament. The same judgment we are to pass on the custom of the Greeks, who crumble the consecrated bread into the wine, and take it out with a spoon.

XXVI. The other action of the guests is to *eat* the bread taken : for this is the immediate end of its being distributed and taken. Whence it follows, that those destroy the end of the sacrament, who take the bread or *host*, as they call it, that they may keep it honorably in a *pyx* or box. This is altogether contrary both to the institution of Christ, and the custom of the ancient church. For Christ has expressly commanded, they should directly eat. And indeed, as the ancient Chris-

tians under Heathen emperors, by reason of the danger of persecution, could not at all times have priests, eat part publicly, and part they carried home ; yet they by no means kept it in a religious manner, in order to adore, but to eat it on the next occasion. To this purpose is the decree of the council of Saragosa, which was held in the year 381, canon 3. " If any person is convinced, that he has not used the received grace of the eucharist, let him be Anathema for ever." For that purpose also the eucharist was publicly kept by the priest, to be carried out of the ordinary course, to the sick, not to be adored, but eaten. But in the earliest times, as the sacrament was celebrated every day, it was to no purpose to lay by the eucharist ; but when the supper was publicly administered, it might be sent by the hands of the deacon to the sick, or to those who were absent on some other account. Which Justin, *Apolog. Secunda*, mentions, was often done in his time. But what was left of the supper, or not made use of, was either thrown into the fire, or given to the school-boys to eat ; as Vossius has proved from the second council of Mascon, from Hesychius and Evagrius Scholasticus, *Disput. 3. de s. cœnæ Domin. symb.* § 8.

XXVII. The third action of the guests is, *to drink* the consecrated wine out of the cup. It is remarkable, that our Lord said concerning the cup, not only, *Take this, and divide it among yourselves*, Luke xxii. 17. but likewise added a mark of universality, *Drink ye all of it*, Matth. xxvi. 27. And we are told how they complied with this command, Mark xiv. 24. *And they all drank of it.* As if the Lord Jesus purposely intended to obviate the sacrilegious boldness of those men who deprive the laics, as they call the common people, of the consecrated cup. 'Tis an insipid exception, that the *all* ought to be restricted to the apostles, to whom

our Lord is there only speaking. For the apostles, in that case, represented the whole church. And unless the Papists will own this, whence will they ever prove, that the eating of *the bread* belongs to the laity or common people; especially, as no universal particle is added to that command? We add the authority of the apostle Paul, who dissuades the whole church of Corinth by this topic from the worship of idols: because, says he, *ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils*, 1 Cor. x. 21. and again writing to the whole church, *As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death, &c.* Where he all along joins the eating of the bread and the drinking of the cup, as actions to be alike performed by the same persons, 1 Cor. xi. 26.—29.

XXVIII. But who are they on whom it is incumbent to observe these duties according to Christ's command? Paul has briefly resolved this, 1 Cor. xi. 28, 29. *Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup: for he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body.* In which words he shews, 1. That no person should approach the table of the Lord, but he who, having a knowledge of the sacred mysteries, can discern the Lord's body, and, in some measure at least, understands the analogy between the sacred symbols and the thing signified by them, and on that occasion can shew the Lord's death. 2. That there is also required in the communicant that experience of the ways of God about the elect, as to be able to examine himself; whether, besides the external profession of faith, he hath also the genuine marks of the Holy Spirit dwelling in him, or, which is the same thing, of a sincere and internal Christianity: such as, the sorrow of a penitent heart, which is

after a godly manner; a lively faith resting on Christ, as the alone Author of life; in fine, an unfeigned love towards God and his neighbour, joined with an effectual purpose of reformation of life. Whoever, upon a previous examination, finds these things in himself, is not to account himself an unacceptable guest to the Lord.

XXIX. These things were carefully observed in the ancient church, while zeal was fervent, and discipline in its vigour. How diligent they were in instructing the catechumens, with what circumspection they acted in admitting them to the holy sacrament, cannot be unknown to those, who have but just looked into the writings of the fathers. And that none but the worthy might come to the communion, the deacon called out with a loud voice to all, before the administration, *SANCTA SANCTIS, Holy things to the holy*; and the priest, *SURSUM CORDA, To heaven with your hearts*. To which words the faithful answered, *Habemus ad Dominum*, "We have raised them to the Lord." In Clement also, *Constit. lib. ii. c. 61.* the deacon duly, at the beginning of the communion, says to the people, "Let none have a grudge against another, none be in a state of hypocrisy." And the custom of the Greeks, at this day, differs not from this: among whom they who are to communicate, turn themselves to every side of the church, and on bended knees address those around them, "Forgive us, brethren, we have sinned both in word and deed." To which they who were present answered in this manner, "Brethren, God will forgive us." Moreover, just when the communicant was to partake of the sacred feast, he addresses himself to Christ in these words: "I will not kiss thee as Judas did, but, after the example of the thief, I confess to thee: Lord, remember me, when thou comest into

thy kingdom." These things we have in Christophorus Angleus, *de statu hodiernorum Græcorum*, c. 23.

XXX. We may easily gather from what we have quoted from Paul, what to think of the communion of infants. It appears to have been a custom in the ancient church, to put the symbols of the holy supper into the mouths of infants just after baptism. A practice still observed by the Orientals. I will here subjoin the words of Metrophanes Critopulus, Hieromonachus, *Confess. c. 9.* "But even infants themselves are partakers, beginning immediately upon their baptism, and afterwards as often as the parents will. And if any one should blame us for the communion of infants, we can easily stop his mouth. For if he be an Anabaptist, we use this saying against him : *Suffer little children, and forbid them not to come unto me*, Matth. xix. 14. And also that other, *Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you*, John vi. 53. But the prophetess Hannah makes very much for us, who dedicated Samuel from his early infancy to God ; who also requires the first-born of the Jews to be given up to him, from their very birth, though not yet endowed with a competent measure of understanding. But if our adversary be no Anabaptist, we will also use the very same arguments against him, which he uses for infants against the Anabaptists ; that as they ought to be baptized, so also to be made partakers of the Lord's supper. And thus with the help of God we have got the better of our argument." Thus far Metrophanes.

