







THE  
GENTLEMAN  
OF THE  
COURT

OF THE  
COURT  
OF THE  
COURT

THE *Sam: Miller*  
SATISFACTION  
OF  
CHRIST,  
STATED AND DEFENDED,  
AGAINST THE  
SOCINIANS:  
IN TWO PARTS:

BY PETER ALLINGA,  
Pastor of the Church of Christ in Wydenesse, in the Dutch Netherlands.

---

---

FAITHFULLY TRANSLATED FROM THE DUTCH,  
BY THOMAS BELL,  
Minister of the Gospel in GLASGOW.

---

---

*Many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased, DAN. xii. 4.*

Entered in Stationer's Hall.

---

GLASGOW:  
PRINTED BY ALEX. ADAM.  
M DCC XC.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

PHYSICS DEPARTMENT

PHYSICS 309

LECTURE NOTES

BY

PROFESSOR

ROBERT A. FAY

CHICAGO, ILL.

1963

PRINTED BY

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

CHICAGO, ILL.

1963

ISBN 0-226-309-00-0

0-226-309-01-7 (pbk.)

THE *Sam. Bell*  
SATISFACTION  
OF  
CHRIST,  
STATED AND DEFENDED,  
AGAINST THE  
SOCINIANS:  
IN TWO PARTS:

BY PETER ALLINGA,  
Pastor of the Church of Christ in Wydenesse, in the Dutch Netherlands.

---

---

FAITHFULLY TRANSLATED FROM THE DUTCH,  
BY THOMAS BELL,  
Minister of the Gospel in GLASGOW.

---

---

*Many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased, DAN. xii. 4.*

Entered in Stationer's Hall.

---

GLASGOW:  
PRINTED BY ALEX. ADAM.  
M DCC XC.

# P R E F A C E.

**T**HEOLOGICAL improvements cannot be the boast of the present age. It is not remarkable either for *soundness of sentiment*, or *purity of morals*, in the professors of Christianity. The *thirty nine* articles on yonder side the Tweed, and the *thirty three* on this, are considered by many, rather as a *bond of peace*, than a *test of orthodoxy*. Hence ministers can subscribe them with their hands, who do not believe them in their hearts: and accordingly there is as great a difference between their subscriptions and their sermons, as between Jacob's hands and his voice, when he deceived his venerable father, Gen. xxvii. 22. Though our Confession of Faith be Calvinistic, yet it is so true, that it cannot be denied, and so important, that it should not be concealed; many who subscribe that Confession are deeply tinged with Arminian and Socinian errors. What they propagate from the pulpit and the press, are incontestible evidences of this. And none more so, than a treatise printed at Edinburgh, anno 1786, intitled a Practical Essay on the Death of Jesus Christ, by William M'Gill, D. D. one of the Ministers of Ayr. This work the author dedicates to his Colleague; a strong additional proof that they are not unequally yoked, and that *that* part of the vineyard committed to their care, is not sown with divers seeds, Deut. xxii. 9, 10. Dr. M'Gill's Essay, containing many things contrary to holy Scripture, and the Westminster Confession, which it was to be supposed he had acknowledg-

ed as the Confession of his faith, could not but attract the attention of the public. Christians of all denominations were astonished to see his doctrine concerning the person, priesthood, and atonement of our Lord; and no less so, to observe that in the judicatories of the church there was a deep silence as to that publication. The Effay was known from one end of the island to the other, and every where considered as stuffed with Socinian tenets; except by the Town-Council, and Kirk-Session of Ayr, who found no fault in it, and strange to tell, had heard no *fama clamosa* concerning it. While it drew the attention of the public, it excited a spirit of inquiry in many. Those who had long known the truth as it is in Jesus, were all ardour to know it more fully, and to communicate what they knew to others, that *they* might be the more confirmed in the faith. A Divine in the establishment, long conspicuous for his learning, piety, and catholicism, had the goodness to transmit Allinga's Dissertations to me, recommending in particular, that on the satisfaction of Christ<sup>a</sup>. I read it with avidity. Finding such a richness of sentiment, in a narrow compass, such solidity of reasoning, and the sinews of Socinianism so effectually cut, I thought, *I did not well*, especially at such a time as this, to keep the lamp under a bushel. Hence I attempted to translate Allinga. How far I have succeeded, can be judged by those only who are able to compare the translation with the

<sup>a</sup> It was printed at UTRECHT in the year 1675, and dedicated, to Pensionary FAGEL.

original. This I can honestly say, that in no one instance have I willingly done violence to the author. Considering the great importance of the subject, I judged it safer to give a literal translation than a free: at least as literal as the genius of our language would admit.

Though several had wrote to excellent purpose against Dr. M'Gill's Essay, I still thought there was room to add something more; and particularly, that it might serve the interest of Christianity, to contrast a number of passages in that Essay with express scripture-texts. By such a method, they who candidly inquire after truth, are led at once to see how far the Doctor differs from scripture. Contraries appear in the most striking light, when placed fast by one another. In the Contrast, the reader sees the Doctor's own words on the left-hand page, and the Scripture on the right. Having read number one on the left-hand, let him then read the same on the right, and so on; always comparing what the Doctor says, with what the Scripture teaches. As to the notes, which are occasionally added, he may consult them as he finds most convenient. In quoting Scripture-texts, I have in a few instances receded from our version, but never, to my knowledge, from the truth of the sacred Originals. It has been alledged, that there are a great many passages in the Essay, which have the appearance of orthodoxy: and these have been plausibly pleaded on the author's behalf. But allowing them to be orthodox, to what does the Apology amount? Why, precisely to this, that doing justice in one company to a

worthy character, must be sustained as an apology for wounding it in another. But who that values truth or character can admit of such a defence?

It is not improper to be observed here, that by dint of the peoples importunity, the cause respecting Doctor M<sup>c</sup>Gill's Essay was brought before the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, in April 1789. And having been tossed from court to court, it came again before the Synod at Ayr, in April last. And there it terminated, little, as I apprehend, to the honour of any party; and much, much to the prejudice of precious truth. A motion having been made and seconded, that as Doctor M<sup>c</sup>Gill had shown a disposition to make suitable acknowledgements, in order to restore peace, some ministers should retire along with him, to draw up what might appear to them calculated to produce so desirable an end. The Synod having considered this motion, did appoint six ministers as a committee to retire immediately with the Doctor, taking with them what papers they thought proper. Said committee, with Doctor M<sup>c</sup>Gill, retired for some hours, and then brought in their report, which consisted of an Explanation and Apology by the Doctor, the committee declaring their satisfaction with it. That some of them were satisfied, i. e. had never been displeased with his doctrine, is not to be wondered at; but that others were, was matter of surprize, and of sorrow. The Doctor's Explanation and Apology was as follows.

“ Considering that every member of the church of  
“ Scotland, is bound, by very solemn engagements,

“ to adhere to her standards, and that these standards  
 “ are the only authoritative interpreters of the sacred  
 “ Scriptures amongst us, I hereby again declare, that  
 “ I am heartily sorry, that my publications should  
 “ have given offence to any of my brethren, or to the  
 “ world. And now upon farther reflection, I am sen-  
 “ sible, that there are ideas contained in these publica-  
 “ tions, which *may appear* improper, and modes of  
 “ expression, ambiguous and unguarded, particularly  
 “ respecting the original and essential dignity of the  
 “ Son of God; the doctrine of atonement by his suf-  
 “ ferings and death; the priesthood and intercession of  
 “ Christ; the method of reconciling sinners to God;  
 “ and subscription to the Confession of Faith: All  
 “ which ideas I hereby disclaim, and for all which ex-  
 “ pressions I am heartily sorry, and hereby declare my  
 “ belief of these great articles, as they are laid down  
 “ in the standards of this Church.” This Explanation  
 and Apology being read and duly considered, the Sy-  
 nod *approved* thereof, and received the same as *satis-*  
*factory*, ordering it to be published. Upon reading  
 this sentence, Dr. M<sup>c</sup>Gill declared his acquiescence,  
 and took instruments in the clerk’s hands. The Sy-  
 nod being satisfied, and Dr. M<sup>c</sup>Gill *acquiescing*, they  
*wrapped up* the matter. How candid he was in his  
 confession, if so it may be called, is not ours to judge;  
 but sure he was not copious. Ideas, which *may ap-*  
*pear improper*, are to be found in the most of publica-  
 tions; and where is the author from whom expressions  
 unguarded and ambiguous never drop? An explana-

tion of error into truth, or an apology for it, is not an easy task. But so it is, that the Doctor's Explanation and Apology was approved by the Synod, without one dissenting voice. All that he had said in his Essay, concerning the four doctrinal points mentioned in his Explanation; and all that he had vented in the appendix to his Revolution Sermon, against subscribing Confessions of Faith, are so effectually wiped away by his Explanation, that the Synod is satisfied. They find no cause to suspend him a few sabbaths from his office; none to rebuke him at their bar, that he might be found in the faith; Tit. i. 15. none to prohibit him from using such offensive expressions as frequently occur in his publications; nay, none to *admonish him*. The necessity of all these is entirely superseded by his Explanation and Apology. A mournful decision indeed! And yet the Synod deeply impressed with a sense of the happy conclusion to which the matter was brought, appointed a Reverend member to return thanks to God for his countenance and direction in that business, which was done accordingly. So Saul spared Agag, and spake of sacrificing unto the Lord, 1 Sam. xv. 9,—23. Numbers however, still approve of the Synod's conduct, and loudly aver, that the matter was brought to a happy issue. How so? O, say they, had it gone to the General Assembly, no such satisfaction would have been obtained. But how come they by this *spirit of divination*? Are they certain that the Church of Scotland is become a swarm of Socinians? Supposing the worst, however, by carrying the

cause to the supreme court, the protesters and appellants would have thrown a weight from off their own shoulders, which now must ly upon them; they spontaneously cherishing the man, whom, in the supposed case, the Assembly would have supported. Had the Assembly really done so, which after all is uncertain, still the appellants, like the honourable Counsellor of old, might not have *consented* to their deed, Luke xxiii. 51. The late decision of the Synod is a bad precedent for futurity. For according to it, a minister may preach and publish all the errors of a M'Gill, and when brought before his superiors, he has no occasion to *retract*; he has only to adopt a M'Gill's Explanation and Apology, and the matter is at an end. If the Doctor shall henceforth teach otherways than in his Essay, it will be a proof of his candour and contrition. But if he observe a deep silence concerning the four important points mentioned in his Apology, let him remember, that as a man can be *starved* to death, as well as *stabbed*; so to *conceal* the truth may issue in the blood of souls, no less than to *corrupt* it, Acts xx. 26, 27.