XXXI. But we are of a quite different opinion. For all the words of our Lord's command (with respect to this sacrament) are so expressed, that they cannot belong to infants, who can neither receive the bread nor eat it, unless it be chewed for them or soaked. For

*Infants are fed with milk, and not with meat*, 1 Cor. iii. 2. Heb. v. 12. Infants cannot examine themselves, nor discern the Lord's body, nor shew his death ; all which we have just heard, the apostle requires of communicants.

XXXII. The arguments of Metrophanes are very easily refuted. For, 1. It does not follow, because our Lord was willing, that young children should come to him, and declared, that theirs was the kingdom of heaven, that they are to partake of the supper. Christ is there speaking of spiritual and mystical communion with himself, which does not imply any sacramental communion whatever ; but that only, of which the subjects he is speaking of are capable. 2. The nature of baptism and of the supper is different. Baptism is the sacrament of regeneration and ingrafting in the church : in the administration of which, the person to be baptized is merely passive : to the receiving of that, the scripture does not so universally require self-examination, and the shewing the Lord's death. And therefore it may be properly applied to young children. But the supper is the sacrament of nutrition, by means of a solid food ; to the partaking whereof, the communicants are required to perform certain actions both by the body and the soul ; of which infants are incapable ; and therefore it belongs to those who are come to the years of discretion, and not to little children. 3. Our Lord, John vi. 53. is not treating of a sacramental, but of a spiritual and mystical eating by faith. For neither was the eucharist then instituted or known : nor will any one readily urge such an absolute necessity for the eucharist, as that without it none can be saved ; which yet our Lord asserts of that eating of his flesh. 4. The example of the prophetess Hannah, who consecrated Samuel a little child to God, is not at all to the purpose. For nothing can be concluded from that, but

that it is a part of the duty of parents, to give up their children, as early as possible, to the obedience and service of God. 5. And what they pretend concerning the dedication of the first-born of the Jews to God, is still more impertinent. For that dedication of the first-born, previous to the setting apart the tribe of Levi, shewed that they were God's, and to be employed in his service : in them the other children were accounted to be consecrated, and even the whole family ; and in a word, they were types of Christ, in whom, as the first-born among many brethren, all the families of the earth are blessed. All which have nothing to do with the participation of the eucharist.

XXXIII. In the ancient church, the communion of the Lord's supper was far more frequently celebrated than it is at this day. It is the advice of Basil to Cæsarea Patricia, *Epist.* 289. "Certainly, to communicate every day, and to partake of the holy body and blood of Christ, is a good and useful practice." Thus also Augustine relates in his former epistle to Januarius, that some *communicated every day*. And to this sense some people wrested the *daily bread*, mentioned in the Lord's prayer : as Fortunatus ; "But the asking our daily bread, seems to insinuate, that we should every day, if possible, reverently take the communion of his body." Afterwards the church increasing in numbers, but abating in zeal, the clergy communicated daily with their priest, while the people thought they had done their duty, if they communicated every Lord's day. But neither did they stop here : for the people knowing no measure to their neglect, it was decreed in several synods, that whoever did not communicate every third Lord's day at least, should be cut off from the church. At last matters came to that pass, that the people scarce communicated on any other days, than the most solemn festivals, especially on the Easter



holy-days. Compare what we have already quoted, *sect. 7.* from Honorius Augustodunensis. This neglect of the common people was frequently reprimanded with severity by the holy men of God. But that custom, which enjoins the communicating once a-year, was so displeasing to Calvin, that he did not scruple to call it a *most certain device of the devil* ; and thinks, we are by all means so to order matters, *as that no meeting of the church be without the word, prayers, and partaking of the supper* : gathering from Acts ii. 42. that such was the practice of the apostolical church, where Luke says, that the *faithful continued steadfastly in the apostles doctrine, and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers.* He at least imagines, the supper may be most decently administered, if each week at least it be set before the church. See *Instit. lib. iv. c. 17. § 43.—47.* Alas ! what a departure is there, at this day, from the sanctity and zeal of the ancients ! Yet, as our Lord has determined nothing as to the time, and in general only recommended frequent communion, by that word, *as oft*, 1 Cor. xi. 25, 26. a certain medium, especially amidst such a corruption of manners, should seem to be observed ; lest, either by the too frequent use, this sacred food should be disesteemed, or we should slight or neglect that august table of the Lord.

XXXIV. Let us now come to the MYSTICAL SIGNIFICATION of the supper, and introduce the beloved spouse of Christ into the inner bed-chamber, where she may delight herself, not with any outward appearance or figure, but exult and melt away in the most desirable embraces of her Husband, and in the pleasures of the purest love ; and forgetting the world, forgetting herself, but full of Christ, she may dissolve away in reciprocal returns of mutual fondness. For this purpose the holy supper is to be considered, I. As a *sign, teaching* us by the institution of Christ. II. As a *seal, ratify-*

ing the promises of the New Testament. III. As a *stipulation*, or solemn engagement, binding on us every duty of piety and love.

XXXV. If we consider the supper as a *sign*, given us for instruction ; it exhibits a *remembrance* of Christ, and a lively representation of most of PHRIKTON TES EUSEBEIAS HEMON MYSTERION, *the awful mysteries of our religion*, as the Greek fathers often speak. The *bread* signifies the *body* of Christ. For as *bread strengtheneth man's heart*, Psal. civ. 15. so the flesh of Christ and the spiritual blessings and graces, purchased for us by Christ, when he was incarnate, are the food of our soul, supporting and strengthening it in the spiritual life, into the hope of life eternal : *I am the living bread which came down from heaven : if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever : and the bread that I will give, is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world*, John vi. 51. Again, as corn, from which bread is prepared, is ground to meal, kneaded to dough, and baked in the oven, before it can be agreeable and wholesome food for man ; so, in like manner, the Captain of our salvation was made perfect through various sufferings, Heb. ii. 10. and scorched both in the fire of the divine wrath kindled against our sins, and in the flames of his own love.

XXXVI. The *wine* signifies the *blood* of Christ. For as wine allays the thirst, revives the animal spirits, cheers the heart, Psal. civ. 15. Prov. xxxi. 6, 7. and makes the maids cheerful (eloquent) Zech. ix. 17 ; so, in like manner, the grace purchased by the blood of Christ, allays the thirst of our soul, abundantly satisfying all our holy longings, John iv. 14. to a kind of a holy and mystical ebriety, Psal. xxxvi. 8. Cant. v. 1 ; it supports and sustains the soul, when sick of love, Cant. ii. 5 ; and *puts gladness into the heart, more than in the time that the corn and wine of scabblu men are*

*increased*, Psal. iv. 7 ; in fine, *causes the lips of those that are asleep to speak*, Cant. vii. 9. and to become eloquent in the praises of God and of his Christ. And hence it is, that the Lord compares the participation of his grace to a *feast of fat things, a feast of wines on the lees, of fat things full of marrow, of wines on the lees well refined*, Is. xxv. 6. And we must not omit, that as wine is squeezed with much force from the grapes when trodden in the wine-press ; so in like manner the Lord Jesus *was straitened*, Luke xii. 50. and oppressed with much anguish, that the blood might flow to us from his blessed body, and his spiritual grace with his blood.

XXXVII. When the dispenser of the mysteries of God *takes* the bread and the cup of blessing into his hands, before the eyes of the faithful, that seems to intimate, that Christ was thus constituted and taken to be Mediator, and *set forth* to believers, *to be a propitiation through faith in his blood*, Rom. iii. 25. The *blessing* and *thanksgiving* pronounced over the bread and wine teach us, that Christ is that blessed seed of Abraham, *in whom God hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places*, Eph. i. 3. and the greatest gift of divine bounty, for which to all eternity we shall not be able to render suitable thanks : nor are we to set about this sacred feast, otherwise than by devout prayers, and a grateful acknowledgement of that infinite mercy, which the Lord vouchsafes to us, who are so unworthy. The *breaking* of the bread represents the breaking of Christ's body, especially that by death ; for the soul is the band, by which all the parts of the body are preserved united. But, on its departure, the carcase is nothing but a heap of dusty particles, which are soon to be separated upon its putrefaction. Which would also have been the case with the dead body of Christ, had not a speedy resurrection prevented that holy One of the Lord from seeing corruption. The

*pouring out* of the wine represents the shedding of Christ's blood, that especially which was done on the cross, for the confirmation of the New Testament. And thus in the holy supper, there is a commemoration of the death of Christ, not in words only, but also by those mystical rites. The *distribution* of these sacred pledges is a figure or emblem of that gratuitous offer, by which the Lord Jesus, with all his saving benefits, is presented to the elect, with the most alluring invitations to accept of him: nor offered only, but actually reached out, and freely given to believers for their eternal salvation. In the preaching of the gospel, there is also a certain, but a more general offer of Christ made to all, who seriously long after his grace. But in the distribution of the sacrament, a much more particular offer and communication of spiritual grace is given to every believing communicant.

XXXVIII. But when believers *receive* the bread and wine, they declare by that action, that they receive by a true faith Christ himself, and all he is, that they may have a right to become the sons of God, John i. 12. But the *eating* the bread and *drinking* the wine signify something more. And *first*, they really set forth the devout and lively employment of the soul, engaged in holy meditations on Christ, who is all its desire, that it may derive from him every thing it knows to be needful for its spiritual life. For what feeding is to the body, that meditation is to the soul: whereby, from the things the thoughts are employed about, it sucks a suitable aliment, as the body is nourished by eating. *Again*, these actions also signify that intimate union which subsists between Christ and believers: as meat and drink, when put into the mouth, are not only received into the stomach, but also converted into the very substance of the person. This union the scripture calls *an abode*, John xiv. 23. *a joining*, 1 Cor. vi. 17.

*the same body*, Eph. iii. 6. *Lastly*, they represent that sweetest delight, which the hungry and thirsty soul enjoys from the fruition of Christ and his grace; not only believing, but seeing and tasting, that the Lord is good, Psal. xxxiv. 9. 1 Pet. ii. 3. And as all are partakers of *one* bread and of *one* wine, this is a figure of that amicable unity, whereby they who partake of the same sacred feast, are united together, as domestics of the same Lord: *for we being many are one bread and one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread*, 1 Cor. x. 17.

XXXIX. But in the holy supper, we have something more than an instructing sign. It is likewise a *seal ratifying* to us the promises and grace of God. And *first*, it really seals all the promises of the *covenant of grace*, which was formerly sealed to believers by the passover, and all those other sacrificial feasts to which they were admitted. *Again*, more especially, the promises of the *New Testament*, better than those of the Old, which the fathers were obliged to be satisfied with. And in this respect the supper of the Christians greatly excels the passover: *This is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins*, Matth. xxvi. 28; in order to a real and not a typical expiation of sin, blotting out the hand-writing, quenching our thirst, and enjoying a fulness of delight in perfect liberty. *In fine*, it most especially seals some *saving blessings*, both of *this life*, and of *that to come*.

XL. The blessings of *this life*, which are sealed to us by the supper, are principally three. 1. Intimate union and communion with Christ, as made perfect by sufferings. Had it pleased our Lord, to give to his disciples a piece cut off from his body for them to eat, or some drops of his blood to drink; even that of itself would not be sufficient to salvation, nor have accomplished a saving communion with Christ, which is not a carnal, but a spiritual thing: yet the disciples would

thereby have had a very effectual sign of the mystical union. But now he substitutes bread in place of his body, wine in place of his blood, when he says, *This is my body ; this is my blood :* and bids us be no less assured, by that pledge, of his mystical communion, than if we took his very body and blood into our hands and mouth. 2. The conservation, and nourishment, the strength and increase of spiritual life, which flow from communion with Christ. As, by the use of bread and wine, he who communicates, experiences his bodily strength renewed ; so at the same time it is intimated to the believing soul, that he shall not want that grace of Christ, which *giveth power to the faint, and to them that have no might increaseth strength*, Is. xl. 29. 3. A satisfying fulness of every desirable good, which neither the world could bestow upon any, nor the beggarly elements of the world separated from Christ, furnish the ancient Jews with ; while the Lord Jesus, presenting these symbols, calls out to believers ; *Ho ! every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money ; come ye, buy and eat ; yea, come, buy wine and milk without money, and without price. Wherefore do ye spend money for that which is not bread ? and your labour for that which satisfieth not ? Hearken diligently unto me, and eat ye that which is good, and let your soul delight itself in fatness*, Is. lv. 1, 2.