The state of matters being as just now represented, it is hoped, that the following Tracts, though *late*, will not be *out of season*. That the God of grace and truth may abundantly bless them unto all, into whose hands they come, is the earnest prayer of,

THOMAS BELL.

GLASGOW,  
July 27th, 1790.

THE  
SATISFACTION OF CHRIST

STATED AND DEFENDED

AGAINST THE SOCINIANS.

PART FIRST.

THE FIRST POINT OF DIFFERENCE.

*Whether God punishes sin, as he is the injured Sovereign?  
or as he is the Governor and Judge of the world?*

**I**T is evident, from scripture and nature, that God is a sovereign of unlimited dominion. It is also visible from these two volumes, that he does not always act as such. Many of his works, must be attributed unto him under another relation. Sometimes he is introduced as a Father, sometimes as a King, sometimes as an unlimited Sovereign, sometimes as a Judge and Ruler.

Hence it follows, that he confounds matters most miserably, who attributes all to God under one relation, or who assigns to him under a wrong relation, these things which belong to him in another. This will not only be a mistake, but also an occasion of greater errors. For this reason, it is of the utmost importance, that we have just apprehensions, under

what relation God punishes sin. To fail herein, is a dangerous error, and will often produce a multitude of others.

He, who with us, acknowledges and honours the Deity, will cheerfully confess, that God punishes, or hath a right to punish. Nevertheless, there is a difference as to this, under what character that right belongs to him, as also under what relation, he puts it in execution. No happy judgment can be formed concerning this, if we do not previously comprehend what punishment properly is, and also what is the reason, why God punishes. Punishment is commonly described, *vindicta noxæ*, that is, the avenging of a transgression, or injury. The word *noxæ*, has two senses, and signifies, sometimes a transgression, sometimes an injury. When it means an *injury*, the description is bad, but when it signifies a *transgression*, it is good.

For 1<sup>st</sup>, That is properly to punish evil, when the wickedness or transgression is avenged. When men avenge the injury, then restitution only is sought.

2<sup>dly</sup>, The foundation of *penal evil*, can be nothing else, but *moral evil*, and so punishment must be an inflicting of a penal evil, in revenge of the moral, that is, of the transgression.

3<sup>dly</sup>, The *formal* reason of a thing causeth the thing to be. *Forma dat esse rei*. What is the reason of punishment? that which makes sin to be sin. What is that? the vitiosity of the act. It is therefore, properly an *avenging of the fault or transgression*.

4<sup>thly</sup>, If punishment was properly an avenging of

the injury, and not of the transgression, then proper punishment would descend to the heirs, as does the injury with the profit. Which strikes directly against the word of God and sound reason, according to which, the innocent is by no means heir of his guilty father.

5thly, He sinneth, who does not satisfy for the injury when he is able. He does not transgress, who does not deliver himself up to punishment. It is therefore an avenging, *not of the injury, but of the fault or transgression.* This is so apparent, that no proper punishment can be imagined or conceived, without immediately thinking of a vitious act, a violation of right, and a transgression of the law.

This teaches us, what divine punishment is, to wit, *An avenging of a fault committed against God's law.* The fault committed against his law, is the reason why he punishes.

1st, This is properly to punish sin, because its very essence consists in transgressing the law.

2dly, God punishes, not because sin is injurious, but because it is worthy of punishment. Rom. i. 32.

3dly, God punishes from holiness, Jos. xxiv. 19. Hab. i. 13. Holiness strikes against wickedness, therefore divine punishment is *an avenging of the transgression.*

4thly, God hates that which he punishes. That which he hates is the vitious or the criminal thing. Therefore that which he punishes, must be the fault or the transgression.

Now it appears, in what capacity the right and the

execution of punishment belongs to God; not inasmuch as he is an absolute Lord, injured, and a creditor, but inasmuch as he is a Governor and Ruler, who judgeth and avengeth the wicked action, the transgression of the law, the violation of the public right; which is the proper work of a Judge. We by no means deny, that God is injured by sin, and that he as such may demand reparation. This is the right of every one who is injured, and for that reason it cannot be refused to God. But here reparation is impossible. For where nothing is, there the proprietor loseth his own. And though reparation were possible, it would here be one and the same with punishment, and therefore they must be joined as circumstances require. Here the idea of punishment must prevail, which is not inflicted upon the sinner, as a simple reparation, but as the punishment of a fault; and that not as a private, but as a public vengeance, executed by a public person. This is therefore our persuasion: we believe, *That the Lord is absolutely free, possessed of supreme dominion, that he is injured by sin, but that he does not punish as an absolute Lord, or as injured, or as a creditor, but as a RULER AND A JUDGE*<sup>a</sup>.

Here the school of Socinus sets itself in opposition. He asserts with his followers, that God punishes as a *sovereign Lord and an absolute Prince*, who is injured, and so demands the punishment<sup>b</sup>. What urges them to

<sup>a</sup> Cocc. de fæd. par. 73. 89. 92.

<sup>b</sup> Socin. de Serv. part. 1. cap. 3. Crell. de Deo. & attrib. lib. 1. cap. 23. & contra Grotium, p. 144.

this, is, that they judge, they can then with less trouble overthrow the necessity of punishment, when sin is committed; and also with greater ease impugn the satisfaction of Jesus Christ. This is a vain attempt. For the necessity of punishment, and the truth of the satisfaction, can be sufficiently defended, by other reasons, without these: and Crellius himself is forced to confess, that there are cases, in which the party injured cannot omit to take vengeance, to wit, when his honour is affected<sup>c</sup>. Thus stands the matter here. The least sin wounds the honour of God. What makes our opponents to err, is, that they measure God by man. They think that among men the right of punishment belongs properly to the person injured, as such, and for that reason, to God also as injured. But, it is not yet proved, that man executeth, or can execute proper punishment upon man. Also it is not true, that the right of punishment, which takes place among men, belongs to the injured, as such.

For, *1<sup>st</sup>*, Then the magistrate could bring none to punishment, to whom the person injured had forgiven the evil.

*2<sup>dly</sup>*, Then the magistrate could not remit the punishment against the will of the injured, yea, not without his consent. The right which belongs to any one by nature, cannot be taken from him, or usurped by another, against, yea, without his will.

*3<sup>dly</sup>*, Then it is not in the power of the magistrate

<sup>c</sup> Crell. contra Grotium, cap. 2. part. 29. p. 198.

to punish any other crimes, but those in which he is injured.

4thly, Then Paul would not have reckoned punishment in governors as an act of force and supreme authority, Rom. xiii. because that does not become the injured as such. Here Crellius, would gladly make us believe, *That in this the magistrates assume the execution of a foreign right.* Where does this assumption appear? where appears such a resignation? subjects can be injured, they can demand reparation of an injury, and have never resigned the right of injured parties.

5thly, If this right of punishment belongs to the injured party as such, then God would not have taken vengeance to himself, to the exclusion of the injured. Rom. xii. 19, 20. For he gives nothing in nature, which he immediately resumes to himself.

6thly, Then also would not nature have given power and strength to every injured person to execute punishment, if this right appertained to the injured as such?

7thly, The injury gives no greater right to the injured, than is the injury done him: that is simple reparation, which differs very much from punishment. Wherefore we have reason thus to conclude, punishment with men, concerns the ruler and judge as such; therefore punishment properly taken, can be ascribed to God under no relation, but that of a *Ruler and a Judge*. In proper punishment, the transgression of the law is only punished, and God avenges the filthi-

ness of sin; the injured the injury only, and therefore hath nothing to say concerning the transgression. That is the work of the judge. It also sounds strange in my ears, that our opponents, maintaining that God punishes as injured, deny however so absolutely, that he punishes as a Judge. As a Ruler and Law-giver, he is first and most immediately injured by sin, and for that reason also as a Judge, who is one with a Law-giver. See all this, James iv. 11, 12. He must therefore first and most immediately punish as a Judge.

Therefore the difference here is this, on both sides it is taught, that the right to punish sin, belongs to God; who also punishes, and that in sin he is injured. It remains in dispute, *Under what relation he punishes, whether as an absolute Lord and Prince, the party injured, and having a right to demand punishment? or whether as a Ruler and a Judge?* <sup>d</sup> Socinus asserts the first, the last is taught by us, and also proved in the following manner.

I. The First reason from the honourable name of Judge. God is represented to us in his word as a Judge, and that he as such, assigns the punishment and the prize. 2 Tim. iv. 8. Heb. xii. 23. compared with Acts x. 42. nay more, the holy Scripture introduces him as a Judge, in the matter of punishment. This is expressly taught, Gen. xviii. 5. Psal. ix. 5. lviii. 11. xciv. 2. He punishes therefore as a Judge.

II. The Second reason from the nature of God's

<sup>d</sup> Cocc. Summ. Theol. cap. 10. num. 59.

judgment. He punishes under that relation, in which he judges, for the judging is the ground of the punishment; yea, includes it, according to the style of Scripture. Rom. iii. 5. Judging has a respect to God, as a *Ruler* and a *Judge*. This is the proper work of a *Judge*. See Acts xvii. 31. compared with Acts x. 42. particularly James v. 9. Therefore he punishes as a Judge.