XLI. The blessing of the *life to come*, an earnest of which Christ gives us in the supper, is that most abundant satisfactory fulness of glory, both in soul and body, which the psalmist has described Psal. xvi. 11. & xvii. 15. and which is frequently represented under the similitude of a marriage-feast.

XLII. Last of all, with respect to us, the holy supper is a kind of *solemn engagement*, strongly binding us to every duty of piety and love, both to Christ and to our neighbour. It binds us to Christ in several respects.

1. In general, on receiving this earnest of the covenant of grace, in which Christ joins himself to us in a marriage covenant, we, by that very thing, promise, and openly declare, and avow, by an oath, that we shall fulfil every duty of a chaste, faithful, and loving spouse towards him. Every one of the communicants, by this public and solemn feast, which is appointed for confirming this mystical marriage, makes an open profession of that before God, angels, and the whole church. Whoever partakes of the bread broken, and wine poured out, says to Christ, if not in plain words, and an explicit meditation on the thing, yet in the implicit meaning of his act; "As I desire, Lord, to be a partaker of thy body broken, and blood shed for my salvation; so I declare, that I deserve to have my body, no less than this bread, broken or torn in pieces, to have my blood, no less than this wine, poured out, if, in the renewal of this covenant, I shall, with an evil and perfidious heart, break my word to thee." 2. Besides, as in the communion of the holy supper, the greatest, and an almost incredible instance of the love of the Lord Jesus towards us, is held forth not only before our eyes, but exhibited to our taste; in like manner it is proper, that the flames of our love towards him, be, in the participation of that feast, kindled up, and the love of him beyond all other love kept inviolate, and become the object of our admiring thoughts. In the same breath, that the spouse was setting forth the love of her beloved to be better than wine; and infinitely preferring the kisses of his mouth to all other things, the most desirable in other respects; she also adds, Cant. i. 2, 3. *Therefore do the virgins love him.* 3. As the holy supper is especially instituted in remembrance of our Lord, and in commemoration of his death, believers, in the use of it, are bound to have always fresh in their memory the Lord Christ, and the dreadful suf-

ferings he underwent, which are the most solid foundation of our hope, and the only matter of our consolation ; and to esteem Christ crucified, as *a bundle of myrrh, lying all night betwixt our breasts*, Cant. i. 13. 4. and lastly, As a greater mark of familiarity, our Lord desires a mutual supper, *I will sup with him, and he with me*, Rev. iii. 20. It is therefore proper, that they who are entertained by our Lord with so magnificent a feast, should be careful to give him a becoming entertainment in return : invite him to *come into his garden, and eat his pleasant fruits*, Cant. iv. 16. and give him to *drink of spiced wine, and of the juice of their pomegranate*, Cant. viii. 2. That is, they should give him delight by the sincere practice of internal Christianity ; than which neither spices, nor the honeycomb, nor milk, nor wine, can be sweeter to him.

XLIII. To conclude, by the use of the supper we are also bound to the practice of brotherly concord, and the sincerest love towards our brethren and sisters, partakers with us of the same table : that in the hearing, and with the applaud of angels, may be sung in the church of God, with one mouth and one heart, *Behold ! how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity*, Psal. cxxxiii. 1. Thus the apostolic church hath set us an example for imitation ; *And they continuing daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart*, Acts ii. 46. To this purpose was the holy kiss, by which they, on all occasions, kept up a mutual peace ; of which frequent mention is made in scripture, and of which, especially in these rites of the supper, the innocent use was for some time continued among Christians. God grant we may in such a manner solemnize this mystical supper on earth, that we may eternally feast with Christ in heaven.

A M E N.



# I N D E X

O F T H E

## PRINCIPAL MATTERS.

A.

**AARON** a type of Christ, iii. 64.

See Priesthood

Abba, Father, ii. 204

Abel a type of Christ's humiliation, iii. 51

Abib, whence so called, iii. 147

Abraham, God's covenant with, ii. 424. Whether the Trinity appeared, 420. His faith, 428. His seed, 428. Why mentioned in the singular number, 429. His bosom, 353

Abrogation of the covenant of works, i. 206, &c. Unhappily explained by some, 208. See Ark, Covenant, New Testament, Sacrifices

Adam, how considered, i. 59, 64. Not at first the adopted Son of God, nor had a right to the inheritance, 87, 88. Without paradise when created, 140, 63. Not ignorant of the Trinity, 60. Nor fell on the day of his creation, 169. Was himself seduced, 184. Not obliged to what was simply impossible, 198. Was free, 198

Admiration to thirst, what, iii. 215

Adoption, ii. 175. The privilege of both Testaments common to believers in all, but different as to degrees, 182, 3. Not to be denied to Old Testament believers, iii. 276

Adoption, Spirit of, ii. 185. Age, 196, iii. 271. His operations, ii. 197. More rare under the Old Testament, 199. More plentiful in the beginning of the New Testament, 201. Sanctifies as well

as comforts, 210. See Abba, Testimony

Affections corrupted, ii. 228. Sanctified, 234

Agony of Christ in the garden, i. 303

Angel interpreter, ii. 441

Angel strengthening Christ, no reason why his sufferings in the garden were not satisfactory, i. 325

Angels ministry at the giving of the law, iii. 6. About the manna, 198, 9. Their special dominion in the Old Testament church rejected, 279, 80

Aphesis and paresis, iii. 267, 8

Apostasy neither total nor final, can befall believers, ii. 294, 5

Appearances, divine, give sufficient evidences of their divinity, ii. 419

Ark of the covenant described, iii. 67. Mystical signification, 69. Centre of the ceremonies, 338. Removal of it promised as a sign of the most happy period, 339. and imports the abrogation of all the ceremonies, 347. None in the second temple, and why John saw one in heaven, 75

Ark of Noah a type both of Christ and the church, iii. 54, 55

Articles of justification various, ii. 188

Assent of faith, ii. 80. Sometimes staggered, 84

Assurance of election attainable, ii. 9. Manner of it, 27. Importance of it to promote godliness, 28, 29. The interest of Protestants to stir for it, 25