III. The Third reason, from the legal procedure of the most High God, where a Sovereign, acts according to the works of any one, there he proceeds, not as an absolute Lord, and simply as injured, but as a *Ruler* and a *Judge*. For to regard merit or worth, is the work of a judge. In the matter of punishment God rewards according to works, Rom. ii. 6. &c. This teaches us, that he punishes as a judge.

IV. The Fourth reason from the extolling of God's righteousness in the matter of punishment. In punishing he is celebrated for punitive and distributive justice. Rom. iii. 5. Rev. xvi. 5, 6. and xix. 2. Thus all judges are commended. This is to be found, Psal. ix. 5. l. 6. It has also its reason. For when any one useth his absolute power; and demandeth debt, he may indeed be praised because of equity and steadiness, but not for punitive justice. On that account only, the *Ruler* and *Judge* is praised, in matters respecting his office.

V. The Fifth reason from God's character as a Law-giver. St. James writes, there is only one Law-giver, who is able to save, and to destroy, chap. iv.

12. He is Law-giver as a Ruler and a Judge, as appears from comparing verse 11. with verse 12. as therefore according to the words of James, he punishes as a Law-giver, so must he also, for the same reason, punish as a Judge.

*Evasion.* Saving and destroying, in James, do not signify to save and to punish, but to appoint who shall be saved and destroyed. Here therefore is not taught the relation under which God punishes, but under which he appoints to punishment.

*Answer.* 1<sup>st</sup>, The words speak of *saving* and *destroying*. The proper sense of the words is for us. He who but appoints a thing, is not said to execute it. He who but appoints, who shall be saved and destroyed, is not said to save and to destroy. 2<sup>dly</sup>, He who appoints as a judge, and executes the self same thing which is appointed, must do that under the same relation. Where the execution is by the same Supreme Ruler, by whom the appointment is, there the execution flows from the same fountain. Therefore he who pronounceth sentence as a Judge, also punishes as a Judge.

*Adherence.* The word Law-giver teaches this. He as such does not punish, but appoints who is worthy of punishment.

*Ans.* The Law-giver punishes also. See also for this, the 11. and 12. verses.

*Adber.* James forbids the judging, and not the punishing of the brethren, and so speaks not of that relation under which God punisheth, but judgeth.

*Anf.* God punisheth under no other relation, than he judgeth. The apostle forbids judging, because God alone saves and destroys, that is, bleaseth and punisheth. For none may judge the conscience, but he who punishes the conscience.

VI. The Sixth reason from God's intention in punishing. He does not here seek his own private advantage, which is the purpose of an absolute and injured Lord, as such. He designs only, that the law be satisfied. Hence David cries, It is time for thee, Lord, to work, for they have broken thy law, Psal. cxix. 126. For this reason, a measure in punishment is appointed to sin, according as the law is broken by sin. God's intention therefore in punishment, is the satisfaction of the law. He also punishes indeed for the sake of his glory: but it is his glory as a *Ruler* and a *Judge*, which accordingly is promoted, when the law is satisfied by punishment. God therefore punishes as a Judge.

VII. The Seventh reason from the nature of those things which are demanded by an injured party.

That which God as injured would demand, should be desirable in itself, as requiring that which is to be desired for the reparation of injury and damage. Punishment is not desirable. It is a *penal evil*, in revenge of the *moral evil*, and for that reason, hath nothing in it, why it should be desired. Therefore the Lord testifies, that he hath no pleasure in the death of the sinner, Ezek. xviii. 32. How no pleasure? that which any one as an absolute and injured Lord de-

mands, is desirable in itself, and for him. Therefore then no pleasure, because he punishes, not as injured, but as a Judge.

VIII. The Eighth reason from the situation of the injurious, distinguished from that of the sinner.

If God punished as an injured Lord, then the sinner had been bound, without the previous sentence of God, to take the punishment upon himself. For that which a man is bound to do, or to suffer, because of an injury, is reparation. This must be immediately paid, and cannot be delayed without sin, when there is an opportunity. Who durst say this of divine punishment? must a man immediately give himself up to punishment? must he anticipate the sentence of God? O no! this now assures us, that he punishes, not as injured, but as a Judge.

IX. The Ninth reason from the right of an absolute injured Lord.

In matters which concern any one as absolute and injured, there he may work what and when he will, and abate what he will. Who durst teach this concerning the divine punishment? Crellius himself teacheth, that God cannot leave the sin of the obstinate, the blasphemer, and impenitent, unpunished<sup>e</sup>. There can be no other reason of this, but because he interposes as a Judge in the matter of punishment. For an absolute Lord is bound to nothing, in that which concerns his liberty. Crellius himself hath expressed this, when giving the reason why such cannot go un-

<sup>e</sup> Crell. de Deo & attrib. cap. 23. Socin. de Servat. part 3. cap. 1.

punished, he writes, *because they go on in an impious manner to despise God's Majesty, to trample on the authority of the laws, to overthrow good order.* He therefore punishes as a Judge. For to maintain order and law, is the work of a Judge. Thus it is with the punishment of the obstinate, &c. It must also be the case, with all punishment, because every sin despises God's majesty, tramples on the authority of the law, overturns good order: and obstinacy requires this, for no other reason, but that it is sin, also a particular kind of punishment can be no work of a judge, if punishment in general be not.

#### OBJECTIONS SOLVED.

*Object.* Man owes the reparation of an injury to the injured, and for that reason to God also, who is injured by sin. Here no other reparation can have place, but punishment<sup>f</sup>.

*Ans.* God is injured as a Judge, and must also by virtue of the objection punish as a Judge. Nay, more, when the reparation consists in punishment, and cannot have place without it, then it depends entirely upon the Judge, and follows the nature of punishment.

*Object.* God is angry as injured, for anger is a desire to punish the offender. God punisheth, as he is angry, that is injured,

*Ans.* This at the most would prove, that the injured according to the nature of anger hath a desire to

<sup>f</sup> Crell. contra Grotium. cap. 2. part. 1. p. 144.

punish the offender. He who as injured desires a thing, has not therefore immediately as such a power or right, to execute that thing. Here also we have a description of human anger. God's anger is very different from that of man. Man is angry at the injury. God's anger has a reference to the transgression. The first concerns the party injured. The second belongs to the bench of the judge.

*Object.* Man is obnoxious to the vengeance of the injured: therefore also to the punishment, for punishment and vengeance are one, because punishment is described, as being an avenging of evil <sup>s</sup>.

*Ans.* A creditor has not immediately a right to execute whatever relates to that which men owe him. Also it is not true, that punishment and vengeance are one, when by vengeance is meant the avenging of an injury. This was spoken of above.

*Object.* Punishment is only for profit. The profit must come to him only, who hath suffered the injury of the trespass <sup>h</sup>.

*Ans.* The profit must also belong to others, to wit, to the whole community. A right to punish is not immediately his, to whom the profit belongs. Also it is not true, that punishment is chiefly for profit. It is in revenge of the fault, for the vitious action.

*Object.* God punishes as a Judge, therefore the injured person is at the same time a Judge also.

*Ans.* Herein there is no absurdity. The highest

<sup>s</sup> Ibid.—<sup>h</sup> Ibid.

must always be Judge in his own cause. Thus it is with treasonable crimes. A parent judgeth, in many cases, in his own cause against his child. This is to be justified to the highest in God, because he is free from passions, and all his works are judgment, Deut. xxxii. 4, 5. &c. The opposite party must also apprehend the matter thus, when they teach that he punishes as injured, and for that reason, is Judge in his own cause. We conclude therefore, this point of difference with these words, Because God has a rational creature under him, he is thereby a *Judge*, and if he do not punish as a *Judge*, then he shall do nothing as such.

## T H E

## SECOND POINT OF DIFFERENCE.

*Whether the will of God be indifferent and indeterminate to punish, or not to punish, when the rational creature hath sinned against him? or if, according to the divine honour and perfection, it certainly inflicts punishment, when sin is committed?*

**A**S the Deity cannot be conceived without a right to punish sin, so there can be no actual punishment without his will. This flows from his pre-  
cedency, supremacy, independency and intellectual jus-

tice. Therefore the word of God ascribes actual punishment to his judgment, that is, to his will, Rev. xvi. 5.

Though this be evident, it seems not however to appear so clearly to all, how the will of God is exercised concerning punishment, when the rational creature hath sinned against him. For the further explication of this matter, it is proper first to be observed, that there is a twofold operation of the divine will, as it works externally. The *first* is so absolute, that it permits of no respect to any antecedent hypothesis, or supposition. To this belongs the will to create the world. God's most free and most wise will, is the only cause of this. There was no perfection in him, which prescribed this to the divine will as necessary. The *second* operation is of that nature, that it shall not actually take place, unless a certain hypothesis or supposition precede. For it consists in the exercise of those attributes, which in order to their operation, require a subject, clothed with certain qualities. Thus it is with the operations of God's mercy and justice. They require for their subject a rational creature, infected with sin.

This *last kind* is again twofold. The *one* demands a subject vested with a certain quality, yet it is not necessary, that the will work concerning it. Thus it is with the work of divine mercy. God hath mercy on whom he will, Rom. ix. 18. There is no bond or obligation between the act of mercy, and the object. Otherways God would be constrained to have

mercy upon all, and his mercy would be no special kind of his singular goodness, contrary to Eph. ii. 4. The *other* operation of the will, is of a different nature. It always works, when it finds a subject clothed with such qualities, that it can work thereupon. Thus the will of God cannot but fulfil his promise, to that object, in whom are the requisite qualities, because his truth demands this. Here there is a connexion between the act and the object. Where, then the object is found in *this* manner, there the will works in *that* manner, because hereon depends the preservation of its perfection.

Now, to which of these belongs God's punishing will? Not to the *first kind*, for it presupposes an object clothed with sin, and must, for that reason, be ranked under the *second*. None can contradict this. There is a difference, however, concerning the *second*. Some assign it to the first member of the second sort, and say, that the will of God is indifferent to punish, or not to punish, when the reasonable creature hath sinned against him. Others judge, that his will is not indeterminate as to this, but that the divine perfections require punishment, and therefore the will inflicts it upon the sinner<sup>i</sup>. This is also our opinion. For I cannot conceive, that scripture and nature should represent God as just to the highest degree, and yet that we may apprehend him under the contrary, to wit, as leaving sin unpunished. Also, how

<sup>i</sup> Cocc. Summ. Theol. cap. 10. num. 61.

then can God's word call the punishment of sin a righteous thing? Rom. i. 32. 2 Theff. i. 6. This signifies a certain execution of punishment, where there is a sinful subject. If I conceive otherways of God, then I should be constrained to say, that he punishes from *malevolence* or ill-will, for he would not do it from perfection.

Who durst say, that God's perfection allows him to give a law, with a promise to the transgressor, that he shall not punish him? Why not, if God's perfect will require no certain punishment? There is no greater absurdity here, than in giving a law, yet without punishing the sinner. Whatsoever is lawful for God to do, it is also lawful for him to give previous notice of the same. We are persuaded, therefore, that there is a natural bond between sin and punishment: and that for this reason, scripture often uses the word *sin* for *punishment*<sup>k</sup>.

This matter is otherways apprehended by Socinus and his abettors. They do not allow that God's perfect will should demand a certain punishment, when sin is committed: and also teach, that his will is indeterminate as to the punishing, or not punishing of sin, if simply considered. They think, that otherways this would lay a necessity upon God, injurious to the liberty of his will. O perverse thought! a simple certainty, arising from the perfection of the Agent, never hurts his will and his liberty. God's

<sup>k</sup> Cocc. Summ. Theol. cap. 26. num. 9 & 10.

truth performs his promise, his sovereignty gives laws to the rational creature, and that certainly, yet without hurting his free-will. Thus God also punishes certainly; according to his divine perfections, yet freely; working herein, with and by the will, and also freely providing for the demonstration of his perfections.

The reason which urges them so to think, is not unknown; nevertheless, they are not so impudent, as to assert that God's will is indeterminate concerning all sinners. They seem to except the extremely obstinate<sup>1</sup>; whereby they destroy the whole of their cause. For all sin carries obstinacy with it. There is no repentance without the blood and satisfaction of Christ. Yea, this ought to expose them sufficiently, that the certainty of punishment highly agrees with God's free will. For he punishes the obstinate, both certainly and freely.

This matter is debated in different ways by our Divines against the Socinians. Some dispute it under the title of the necessity of punishment, when sin is committed. Others dispute it under the idea of God's justice, whether it necessarily requires punishment when sin is committed. We rather incline to state it thus, *Whether the will of God, &c.* First, to explain, that we assert no necessity of punishment to the prejudice of God's will, it being also shown, that this necessity is nothing else but the certainty of punishment,

<sup>1</sup> Socin. de Servat. part 3. cap. 2. Crell. de Deo & attrib. cap. 23.

arising from God's holy, righteous and perfect will ; and for that reason, not excluding, but including the will, and so only detesting an *indifferent* and unholy will. Secondly, To teach, that there are more perfections in God than his justice, which inforce certain punishment. These we shall point out afterwards. Thirdly, Also to remove the difference, which seems to be among our *Divines*. Some make a difficulty of admitting a necessity here, who nevertheless yield very cheerfully to the certainty of punishment, as well-becoming the perfections of God. Wherefore they teach nothing prejudicial to the certainty of punishment, but produce many reasons which demonstrate to us, both its congruity and its necessity, because God never acts contrary to that which becomes him.

The difference therefore lies not in this, whether God may punish all sin, or not ; whether he punishes freely ; much less, whether actual punishment proceeds from his will. In this we are perfectly agreed. Also we raise no dispute concerning the degrees or the time of punishment. These we commit wholly to the judgment of God. We reprobate the indifferent will, and assert, *That God's will inflicts certain punishment, when the rational creature hath sinned against him*<sup>m</sup>, which we make good by the following proofs.

<sup>m</sup> Cocc. in Rom. iii. 24, 25, 26. Cocc. de fæd. par. 43. 170.

I. The First reason from the character of God as a Judge.

That he punishes as a Judge, is already proved. It is the Judge's duty to inflict deserved punishment. God's perfection does not allow that he should not execute the office of a Ruler and a Judge, Gen. xviii. 25.

*Evaf.* God must not be considered as a Judge, who manages a foreign right, and to whom it would not be permitted to deviate from the law.

*Ans.* The supreme Judge must do that which belongs to his office. He who is invested with this office, must execute that which belongs to it. These duties are inviolable, else the office is not rightly executed. The more therefore, when he hath given penal laws, and hath proposed himself as a pattern of right and duty. Thus it is with God.

II. The Second reason from the glory of God's justice.

From the scripture it is known, that he is extolled as righteous because of punishing, Psal. ix. 5. 6. xi. 7, 8. cxxix. 4. Lam. i. 8. Dan. ix. 14. Rom. ii. 5. Rev. xvi. 5. 6. xix. 11. ° When this punishing depends on an indifferent will, he cannot be praised as righteous because of it. This is only said, when one is bound to a thing by virtue of justice.

*Evaf.* God is extolled as righteous, not for the act

° Cocc. summ. Theol. cap. 10. num. 56.

of punishing, but for the measure observed in punishing <sup>p</sup>.

*Ans.* The most of the texts quoted, if not all, speak nothing of the measure, in distinction from the act. They extol him as righteous for punishing.

III. The Third reason from that perfection of God, which appoints a measure to every sin.

It is confessed on all hands, that there is a perfection in God, which requires, that sin in general be certainly punished. Take away the measure, you take away the thing. How can justice command to tell down such a sum to the creditor, without commanding in general the payment of the debt? that perfection therefore which commands the *measure*, must also demand the *act* of punishing, because without punishing there neither is, nor can be measure.

IV. The Fourth reason from God's holiness.

His will does not permit his holiness to be hurt in any degree <sup>q</sup>. When therefore the divine holiness requires punishment, then the will of God certainly demands the same, as that is nothing else but his holy will. That God's holiness requires this, is proved in the following manner. *1<sup>st</sup>*, From the express testimony of holy scripture. Hab. i. 13. *Thou art of purer eyes than to behold evil, and canst not look on iniquity.* By *not beholding*, &c. is taught the certainty of punishment. For otherwise this would speak no

<sup>p</sup> Crell. contra Grot. cap. 1. part. 78. 79. p. 98.

<sup>q</sup> Cocc. summ. Theol. cap. 10. num. 55.

comfort to the oppressed against the persecutors. 2dly, The holiness of God makes him hate the sinner. Who can conceive of the divine hatred, without the certainty of punishment? What is hatred? It is the nature of hatred to will, to do evil to the hated when there is power. This here is punishment. Hatred can denote no *affection* in God. He is subject to no passions. It must therefore express the *effect*, that is, denounce certain punishment to the sinner. Therefore we read, that God's word explains this *hating* by *punishing*, Psal. v. 5, 6. xi. 5, 6, 7.

V. The Fifth reason from God's sovereignty and natural dominion.

This requires, that a law be proposed to the reasonable creature, yea, a *penal* law; because a law without a *penal* sanction, hath no strength with the subject, and it is judged, that the neglect thereof is of small importance, and that the Law-giver considers the transgression as a trivial matter. Add to this, that otherways it might possibly be, either that God should fall from his natural right and dominion over rational creatures, and so be no God; or that this right being established, the rational creature should not be subject to him because of sin, which is a contradiction in itself. A *penal* law is therefore necessary, to keep the rational creature in subjection. Where God's sovereignty and dominion certainly appoint a *penal* law, there his will shall enforce the *execution*. For the *penal* law is with a view to *execution*, and God's dominion cannot obtain its end in

the *penal* law, but by the *execution*, that is, by certain punishment.

VI. The Sixth reason from God's zeal for his honour.

He neither will, nor can cease to be zealous for his honour. This zeal teaches us the certainty of punishment, when the rational creature hath sinned<sup>r</sup>. In reference thereto, it is said, *Jos. xxiv. 19. He is a jealous God, he will not forgive your transgression, nor your sins*, to wit, without the satisfaction of a sacrifice. This also teaches the hideous nature of sin. It willeth, and standeth to it, that there is no God, being *enmity against him*<sup>s</sup>, *Rom. viii. 7.* It flights, scorns, and dishonours God. It prophanes his name, dominion, and holiness. Thus it is with the least sin. So that God would rather be no God, than leave such evil unavenged.

VII. The Seventh reason from the goodness of God.

The goodness of God cannot consent, that he should punish without reason; yea, without the powerful demand of his perfection<sup>t</sup>. Where all turns on an indifferent will, there all reason and necessity of punishment is taken away. A high punishment without necessity, such as is the curse of the law, or the pains of hell, is very justly accounted cruelty, and cannot agree to perfect goodness. This goodness also does not suffer men to say, *That God punishes be-*

<sup>r</sup> Cocc. de fæd. par. 43. & summ. Theol. cap. 10. num. 55

<sup>s</sup> Cocc. summ. Theol. cap. 25. num. 5.

<sup>t</sup> Cocc. summ. Theol. cap. 10. num. 60.

*cause he will.* The scripture never teaches so. It proclaims the contrary, while it states punishment as a work of righteousness, Rom. ii. 5: and cries, *That God hath no pleasure in the death of the sinner*, Ezek. xviii. 32. He therefore does not punish, from an indeterminate will, but from a holy-perfect will, which demands the certain punishment of all sin.