Assurance of faith, ii. 84. Of salvation, 124

Assure a believer, meditation of, 39

Azazel, what, iii. 78. Mystical, 81

## B.

**B**ALAM not Elihu, ii. 415. His prophecy, 115, 6

Baptized into Moses, what, iii. 178, 9

Baptism, Christ submitted to it, i. 382. Of the Israelites, the manner, iii. 384. In the cloud and in the sea, 178, 9. Of the Jews twofold, 383, 4. Of John, 387. Compared with the New Testament baptism, 389. Whether by immersion or aspersion, 390. By one or three applications of water, 394. Form of words to be used, 395. Mystery, 396. Of infants, defended, 410, 11. Succeeded circumcision, 115. Is of practical use, 414

Beginning from the, what, ii. 18

Benefits of the covenant of grace, ii. 1. See Old, New Testament

Logics of believers raised the same in substance, but different in qualities, ii. 361

Body, the fortress of sin, ii. 229. How sanctified, 235

Bohemians, their custom in baptizing infants, iii. 415

Bondage, Spirit of, what, and why ascribed to the Old Testament, iii. 307

Bone of the pass-over not to be broken, iii. 174

Book of life, to be blotted out of it, what, ii. 25. Writing in it various, 8. Original of that way of speaking, ib.

Book of scripture and of conscience, ii. 27

Bread, common, to be used in the Lord's supper, iii. 112. Whether leavened or not, ib. Blessing of it, what, 456. Eating necessary, ib. Going and eating, what, 127. Mystery of the rites, 125. How a resemblance of Christ's body, 119. Not to be kept in a house, 122

From the serpent's head, what, ii. 375

## C.

**C**ADIZ, where Christ's body, iii. 211. See 210

Call external and internal, ii. 33. See Nature

Calling effectual, ii. 30. Internal effected by divine power, 45. Consistent with human liberty, 46. Of the Gentiles, iii. 352

Canaan a type of the heavenly inheritance, iii. 231

Ceremonies a privilege to Israel, iii. 235. Not a barthen only, but seals of grace, 235. A veil, 300. Elements of the world, 302. A yoke and sign of childhood, 303, 4. A wall of partition, 304. A hand-writing, 305

Cherubim, their figure and shape, iii. 68. An emblem of the angels, 71

Children of God, marks of, ii. 207. Excellent condition of, 188, 189. See Sons

Christ, why man, i. 256. Holy, 270. Born of a virgin, 272. True God, 274. The Son, 276. God-man, 275. How inferior to the Father, 255. Could not sin, 257. Whether he merited for himself, 263, 4. A Priest from the beginning of his life, 317. The author of salvation from the beginning, 420. Concerned in sanctification, ii. 211. To be imitated, 262. Consideration of him a mean of sanctification, 272. The soul of the Old Testament, iii. 40, 41. Socinians deny, that, in any respect, he lived after his death, ii. 353. See Agony, Death, Justification, Law, Obedience, Righteousness, Sacraments, Sufferings

Church built on a rock, ii. 209

Circumcision, iii. 121. A domestic sacrament at first, 122. Of women, 128. Necessary, 128. The minister, 131. The mystery, 132. Duration, 137. Abrogated, 137. Will be renounced by the Jews after their conversion, 110. A yoke, i. 153. Of Christ, what it signified, 154. Of the heart under the Old Testament, ii. 219. See Egypt, Circumcisers

Cloud in the wilderness, iii. 183  
 Coats of skins, iii. 105  
 Concurrence divine, i. 194, 5  
 Conflict between the flesh and the spirit, ii. 280  
 Conscience good, what, iii. 397.  
 Answer of, ib.  
 Conservation of believers, ii. 294.  
 Orthodox doctrine promotes both piety and comfort, 327. The object of it, 294.  
 Part of Christ's purchase and intercession, 306  
 Covenant, significations of, i. 46.  
 To cut or strike, ib. To be renewed, ii. 276. Of salt, i. 51. Twofold, 56. Of the decalogue, iii. 37

Covenant of grace described, i. 226.  
 Between the Father and the Son, ib.  
 Periods, 211. Law, 246. Has no proper conditions, 401. With the elect, 397. One in substance, 411. See Son, Threatenings

Covenant of works, i. 56. Abrogation, how, 206. Not to be renewed, 218. See Promises

Creation, the first a type of the second, iii. 46

Crucifixion of Christ, how represented by the passover, i. 394

Cup, the taking and giving, what, iii. 420. Signification, 431. To be received by all, 433

Curse, the fathers not under, iii. 259

Cutting a soul off from his people, what, iii. 128

## D.

**D**AVID not cut off from Christ by his adultery, ii. 213

Dead to sin, what, ii. 230

Death contains the miseries of this life, i. 110. Of the body threatened in Gen. ii. 17. 104. Spiritual, 110. ii. 50. See Spiritual. Eternal threatened, i. 112. Not confined to the despisers of the gospel, 116

Death of Christ satisfactory, i. 301.  
 An accursed death, 323

Decalogue, iii. 2. Given by God, especially the Son of God, 3. Time, manner, and place of its publication, 8, 9. The law of love, 13. See Angels, Covenant, Law, Moses

Declaration of God relates either to the actions or state of men, ii. 109.

Founded in inherent righteousness, 113

Deluge, the mystical signification of, iii. 56

Dove of Noah, the mystical signification of, iii. 57

## E.

**E**AT the dust, what, ii. 375

Egyptians, circumcision of, iii. 125

Elect, their privileges before effectual calling, i. 333. How considered in the covenant, 397. See Assurance, Satisfaction

Election both of Christ, and of those to be saved, ii. 2. Described, 2. From eternity, 9. Most free, 21. Immutable, 23

Enjoyment, gracious, of God, ii. 337

Enmity between the serpent and the woman, and between their seeds, ii. 379

Enoch a type of Christ's exaltation, iii. 51. Prophecy of, ii. 329

Epirus, whence its name, ii. 248

Eternity of punishment from whence, i. 134

Ethiopia not subject to the queen of the South, iii. 126

Ethiopsians, their circumcision, iii. 125.

Why they entered their temples without their shoes, iii. 152

Eve, why so called, ii. 322. The name given her after the fall, 320. The mother of all living, how, 322, 3. Whether she thought Cain was the Messiah, 324; or that the Messiah was to be born of a virgin, 327

Evil infinite, i. 135. See Six

Examples of saints to be imitated, ii. 260, 1

Expiation, feast and ceremonies, iii. 76, 7. Mystery of, 84

F.

**F**ACULTIES. See Soul

Faith in the Messiah, none saved without, i. 432. Its place in the covenant of grace, 108. Historical what, and if rightly so called, ii. 92. Temporary what, and how it differs from saving, 92

Faith, saving, very comprehensive, ii. 74. Not in one faculty, ib. Yet there is one principal justifying act, 77. Plerophory, hypostasis, and elenchus, what, 81, 2. No falsehood in divine faith, 84. Receives and relies on Christ, 86, 7, 8. Submits to him as Lord, 89. The syllogism of, ib.

Faith's relation to justification, ii. 128. Alone justifies, 127. Consists not in observing the commands of the gospel, nor comes in the room of perfect obedience, 128, 9. Nor justifies as our act, 130. Nor the proper condition of justification, 139. Includes not the acts of the other graces, 133. Justifies, how, 136

Faith sometimes signifies a persuasion of the lawfulness of a thing, ii. 253. The original of holiness, 251

Fall foreknown and foreordained, i. 191. Was certainly to be, 192. God not the author of it, 199. See Adam

Father called Christ's God, i. 233

Fathers of the Old Testament had the promises of the resurrection and eternal life, i. 413, 14, 15. Saved by Christ, 431. With whom they had communion by faith, 432. Had not full liberty before Moses, 430, 1. Enjoyed true and permanent benefits, iii. 240. See Adoption, Circumcision, Curse, Justification, Peace, Spirit, Writing

Fear of death, ancient believers subject to it how far, iii. 283

Feasts federal, i. 49

Finished, in what sense Christ said IT IS, i. 296

Fire, sacrifices consumed by, iii. 110, 11

Forgiven, Christ not, i. 359.

Foundation of God sure, ii. 222. Of the world, from the, 11

Friendship with God what, ii. 160. When interrupted, how renewed, 171

G.

**G**ARMENTS of Aaron, iii. 65

Gates of Hell, what, ii. 311

Gentiles, fulness and riches of, iii. 380. See Proselytes

Glorification, ii. 231. Both in this and in the future life, 333, 4. In this life. See Assurance, Enjoyment, Holiness, Joy, Vision. In the future life, viz. of the soul, 359. Of the body, 340. Degrees of it, 363

Glory of God the end of our actions, ii. 265

God how considered in the covenant of works, i. 59. In the covenant of grace, 297, 8. To be called the God of any imports a covenant, 253. and includes eternal life, 414

Godliness prompted by the doctrine of justification, ii. 153

Gospel first promise explained, ii. 371

Grace and works opposite, ii. 122

H.

**H**AND-WRITING; ceremonies so called, why, iii. 305. Exacted of the fathers before Moses, 266

Head, bruising the serpent's, ii. 278

Heart, with the whole, what, ii. 255

Heathen, their excellent expressions concerning the original of virtue, ii. 243

Heel, to bruise, what, ii. 285

Hind let loose in Gen. xlix. 22. what, ii. 437

Holiness, Christian, preferable to Heathen virtues, ii. 259

Holiness, God's essential, does not suffer sin to be unpunished, i. 126. And

righteousness distinguished, 65. A part of glory, 333

Holy, elect why called, ii. 214

Horse of divine majesty, what, ii. 250

Humility promoted by the doctrine of justification, ii. 151

Hunger and thirst after Christ, ii. 86

## I.

**J**ACOB and Esau examples of predestination, ii. 431, 5

Jacob's prophecy, i. 420, 422, 426

James and Paul harmonious in the doctrine of justification, ii. 114

Japheth, whence called, ii. 412. Whether he or God dwell in the tents of Shem, 414

Jews, their restoration, iii. 370

Image of God in its whole extent, i. 68. Consisted in righteousness, ib.

Imitation of Christ, ii. 262

Imposition of hands on the sacrifice, iii. 82

Infant-baptism, iii. 409

Infinite, the malignity of sin how, i. 155

Interpretation, rules of, i. 239

Job's confession, i. 420. His Notzer, ii. 440

Joy, spiritual, ii. 533

Isaac a type of Christ and the church, iii. 57, 8, 9

Israel called God's first-born, ii. 176. All in Rom. xi. 26. what, iii. 371

Israelites duty as to the manna, iii. 266. Sins, 211. See Jews

Judgment described in Matth. xxv. universal, i. 117

Justice, vindictive, suffers not sin to go unpunished, i. 127

Justification, importance of the doctrine, and signification of the word, ii. 100, 1. More than a bare declaration, 108. Considers man as in himself, or in Christ, 112. Of a sinner as in Christ, 115. Every thing necessary performed by him, 117. The parts of it, 116. The

judge, 119. The matter, 120. The mean, 127. Articles, 136. In the next world, 110. The usefulness of the doctrine, 149. The privilege of Old-Testament believers, iii. 259. See Righteousness

Justified, how Christ was, i. 388

Justify does not always signify to declare, ii. 103

## K.

**K**NOWLEDGE of faith attainable, ii. 97. Sometimes difficult, 98. Expedient, though not necessary to salvation, 99

Knowledge belongs to faith, ii. 77. Which in many is very implicit, 78

## L.

**L**AMBS most frequently used in the passover, iii. 157. Represented the person of Christ, 167

Land of Canaan not first promised at Sinai, i. 456

Law threefold, iii. 1, 2. See Decalogue. To what, and how far Christ was subject, i. 251, 2. Not abrogated by Christ's suretiship, 285. But only as a covenant of works, iii. 25, &c.

Law of the decalogue, by whom written, why and how, iii. 14. Of perpetual obligation, 21. Use of it, 26

Law of God, why the law of sin and death, ii. 125

Law of nature, i. 72. Was before the fall, 75. Its precepts founded in the nature of God, 80. Obedience due to it, 86

Least in the kingdom of heaven, who, iii. 312

Leaven not to be used by the priest of Jupiter, iii. 162. Nor in the passover, 175

Liberty, Christian, iii. 367

Liberty, God's clemency and predestination not prejudicial to it, i. 197. Of the wild not infringed by converting grace, ii. 46

Life eternal promised in the covenant of works, i. 91. To be enjoyed in heaven, 94. Not obtained but by perfect obedience, 207. Promised to the elect from the beginning, 400. See Spiritual.