VIII. The Eight reason from the divine aversion to sin.

The filthiness of sin teaches, that God hath an aversion to it, and that it is in the highest degree displeasing to him. It is impossible to conceive of sin, without thinking that it is displeasing, loathsome and detestable to God, It militates against his purity, and in his word is called *uncleanness*. How abominable and odious! God is blessedness itself, and touched with no grief or sorrow. Sin therefore displeases him, and is loathsome and detestable to him, in no other respect, but because it subjects the sinner to debt, and to certain punishment. Wherefore also the Spirit of God explains the *loathing* of God by *punishing*, Lev. xxvi. 11. 30. 44. Psal. xcv. 10. with Heb. iii. 10. 17. Jer. xiv. 19.

*Evaf.* When therefore any thing good is called acceptable to God, is the meaning this, that God will crown it with something good?

*Ans.* Yea, certainly. For to be acceptable to God, assures us, that something good is therefore laid up. See Rom. xii. 1. 1 Tim. ii. 3. Heb. xiii. 16.

IX. The Ninth reason from the connexion between

the holiness and the happiness of God.

He who seriously observes the innate idea of God, sees that in him holiness and happiness are united. This teaches, that only the holy can be happy, and not the sinner. Not to be happy is the bitterest punishment to a rational creature who is formed for felicity. This idea also teaches us by virtue of opposition, that unholiness and misery must go together, the *penal* evil and the *moral*; as certainly as the holy and the blessed good are united in God. The reason of the connexion is not less here; and the *penal* evil answers as much to the *moral*, as the *happy* to the *holy* good. Thus the will of God, can not be indifferent here, but must join certain punishment to sin.

X. The Tenth reason from the foundation of divine punishment.

God punishes sin, *because it is worthy of punishment*, Rev. xvi. 5. Therefore death is called *the wages of sin*, Rom. vi. 23. Where sin is punished, because it is worthy of punishment, there is a strong and a certain connexion between the two. There men owe punishment to justice, and cannot consistent with the honour of justice be passed by. The force of this reason is set before us, Rom. i. 32. *Knowing the judgment of God, that they who commit such things, are worthy of death*<sup>u</sup>. There it is hinted, that God punishes, because of the desert and demerit of sin, and that this lays the foundation of certain punishment to the sinner. For

<sup>u</sup> Cocc. de. fæd. par. 43.

the word *dikaiooma*, translated judgment, expresses, that it is such a righteous demand of justice, that the Judge, consistent with the honour of justice, cannot leave sin unpunished. The sense of the word is to be seen, Rom v. 18.

XI. The Eleventh reason from the proper and the certain operation of sin.

Without likeness to God there can be no communion with him. 2 Cor. vi. 14. 1 John i. 5, 6, 7<sup>v</sup>. Therefore sin's first and surest effect is to make a separation between God and the sinner, Isa. lix. 2. This separation speaks the highest wretchedness, including in it all misery, according to 2 Theff. i. 9.

*Evaf.* God can renew the sinner, and in that manner restore communion to him.

*Ans.* It is not yet proved, that God's perfection allows of such a renovation, without a satisfaction and a valuable sacrifice. Such a renovation would be a testimony against the first truth, which teaches, that God does not leave the dishonouring of his name and government unavenged. Also, who can conceive, that the filthiness of sin must be removed by renovation, in case there shall be communion with God; and that on the other hand, the guilt should be covered by simple forgiveness, without a satisfaction? here the guilt arises from the filthiness of the act. God punishes from holiness, because his law proceeds from holiness. Where the law flows from holiness, there

<sup>v</sup> Cocc. de fæd. par. 43.

punishment is from holiness. Now, as God's perfection does not suffer, that he giving laws from holiness, should have communion with the unholy; so also that perfection will never permit, that he punishing from holiness, should renew the sinner without a satisfaction; and reconcile him to his holiness without a propitiatory sacrifice.

XII. The Twelfth reason from God's wrath so strongly urged in the holy scriptures.

This wrath of God furnishes us with a new reason. He is subject to no *passion*, Jam. i. 17<sup>w</sup>. Nevertheless he could not be said to be wroth against sin and sinners, if punishment arose only from his indifferent will. This does not agree to the idea of wrath. In a holy perfect Being it cannot be applied to an act of an indifferent will. With men it signifies an *affection*, whereby they are naturally provoked against those who injure them. This, therefore, applied comparatively to God, teaches, that he certainly punishes sin. For his wrath is not only against obstinacy, but against *all ungodliness*, Rom. i. 18.

XIII. The Thirteenth reason from God's appointed order.

The God of order will bring no rational creature into the world, without order; and for that reason, will also inviolably maintain the appointed order; and it being broken, he will not neglect, but restore it. What order is instituted by God? This, that the ra-

<sup>w</sup> Cocc. de fæd. par. 43.

tional creature sinning, and so violating the bond between God and him, should be miserable and suffer punishment. This appointed order is apparent to every man. It is also too holy, that God should not maintain it, and that the *voluntary* destruction should not be redressed by a *penal*; and the *base* evil be brought into order by the *sorrowful*. This order is therefore the more constant, because nothing but punishment can restore it, when violated and disturbed. It comes instead of that obedience which is refused, and is only fit to restore, and to repair what was violated. See upon this, Crellius himself, in his Book concerning God and his attributes, chap. 23. Here therefore, an indifferent will can by no means have place.

XIV. The Fourteenth reason from the conscience of the sinner.

This conscience is spoken of, Rom. ii. 14, 15. This Witness, Judge and Executioner, cannot be taken from man, without destroying his nature. It torments the mind, not merely by putting it in remembrance, that man is worthy of punishment, but by a demonstration of certain punishment. Otherwise it would not fill the heart with such a tide of terror. Of this we have as many witnesses, as ever at any time attended to the verdict of their own conscience. Therefore John writes, *that it condemns us*, 1 John iii. 20, 21. Observe, *us*, that is, not only wicked actions, but *persons* for those actions. What is it to condemn persons? To sentence them to certain punishment.

It denounces therefore a certain punishment to the sinner. This it does according to the judgment of God. For it is placed in us by him. It flows from his judgment, and thus it portrays and presages his procedure concerning sin. For which reason, John approves of the judgment of conscience, 1 John iii. 19. 20, 21. Also Paul, Rom. ii. 14, 15.

*Evaf.* This conscience teaches indeed what God's will now is, but it does not prove, that that will before the creating of this conscience, was not indifferent as to the punishing, or not punishing of sin.

*Anf.* It also proves *that*. For it judges and directs not concerning things flowing from God's indeterminate will. It determines only upon morality, and things virtuous in themselves; and upon other things, in so far as they respect that morality. It determines here as a subordinate judge, shewing what the supreme Judge pronounces according to his office. Therefore it is not indifferent, to perform or to neglect its office. See this very fully explained by Paul, Rom. ii. 5, 6—14, 15, 16.

XV. The Fifteenth reason from the assertions of the opposite parties.

Socinus, with his followers teaches, *That it does not become God to leave unpunished the sins of the obstinate and unconverted*<sup>x</sup>. Hence we conclude, that it does not become him to leave any sin unpunished. *1st*, Because every sin without Christ, includes in it, obsti-

<sup>x</sup> Servat. part. 3. cap. 2.

nacy and impenitence. *2dly*, There is no reason from necessary fitness, to be constrained to punish on account of one particular kind of sin, if the congruity of punishment respecting all sin, be not first established. For the evil which deserves punishment lies in every sin; yea, first in sin. *3dly*, Obstinacy as such is not punished. For then God should not only punish the *evil*, but the *accident* itself; and also all perseverance should necessarily be punished. Sin is therefore the reason of punishment. Where then sin is, it is fit that punishment certainly follow.

Crellius writes, *That God inflicts punishment as an absolute Lord, because punishment is in place of due obedience*<sup>y</sup>. Hence we form this conclusion, that punishment certainly awaits all sin. For the debt of obedience to God is natural and indispensable, and for the same reason, that also which comes in its place.

#### OBJECTIONS SATISFIED.

*Obj.* Sins are nothing else but offences against God's Majesty. Cannot he by the highest right, forgive injuries, without a satisfaction? or, shall we ascribe less to God, than to man<sup>z</sup>?

*Ans.* Can he also forgive the sins of the impenitent and obstinate, the contrary of which you have just now taught? Injuries to God's honour must not con-

<sup>y</sup> De Deo & attrib. cap. 23.

<sup>z</sup> Socin. præl. cap. 16.

tinue unavenged. Also, sin is somewhat more, it is a violation of order, a transgression of the law, a contempt of God's judicial character and government. Such crimes are by all means to be punished by the supreme Judge.

*Adher.* This supposes God less than man.

*Ans.* It is not lawful for all and every man, to forgive all things without a satisfaction. The Judge must avenge the injury done to his office, to order and to laws. We must not always leave unpunished the dishonour cast on our good name. Crellius confesses this. By how much any one is greater, by so much he is the more constrained to enforce punishment. It arises from God's greatness, that he avenges all sin. By virtue of his dignity, he has to judge concerning the filthiness of sin; and man only concerning the injury, which is done him. Such his excellency, that he cannot renounce his government, a thing which man can lay down. This and other God-like glories constitute the difference here. So that by our doctrine we exalt God far above man.

*Obj.* Sins are called debts. It is free to every one to forgive his debts<sup>a</sup>.

*Ans.* Then also the debts of the blasphemer, the obstinate and the impenitent? Then also the debt of obedience to God? *Penal debts* are of another nature than *pecuniary*. Not to pay the latter, tends only to the prejudice of the creditor. The former vio-

<sup>a</sup> *Ibid.*

late offices, order and laws. Satisfaction must be made for debts to them.

*Obj.* Every one has liberty, to desist from his right, as much as he pleases <sup>b</sup>.

*Ans.* Why then may not God also desist from punishing the blasphemer, &c. Why not also from the right of divine government, and of the honour of his name? O abominations! To forgive sins without a satisfaction, would be, not merely to desist from his right, but to neglect it; yea, to slight his office.

*Obj.* God injures none, whether he punish or not punish, because here his own right only is concerned. For man is not bound to punish the guilty. The sinner owes *that* to him, against whom the injury strikes first of all, and this is God <sup>c</sup>.