Lord's supper, why so called, iii. 417. Why Christ used bread and wine, 418. The use of wafers condemned, 420. Sacramental actions explained, 426. Words 428. Rites compared with those of the passover, ib. Uses, ends, and mystical signification, 429. Whether to be administered to children, 436. How often, 438. Preparation, 434, 5

Love belongs to faith, ii. 85. Of Christ a motive to holiness, 273

Love to God, the principle of holiness, ii. 253. To ourselves should centre in and flow from this, 257. And to our neighbour, could not but be required, i. 82. With all the heart, what, 285

## M.

**M**ANNA, why so called, iii. 192. Of the Israelites, compared with the Polish and the common, 194, 5. Why called *LECHÈM ABIRIM*, 198. Figure, colour, taste, &c. 200, 201, 2. Place and time, 215. Mystery, 212, 13. See Israelites, Moses

Mean, or instrument of justification, ii. 127

Mediator, requisites of, i. 266. Inferior to the Father, how, 257

Mortification of the old man, ii. 240

Moses, the shining of his face, iii. 18. Ministry about the manna, 198. Represents both the law and Christ, 60, 61. A mediator, 62. Type of Christ, 187. See Baptized, Decalogue

## N.

**N**APHTALI's blessing, B. 407

Nature invites men to seek after God and heavenly things, ii. 32, 4. Yields some hope of enjoying God, 56. Teacheth that purity of heart is requisite, ib. Its invitation useful, but insufficient, 29

New man, ii. 234

New Testament, different epochas of, i. 419, 30. Peculiar benefits, iii. 359. See Promises

Nisan, whence so called, iii. 147, 8

Noah, whence so called, ii. 400, 401.

What Lamech expected at his birth, 401, 2. A preacher of righteousness, 404.

Type of Christ, iii. 52, 3. See Ark  
O.

**O**ATH, believers devote themselves to God by, ii. 220

Obedience, perfect, the only meritorious cause of eternal life, i. 216. Christ's active and passive imputed, 250, 88, 9. How different from ours, 259, 60. Its relation to the reward, 263

Economies of the covenant of grace two, i. 421. Not three, 450, 1. See Testament

Old man, ii. 225

Old Testament, beginning of, i. 407. Its several periods, 443. Consists not in the allotment of Canaan alone, 455. Covenant ascribed to Moses, 446. Last things of it coalesce with the first things of the New, 418, 9. Defects, iii. 296. Peculiar blessings, 228. Are true and permanent, 244, 5. Abrogation, 310, &c. See Adoption, Angels, Circumcision, Curse, Fear, Justification, Peace, Writing

Oneness of the covenant of grace, i. 411

Oxen called passovers, why, iii. 157

## P.

**P**ARADISE a type of heaven, i. 141, 144. Ejection out of it not a sacrament, iik 104. See Adam

Passage through the Red sea, iii. 177, 8

Passover, what it signified to Christ, i. 223. Name, iii. 116. Time of its celebration, iii. 147. Place, 149. A real sacrifice, ib. Ministers and guests, 151, 2, 3. A second for the unclean, 156. The victim, 157. Preparation, killing, roasting, eating, 159, &c. Other ce-

reasons peculiar to Egypt, 164. Mystery, 166. Celebrated by Christ when, 419. See Crucifixion, Egyptians, Women

Peace of conscience under the Old Testament, iii. 276

Peace with God, ii. 154. With conscience, and with the friends of God, 162. With the creature, 163. Spiritual to be sought after, preserved, and renewed, 165. Sense of it often interrupted, 168. Differs from carnal security, 170. Conferred on believers under the Old Testament, 174

Perfect, nothing avails in justification, but what is, ii. 124

Perfection threefold, i. 86. Various kinds of it in scripture, ii. 283. Absolute not attainable in this life, 278

Pharaoh's chariot, the church compared to the horses of, ii. 213

Pharisees falsely commended, i. 417

Pillar of cloud and fire, iii. 188

Pit wherein is no water, iii. 318

Possible, if it be, what, ii. 301

Pot of manna, iii. 76. How said to be in the ark, 210

Prayer a mean of sanctification, ii. 275

Preparations to regeneration considered, ii. 55

Priesthood of Aaron abrogated, iii. 342

Promises of the covenant of works, i. 91. Flow from the nature of God, 96. See Life. Of the covenant of grace, 400, 401. Of the New Testament better than those of the Old, 401

Prophet in Deut. xviii. 15, 18, who, iii. 326

Proselytes, their initiation among the Israelites, how, iii. 334

Psalm xxxii. b. ciii. not prophecies concerning the Messiah, iii. 261

Punishment of sin from the nature of God, i. 120. Eternal due, 125. Of loss attended with that of sense, 115

Punishments convictive and compensatory, warlike and judicial, i. 320

## R.

**R**AINBOW, a sign of what covenant, iii. 115. Symbol of divine grace in Christ, 117

Red sea, its names, iii. 179. Miraculously divided, 180, 1. Passed through by the Israelites, how, 181. Mystery of that passage, 188, &c.