*Ans.* Why then do ye except blasphemers, obstinate and impenitent persons? It is an infernal principle, that every thing is fit, wherein we do not injure one another. Men must also do no injury to good order, laws and offices. Much less must this abominable axiom be applied to God, who neither will nor can do any thing which strikes against his holiness, justice, name, and other God-like perfections. These he will not injure, nor leave the injuries done them unavenged.

<sup>b</sup> De Servat. part. 3. cap. 1.

<sup>c</sup> Crell. de Deo. & attrib. cap. 23.

THE

THIRD POINT OF DIFFERENCE.

*Whether the Divine threatening, annexed to the covenant of the law, denounces sure and certain punishment, when man breaks that covenant in any respect? or if it signifies to the sinner mere guilt only, without the certainty of punishment?*

THE observation of God's dignity and of man's reason teaches us, that man must be under a moral law, in order to be subject to God in a rational manner. As necessary as that law is, so necessary is it also, that a *penal* threatening be added to it. Without this, the law is not confirmed, and shall without it be little esteemed. Without this, men would judge, it was indifferent whether the law was obeyed or rejected. How also should order be restored, which is broken by sin; and the dependency of the creature maintained, if the law be not enforced by a threatening? for this restoration must be effected by punishment. Where no threatening is, there no punishment can follow. This has the more place, where the law is good in itself to the highest degree. Such a law must be esteemed in the highest degree, and so be enforced by a threatening.

Therefore God hath also confirmed the covenant of the law with a threatening. Accordingly this is to be accounted the finew which gives strength to the law, and preserves its authority. It is certain, that it denounces penal evil or punishment to the sinner. But how certainly it denounces that, is not equally certain to all. Some judge, that it does not denounce punishment as certain to the sinner: supposing, *that it only testifies the penal desert and guilt of the sinner*<sup>d</sup>. We have very different thoughts of the matter. The execution is as certain to us, as that the law was certainly given, and strengthened by a threatening. For these things follow one another. The law requires a threatening, the threatening execution; because it is strengthened by execution only, and without this, the law cannot be confirmed.

It is proper by all means that we carefully consider from whence God's threatening arises. Not from an indeterminate will, *but from his holiness, and from the order of things*<sup>e</sup>. Such threatenings signify a certain punishment. A law strengthened with a promise and a threatening, shews us also a treaty of a federal nature. Therefore we read of the covenant of the law, Rom. vii. 1. &c. A threatening of a covenant, yea, of an established covenant, speaks certain punishment to the breaker of that covenant.

<sup>d</sup> Cocceius calls this a most pestilential heresy. This is very gravely said, for it pleads in behalf of the old serpent's lie.

<sup>e</sup> Cocc. summ. Theol. cap. 26. num. 10.

This is not favoury to the Socinian palate. Their Crellius writes, *That the threatenings are meant not absolutely, but conditionally, and the punishment is not to be supposed as certain, but when the condition is neglected*†. Wherefore he compares them to human threatenings, of parents, masters and teachers, to children, servants and scholars, which are stopt in their execution, by intervening occurrences. But *God's ways are not as our ways*. His threatening arises from his holiness, righteousness, office, and dominion, and has for its object the punishing of the filthiness of the offence. Man's threatening arises from a design to promote the welfare of those, who are placed under him, and aims at the preventing of mere inconveniencies, and the hurt arising from them.

I do not deny, that conditional threatenings occur in the word of God. This is to be seen, Isa. xxxviii. Jer. xviii. Jon. iii. Here a difference must be made between the threatenings, which denounce some temporal evil only, and those which denounce punishment on the filthiness of sin, and the transgression of the covenant of the law. The *first* are particular and conditional. This is taught in the passages quoted. In the *second* we read of no condition. In the former also no proper punishment is denounced, as is indeed in the latter. For the scope of the first is repentance, of which the law, as a law, knows not to speak. Add

† Crell. de Deo & attrib. cap. 24.

here, that the not inflicting of the troubles threatened, is either but a delay and a mitigation for a time, in order to take more rigorous vengeance afterwards; or if perfect freedom follow thereupon, then it proceeds from the covenant of grace, and the suretyship of Christ.

It is easy to conceive, what our opponents aim at in this their doctrine, and what is the difference here. It is confessed on both sides, that God hath strengthened his law by a threatening, and that *that threatening* proposes punishment. The difference lies in this, They will have it, that the threatenings properly shew God's right, that he *may* punish, and not certain punishment, when sin is committed <sup>s</sup>. We say, *That the threatening of the law denounces certain punishment to the transgressor* <sup>h</sup>, which we prove by these reasons.

I. The First reason from the absolute nature of this threatening. Absolute threatenings speak certain punishment. The opposition between *absolute* and *conditional* indicates this. This threatening is absolute, *1st*, Because the law pronounces a certain curse upon him who transgresses in the least, which excludes every condition, whatever it might be. *2dly*, It is the peculiar act of grace to admit of repentance: the law knows no grace; and for that reason, no condition of repentance. *3dly*, Were the threatening conditional, then according to the law, the penitent had

<sup>s</sup> Crell. de Deo & attrib. cap. 23. & 32.

<sup>h</sup> Coec. summ. Theol. cap. 61. num. 6.

nothing to fear. Yea, though a transgressor, he must be justified according to the law. For he had satisfied the law, because it had threatened the evil only under condition, or upon the neglect of repentance, and so absolves where there is repentance. This is absurd. The threatening therefore is absolute.

II. The Second reason from the divine truth <sup>i</sup>.

God fulfils what he says. The threatenings of the covenant of the law, speak certain punishment. This we learn from the very words of the threatening; *Cursed is he, Thou shalt die the death.*

*Evas.* According to the letter they speak of the *act* of punishment, but according to the sense, of the *right* <sup>k</sup>.

*Ans.* The very letter and power of the words is therefore for us. It is quite absurd to explain words of fact, as indicating a right only. This is against all reason. For this threatening was enacted to deter man from sin. It must therefore be taken in *that sense*, in which it urges most strongly thereto. The certain *act* operates much more powerfully, than the mere intimation of the *right*.

*Adber.* This threatening leans upon the non-performance of the condition of repentance, and so it is by no means repugnant to the truth of God, to omit punishment, where the condition exists <sup>l</sup>.

*Ans.* It is proved, that the threatening speaks of

<sup>i</sup> Cocc. summ. Theol. cap. 61. num. 6.

<sup>k</sup> Crell. de Deo. & attrib. cap. 32.

<sup>l</sup> Ibid. cap. 23.

the certain act. Therefore it cannot be conditional. Also, it is already taught that it is absolute. I add here, that according to this notion of Créllius, God should have no right, to punish the sinner immediately. He behoved to wait till the condition was neglected. These are detestable thoughts.

III. The Third reason from the declaration of the threatening.

When a threatening is declared for the strengthening of a law, it cannot stop in the execution, before it be satisfied; nor its end be obtained without punishment. Otherwise it is an useles bugbear, and excites no respect to the honour of the law. Yea, every human threatening which is just, stands fast, so long as its end cannot be accomplished without the execution. God's end, aimed at in the threatening, cannot be obtained with respect to the sinner, without the execution. For his intention is, to punish the sin or crime as such, because punishment is nothing else, but the avenging of the crime. This is never to be obtained without the certain execution.

IV. The Fourth reason from God's actual imputation of guilt.

Holy Paul plainly writes, Rom. v. *That sin is imputed, and the guilt comes to condemnation*<sup>m</sup>. Where *imputing* is opposed to *forgiveness*, and the effect of sin is called *condemnation*, verses 16, 17, 18, 19. This teaches, that the threatening of the law is followed with certain execution. It is true, believers escape

<sup>m</sup> Cocc. de fæd. par. 64.

that condemnation. How? By Christ's satisfaction, verses 11, 18, 19. who also bore the threatened punishment, and thus it is proved, that the execution is certain.

V. The Fifth reason from the innate law.

This law teaches us, that punishment is certain, where sin is committed, Rom. ii. 14, 15. that which it denounces, God prosecutes in his threatening. For the law of nature and the law of works are one and the same°. Therefore God's threatening teaches certain punishment, and not the mere *right* that he *may* punish.

VI. The Sixth reason from the immediate opposition between the promise and the threatening.

This cannot permit, that the sinner enjoy the benefit of the promise. Which, however, behoved to follow, if the execution of the threatening were not certain. For what is the benefit of the promise? *Freedom from the penal evil.* This, however, the transgressor enjoys, if the certain execution of the threatening does not follow upon sin. Or do you think, that the promise does not announce that freedom? O erroneous! For then it were lawful for God to smite the faint with the penal evil, in the midst of the same blessed life, which the law promiseth to him, and which he enjoys by virtue of that promise.

VII. The Seventh reason from equality.

The promise ensures the certain good on the one

° *Summ. Theol. cap. 22. num. 45.*

side. Why should not the threatening denounce certain punishment on the other? the words are equally absolute on both sides. They must therefore be explained equally absolute on both. Of like things a like judgment must be made. They who speak otherwise, join with the old serpent, who said to Eve, *Thou shalt not die*, to wit, though thou breakest the commandment. His lie they patronize<sup>p</sup>.

#### OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.

*Obj.* All threatenings may be relaxed.

*Ans.* Even to the impenitent and obstinate? this is not true concerning the divine threatening of the law.

*Obj.* The God who threatens is under law to none.

*Ans.* Not even to him who promiseth? not even when he threatens the obstinate, &c.? His truth, holiness, &c. is a law to him.

*Obj.* This is injurious to God's highest liberty.

*Ans.* No more, than his stedfastness in his promises; no more, than his holiness, which gives laws to the rational creature; and his sovereignty, which cannot cease to govern that creature.

*Obj.* The threatenings are conditional.

*Ans.* These are words. The contrary is proved above. The law knows no repentance, and worketh death every where.

*Obj.* Do the threatenings intimate the certain ex-

<sup>p</sup> Cocc. summ. Theol. cap. 27. num. 15.

ecution of punishment, then the sinner himself must be punished, because they not only threaten the evil of punishment, but they also threaten it to the transgressor himself <sup>p</sup>.

*Ans.* St. Paul answers this reason, Gal. iii. First, he asserts, that none is justified by the law, because it threatens the curse to him *who continueth not in all things*. This should not be true, if the threatening was not absolute, but conditional. For then it should be satisfied by him who fulfils the condition, and so behaved to justify the transgressor fulfilling that condition.

He afterwards asserts, that that curse was satisfied, when Christ was made a curse, and so delivered us from the curse. Here a difference must be made between debts which admit of suretyship, and those which do not. The first are paid by a surety. So all penalties respecting money-matters are for that reason, perfectly paid by a surety. It is true, Socinus allows of no surety here: but we shall prove the contrary afterwards, and it is already established by Paul's words, Gal. iii. 10, &c. This is also to be read, Heb. x. 26—28, 29. where it is taught, that the transgressor of the law died without mercy, and others escaped by the interposition of sacrifices.

<sup>p</sup> Socin. de Servat. part. 3. cap. 3.

## T H E

## FOURTH POINT OF DIFFERENCE.

*Whether by the promise and tender of gospel-grace thro' Christ, the law, or the covenant of the law be wholly abrogated and disannulled? Or, if we be saved by Christ, in a consistency with the right, and the demand of the law?*

**A**S not a covenant of works, but of grace can be established with the sinner; so also it pleased God, after the breaking of the covenant of works, to enter into a covenant of grace with man. Therefore that first covenant can have no power (after the entrance of the covenant of grace, which bringeth salvation) to justify, sanctify, and glorify the sinner. This, which was its principal use respecting innocent man, ceases upon the entrance of the covenant of grace, and also through the sin and impotence of man.

Without all controversy this is true. I durst not however say, that upon the entrance of the covenant of grace, the demand of the covenant of works is disannulled, and that we could be saved by the covenant of grace, without satisfaction being given to the demand and the right of the law. The covenant of works is natural. It not only began with innocent

nature, but it also contains that natural tie which subsists between the rational creature and his Creator. It demands love to God. The confirmation of the promise as well as of the threatening, preserves the natural order of the divine government over rational creatures. Such a covenant cannot be difannulled in its demand and right. The gospel by no means tramples on innocent nature, but aims at its restoration.

The covenant of works testifies God's invariable rectitude and holiness, and gives a law of holy friendship, becoming God. To divest this covenant of its demand, would therefore be to trample on his rectitude and holiness. It is also an established covenant, and is for that reason turned into an everlasting and an unchangeable law. Its demand and right must therefore be fulfilled.

It will throw great light upon the subject, when we take a nearer view of the articles of this covenant. The duty required is love to God, and to our fellowmen. Man cannot be absolved from this, without destroying his nature. The confirmation is, *Do this and thou shalt live : cursed is he, who continueth not in all things.* This is still in force, according to Paul's reasoning, Gal. iii. 9, 10. &c. for he there urges it against us, to lead us to Christ. If the covenant of the law was annihilated in its demand, in its promise, and also in its threatening, then the law could not drive us out of ourselves to Christ. For that which does not exist, has no accidents, no operations, no

terrors to astonish and to move the mind. That which does not bind, cannot terrify.

Also one can form no proper conception of this disannulling or change. The only way would be, that God should appear satisfied with an imperfect righteousness, and justify the man who has it <sup>9</sup>. This is a vile conception, because then it would be no justification, which is an act of jurisdiction and of justice, as the word itself teaches; but a pardon. This should also overthrow the covenant of grace, since grace and works cannot go together, Rom. xi. 5, 6. Eph. ii. 9, 10. Then also what reason was there, that the saints so earnestly deprecated God's judgment, Job ix. 2. Psal. cxxx. and cxliii. ? Finding this imperfect righteousness in themselves, they had that which was required, and could have boasted because of it, contrary to Rom. iii. 27. The righteousness therefore, which shall stand before God, must be perfect, which proves that the covenant of the law cannot be abrogated in its demand and right.

The school of Socinus pleads the contrary here, and in order to attack the satisfaction with the greater ease, as for the same reason they dispute concerning the preceding differences, they maintain that the entrance of the evangelic promise was also attended with the *abrogation* or disannulling of the *legal sanction* of the covenant of the law. How they reconcile this with their other assertions, I cannot see. They teach,

<sup>9</sup> Cocc. summ. Theol. cap. 63. num. 16.

*That righteousness, is still sought by works, and that now a more perfect law is given.* Therefore the old covenant is by no means abolished, but perfected and amended. There are two things which they understand amiss, and thereby strengthen themselves in their error: which being properly conceived, might furnish them with reasons for our persuasion, as they are of great force to us for that purpose. We shall point them out.

First, That they, in opposition to the plain words of Paul, will not allow, that Christ was made a curse for us, Gal. iii. 10, 11, 12, &c. that he was made under the law, Gal. iv. 4. Were the law disannulled, then he could neither be a curse, nor under the law, to redeem us from the curse of the law. For, by the previous disannulling we were all delivered from that curse. Secondly, That they do not acknowledge, that the covenant of grace began from the fall, Gal. iii. Acts xv. 10, 11. If upon the introduction of the covenant of grace, the covenant of the law was disannulled; then God would not have gone on to urge the covenant of the law by Moses, Lev. xviii. 5. Rom. x. 3, 4, 5. That which is not, vanishes away in its right and requisition. Hence it can now be easily conceived, to what the difference amounts. On both sides a two-fold covenant is allowed, and that the covenant of grace came in after the covenant of works. They suppose, that upon the entrance of the *second*, the *first* was abrogated and divested of its power. We acknowledge a covenant of grace, in

which the right of the law is preserved and fulfilled. For here a Mediator interposes for us, who fulfils this right for us. We are therefore saved, consistent with the right of the law. This then is, the difference: *Whether the covenant of the law, be so disannulled by the introduction of the covenant of grace, that its right and demand are abrogated? or if its right and demand remain, so that we are saved in a consistency with them<sup>r</sup>?* We assert this last. Before we exhibit our following reasons in proof of the same, we must solve a difficulty. You will say, Does the right and the demand of the law remain, then it must be fulfilled by the man himself. Its right is over the man, the guilty person. To him the law speaks. To solve this clearly, a difference must be made between covenants which allow, or do not allow of suretiship. In the *first*, it turns only on the law-giver, whether to punish the guilty in his own person, or to be satisfied with a sufficient surety. Such laws always admit of this sense, so long as the law-giver has not excluded suretiship. This supposes no *abrogation* of the law in the least, but only a favourable interpretation of the Judge (on whom alone it turns) concerning the demand of the law, in favours of the guilty. You will still insist, that the law speaks of the guilty. It is so. And thus it must also be, because the guilty is bound as long as he has no surety, and the right of the law is not explained in his favour by the Judge. According to which

<sup>r</sup> Cocc. summ. Theol. cap. 61. num. 6. de sæd. par. 77. 78, 199.

interpretation therefore, the surety perfectly fulfils the right of the law. This is evident in all money-matters. And it has the greater place here, because this surety does not only pay, as in pecuniary-punishment, but comes under the law instead of the guilty, and makes himself a subject of the law. What is the highest demand of the law? To be fulfilled by its subject<sup>f</sup>. This takes place here. See, Gal. iv. 4. We shall now adduce our arguments, to verify our opinion.

I. The First reason from express texts<sup>†</sup>.

Rom. iii. 31. *Do we then make void the law by faith? That be far! yea, we establish the law.* And again, Rom. viii. 3, 4. *What the law could not do since it was weak thro' the flesh, God hath, sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin hath condemned sin in the flesh, that the right of the law should be fulfilled in us.* Thus the demand and the right of the law continue in force. See also, Gal. ii. 19, 20.

*Evaf.* Upon Rom. iii. the apostle writes, That he does not abolish the law by faith, but establish it, because that which in the law deserves to be everlasting, and agrees with grace, truth and spirit, is transferred from the law into the gospel, and the rest as contrary to their nature, is taken away<sup>‡</sup>.

*Ans.* When somewhat is transferred from that

<sup>f</sup> Cocc. de fæd. par. 81.

<sup>†</sup> Cocc. de fæd. par. 77, 78.

<sup>‡</sup> Crell. contra Grot. pag. 230.

which is disannulled, it may not therefore be said, that it is not disannulled, but established. He who speaks as Paul, teaches that the law itself continues in force.

II. The Second reason from the state of those, who are reconciled unto God, and justified <sup>w</sup>.

They are reconciled as *sinners and enemies to God*, Rom. v. 6, 7, 8, &c. As lying under the guilt of condemnation, verses 16, 17, 18, 19. They are justified as *ungodly*, Rom. iv. 5, &c. This teaches, that the sentence, which according to the covenant of works, presses the children of Adam, is not passed of new. Therefore the law and its threatening are not abrogated and disannulled.

III. The Third reason from the state of unbelievers <sup>x</sup>.

Should the covenant of the law be divested of power and right, how does it keep unbelievers under the curse? John writes in his gospel, He who believeth not, *is condemned already*, John iii. 18. Not he is first condemned anew, when he does not believe; but he is *condemned already*, to wit, by virtue of the old sentence of the law. Again, verse 36, *The wrath of God abideth on him*. The word *abide* intimates, that wrath lay upon them prior to their unbelief, and for the future continues upon unbelievers.

*Evaf.* The word *abide*, does not always teach a

<sup>w</sup> Cocc. de fæd. par. 199.

<sup>x</sup> Cocc. de fæd. par. 199.

continuation of that which was before. See John i. 32, 33. vi. 56. xiv. 16. 1 John ii. 10. iii. 24. iv. 15, 16.