Regeneration variously taken, ii. 60. Described, 50. Mysterious, 49. In a moment without any intermediate state, 53. Who to be accounted in this state, 67. The author, 68. The cause, *ib.* The seed, 70. Means to be used, how, 71

Remission of sins under the Old Testament, iii. 258

Repentance, several kinds of, ii. 237

Repenting sinner gives joy in heaven, why, ii. 288

Reproof to be borne, ii. 278

Resurrection of the dead promised under the Old Testament, i. 414

Reward promised to Christ, i. 261

Righteousness and holiness, whether, and how distinguished, i. 66. Of Christ the matter of justification, ii. 120, &c. Imputed to the sinner, when united to Christ, 117. Of God in Rom. iii. 21. what, 351. Not his veracity, 352

Rock giving water, iii. 219. Mystery, 220. Another, 221

Rod, Aaron's, that budded, iii. 67

## S.

**S**ABBATH instituted, when, i. 155, &c. Nature of the first, 158. Mystical signification of that day, 163

Sacraments, the use of, i. 137. Under the covenant of works, 138. Seals of death, to whom, 154. Used by Christ, 245, 382. What they signified to him, 385. His faith confirmed by them, 321. Before Abraham, iii. 103. Extraordinary in the wilderness, 177. Under the New Testament only two, iii. 302

Sacrifice, mystery of their oblation,

- iii. 110. Sacraments, how, 108. Before the law, 107. Mystical signification, 110. Contained a confession of sin and guilt, 113. An excitement to piety, *ib.* Abrogation of, 348. Imports that of the whole ceremonial worship, 350
- Salt, covenant of, i. 51
- Salvation, how believers may have an eye to it in the exercise of duty, ii. 268. Revealed under the Old Testament, iii. 246
- Sanctification belongs to glorification rather than to justification, ii. 105. Distinguished from regeneration, effectual calling, and justification, 221. Both a blessing and a duty, 223. Parts of it, *ib.* Order, 238. Wherein it consists, 239. Appropriated to the Spirit, 240. Means, 269. Imperfect in this life, 273. See Christ
- Satan's death, ii. 373
- Satisfaction, efficacy of Christ's, i. 327. What it procures, 329, &c. Necessity of it, 343. For whom, 359, &c. Advantages the reprobate reap from it, 361
- Scape-goat. See Azazel
- Scaled, believers are, how, ii. 219
- Sealing of the Spirit, ii. 522, 3
- Security, carnal, differs from spiritual peace, ii. 175
- Seed of the serpent, ii. 388. See Abraham, Woman
- Serpent the seducer, who, i. 181. A type of the devil, does not feed on the dust only, ii. 371. Why cursed above all cattle, 374. Why condemned to go on his belly and eat dust, 375. Brazen, the history of, iii. 222. Mystery, 223, &c
- Seth, whence the name, ii. 398. His children, 445, &c.
- Stheno, queen of, iii. 126, 7
- Sin infinitely evil, how, i. 135. How deprived of its twofold power, ii. 125, 6
- Sin, the first, violated the whole covenant, i. 182, 3. Why ascribed to Adam, 183. Justly imputed to his posterity, 200. His first only imputed, 206. See Fall
- Singular piety, what, ii. 216
- Sinner still under obligation to obedience, i. 207. Even to that which is perfect, 214
- Son, necessity of his being Surety, i. 276. Covenant with the Father, 226. Whether he could refuse to undertake, or withdraw from the covenant, 254
- Sons of God, who, ii. 175. Believers how, 177. Under the New Testament, 185. Testament of, 190, 1
- Soul, faculties of, not really distinct, ii. 74
- Souls, state of, after death, according to the Socinians, ii. 340. Survive death, and have the power of perception, 341, 5. Are received into heavenly joys and mansions, 350. Change their place as well as their state, 355. Enjoy happiness, 357. Which will be perfect at the last day, 359, 60. Place of those who were soon to be reunited to their bodies, 358
- Spirit, Holy, dwells in the elect, ii. 314. Confirms and seals believers, 320. An enemy to the Israelites, 316. See Adoption
- Spirits in prison, ii. 405
- Spiritual death, degrees of, ii. 62. See Death
- Spiritual life, the progress of, ii. 65. Of a believer compared with that of Adam in innocence, 317
- Star out of Jacob, ii. 446
- Strike or cut a covenant, what, i. 46, 9
- Sufferings, warlike and judiciary, not proper, i. 300. Of Christ all satisfactory, 292
- Supper, Christ partook of it, i. 383. What it signified to him, 395. See Lord's
- Suretyship of Christ, i. 280
- Surety, Christ why man, i. 266. And God, 274. Both in one person, 278

T.

**T**ABLES of stone on which the Law



was written, two, iii. 14, 15. The first broken, and two others renewed, 16, 17

Temporary faith, ii. 92. See Faith

Temptation, first, explained, i. 186

Testament, whether three economies, i. 450. Old and New, and the difference between them, 434, 5. See Benefits, Old, New

Testimony of the Spirit concerning our adoption, ii. 206. Has the marks of its divinity, 212. Comforts only the broken in heart, 213. See Adoption

Threatenings of the covenant of works, i. 104. All from the law, none from the covenant of grace, strictly speaking, 409, 10

Times of wrath not those of the Old Testament, iii. 295

Tranquility of soul from faith, ii. 90

Tree of knowledge of good and evil, why so called, i. 81. Why prohibited, and whether but one, 85. Whether a sacrament, 149. Of life, why so called, and whether but one, 146. A type of the Son of God, 148

Trinity. See Abraham

Types, doctrine of, iii. 40. May be explained by uninspired men, ib. Rules for explication, 43. Division of them, 46

## U.

**U**NDERSTANDING, how corrupted, ii. 225. Enlightened in sanctification, 231

## V.

**V**IOLATION of the covenant of works, i. 182

Virtue, beauty of, ii. 274

Vision of God in the light of grace, ii. 334

## W.

**W**ATER represents the blood and Spirit of Christ, how, iii. 399

Will, not really different from the understanding, ii. 74. How corrupted, 226. How renewed, 253

Wine represents the blood of Christ, how, iii. 131. Whether white or red, pure or mixed, 421, 2. Why mixed by the ancients, 423. May be supplied by countries who have it not, 425. The fruit of the vine, 421. Why nothing is said of pouring it out, 430, 1

Woman's seed, ii. 381

Women, passover of, arbitrary, iii. 153

Word of grace published from the beginning, and sufficient for the elect in all ages, ii. 42. Never universally published through the world, 43. Requires all to obey the command of faith, 44

Works opposed to faith in justification, ii. 134. All excluded there, 134. Will be alledged as vouchers of faith, &c. at the last day, 111. Yet not then declared to have been perfect, 116. See Covenant

World signifies that of the elect, i. 366, &c. Before it began, what, ii. 14. Possession of, 190

Writing the law on the heart not peculiar to the New Testament, iii. 255

## Z.

**Z**ABIANS, iii. 324

Zacchæus's law, i. 45.