*Anf.* The power and the ordinary signification of that word, teaches always a continuation of that which was before. This manner of speaking, *wrath abideth upon him*, must have this sense, *he continues obnoxious to the old punishment.*

*Adber.* The wrath of God can abide upon them by virtue of natural equity, without the threatening of Moses <sup>a</sup>.

*Anf.* The covenant of the law is one with natural equity, and a wrath arising from natural equity, must be satisfied.

*Adber.* Wrath can abide upon them by virtue of the gospel; being damned; not simply because they had sinned, but because they had not believed in Christ <sup>b</sup>.

*Anf.* We shall presently prove that the gospel hath no threatenings. How then should it introduce a new *penal* law? The text satisfies this objection. For the proper sense, and common use of the word *abide*, signifies that the wrath which was before, now continued, and did not cease, nor was resumed by accident.

IV. The Fourth reason from the threatening of the law.

The threatening is still held forth to sinners, and

<sup>a</sup> Crell. contra Grot. p. 255.

<sup>b</sup> Ibid.

they are still placed under the curse of the law. They are *under the law*, Gal. v. 18. *The law is set against them*, 1 Tim. i. 9. How this, if the covenant of the law be abrogated? This supposes that the law is in force.

*Evaf.* Paul uses a certain condescension in these texts, forming his arguments, according to the persuasion of those, with whom he had to do. They supposed that the law was still in force<sup>c</sup>.

*Ans.* From whence does this condescension appear? It is never usual with the apostle. A man may not on account of a party, condescend to teach any thing against the truth and his own persuasion. Also the apostle does not dispute, but tells plainly, what is his meaning, showing them, what sinners had to fear, to wit, the curse of the law.

V. The Fifth reason from the nature of the gospel<sup>d</sup>.

The gospel knows no *penal* threatening. It announces the joyful message of our salvation in Christ. This is also to be seen in the contents of the new covenant, Jer. xxxi. 31, &c. Heb. viii. 10. Were the covenant of the law now disannulled, then the sinner had no punishment to fear, because the gospel threatens no punishment. Who can admit such things? The law must therefore continue in force, to subject the sinner to punishment.

*Evaf.* We find also threatenings, John iii. Mark xvi. Heb. iii. & iv.

<sup>c</sup> Crell. contra Grot. p. 230.

<sup>d</sup> Cocc. summ. Theol. cap. 63. num. 3, 4, 5. 8, 9, 10.

*Ans.* These flow from the covenant of the law, which also aggravates sin, when God's goodness is slighted and despised.

*Evaf.* Paul writes, that God shall judge according to his gospel, Rom. ii. 16.

*Ans.* He there refers to the judgment of absolution. For according to his gospel, Christ will at that day, absolve believers from the judgment of condemnation. Thus the gospel, properly taken, hath no threatenings.

VI. The Sixth reason from the similitude used by Paul, Rom. vii. 1, 2, 3, 4, &c.

The apostle supposes the man under the law as in a spiritual marriage. And that, 1<sup>st</sup>, As pure and undefiled. This was in the creation, when man was free from sin, and could not be charged with spiritual adultery. 2<sup>dly</sup>, As a violated marriage, in which the adulterous, that is, the sinful wife, not only remains under the right of the husband; but through the fear of death, and the deserving of evil, is also as a slave to him, and groans under his rigorous commands. 3<sup>dly</sup>, In the dissolution of the marriage, which takes place through the death of the first husband, that is, the law. This death proceeds from the power of Christ's death<sup>c</sup>. Having by his death slain the right of the first husband, the accepting of the new marriage with Christ, follows thereupon. This similitude shows, that the covenant of the law remains in force, and

<sup>c</sup> Cocc. summ. Theol. cap. 61. num. 6.

its right satisfied : remains in force over all, who do not enter into this spiritual marriage with Christ ; its right satisfied for those who go into this marriage, they not being espoused to Christ, till the law, that is, the first husband, be slain by Christ's death ; or which is the same, its right be fulfilled. We are therefore saved consistent with its demand and right,

### OBJECTIONS SOLVED.

*Obj.* Is that no disannulling, when by the authority of the Lord of the law, the power of the bond, which the law has over all its subjects, is taken away for ever<sup>f</sup>? This is to be seen in the gospel-promises to believers. They promise salvation to such, whereas the law threatens the curse to the least transgression.

*Ans.* Then unbelievers, however, remain under the law, and believers go free, because Christ hath fulfilled the right of the law, Gal. iii. 8. Upon this fulfilling those promises rest, and for that reason they can prove no such abrogation, but establish the contrary.

*Obj.* It is expressly taught, Heb. viii. 13. That the covenant of the law is become old and vanished away<sup>g</sup>.

*Ans.* The covenant which is promised, Heb. viii. relates to those only, in whose heart God's law is written, and their sins forgiven. This is not applicable to unbelievers. With respect to them therefore the

<sup>f</sup> Crell. contra Grot. p. 221.

<sup>g</sup> Ibid p. 228. 229.

covenant of works should still continue. To be short, Crellius must prove, that by the antiquated covenant is understood the covenant of the law. Whereas there is a reference to the Old Testament, or to the old ceremonial administration of the covenant of grace. This vanished away at the death of Christ.

*Adher.* Those words, Deut. xxvii. *Cursed, &c.* refer also to the ceremonial institutions. Where the laws cease, there the threatening must also cease.

*Ans.* According to this reasoning it follows, that the threatening continues in force. For the moral precepts, which are the principal, remain in force. But to speak to the point, That threatening began with the law of nature, and not with the ceremonial law. From thence it was borrowed to strengthen the ceremonial law. It does not vanish away therefore because the ceremonies did.

*Obj.* The gospel under the name of *grace*, is opposed to the *law*, John i. 17. Rom. vi. 14. Therefore especially to the threatening, which is the most rigorous part of all the law<sup>b</sup>.

*Ans.* This opposition teaches, that we do not in our own person fulfil that law. Not because of a simple abrogation, but because the surety hath fulfilled it for us. Thus grace is by no means prejudicial to the right of the law. For mercy and righteousness kiss one another,

<sup>b</sup> Ibid.

## THE

## FIFTH POINT OF DIFFERENCE.

*Whether Suretiship for the Sinner, can have place before  
the Divine Tribunal?*

**I**N our preceding discourses, we have frequently appealed to this, that suretiship for the sinner can have place before God's tribunal. It is therefore more than time, that we ponder and prove this matter somewhat further. It is profitable to the orthodox, to strengthen them in the doctrine of the truth. It is useful to their opponents, to make them see, that it militates nothing against right or equity; that so they do not always continue the enemies of the cross of Christ <sup>h</sup>.

In order to form a proper judgment of this matter, it is by all means necessary, that it be well understood what is meant by this suretiship, to wit, a pledging of one's self to punishment instead of another, who hath

<sup>h</sup> God's virtue and truth are in no ways injured thereby, on the contrary, the riches of God in giving a just Saviour, and the power of his grace in justifying the weak are displayed. Cocc. summ. Theol. cap. 22. num. 44.

deserved that punishment, with a view thus to deliver him.

In this suretyship therefore we require ;

*1<sup>st</sup>*, That the surety be fit, to bear the deserved punishment for the guilty, by unity of nature with them.

*2<sup>dly</sup>*, That he be able to endure the punishment.

*3<sup>dly</sup>*, That he be also sufficient to deliver the guilty.

*4<sup>thly</sup>*, That he be absolute master of his life, state, and all things, and so have a right to pledge that which is his own.

*5<sup>thly</sup>*, That he spontaneously substitute himself instead of the guilty.

*6<sup>thly</sup>*, That all things be done here with the consent of the Judge. This simple proposal justifies the thing. All the parts are equal. How then can the whole be unjust? None is wronged here. Neither the guilty, nor the surety, nor the Judge. For every thing is done with common consent. Nay, more, the law is provided for in its requisition and right. He who thinks to see injustice here, has yet no proper conception of what is just or unjust. This subject will be set in a clear light, when we unfold the intimate union between the surety and the guilty, which this suretyship supposes for certain.

It is, *1<sup>st</sup>*, Natural, by unity of nature. *2<sup>dly</sup>*, Supernatural, in his being the head and the husband of the guilty. *3<sup>dly</sup>*, Legal, by his being of one state and will with them, putting himself under the same law. Can injustice still be imagined here? He who

speaks against such a suretyship, deprives God of the power of showing his perfections in the most glorious manner. For in it they shine forth most transcendantly. Here his righteousness and mercy meet, in the conjunction of which he places his highest name, Ex. xxxiv. 5, 6. Observe, he proclaims his name, merciful and forgiving, and yet *holding the guilty not guiltless*. Not the *impenitent* only, but the *guilty*, that is, holding every guilty person not guiltless. This name can have no place without such a suretyship.

It is the honour of the highest good, to overcome all evil. This honour must be refused to God, the supreme good, if suretyship can have no place with him. For in no other manner can the evil of punishment be taken away. A mere pardon, or a simple acquittance, can find no place here. For it is already proved at large, that punishment is certain, when the rational creature hath sinned against God. Of this also, we have no obscure evidences in the Old Testament. What were the *Goels* in the Old Testament? Were they not as sureties, who paid for others, and true types of Christ the surety, Job xix. 25, 26.? What mean Hezekiah and David, when they ask God to be their surety? Isa. xxxviii. 14. Psal. cxix. 122. These groanings approve at least of suretyship at God's tribunal as good. What is higher love than this suretyship? Now, who can imagine to himself, that the highest act of love should be unjust? one brother may pledge his life for another, when he

expects that the other shall get off on his credit. Crellius confesses this<sup>i</sup>. How then should it be unjust, to become surety for such, who otherwise were undone for ever? The glory of God, and the salvation of multitudes require this.

Socinus, strengthened by the band of his disciples, writes against it<sup>k</sup>. They allow of no suretiship in corporal or capital punishments: also not among men. But the greatest lawyers are of another judgment. The right of hostages teaches the contrary, and is defended by them, as just. The welfare of the public is the highest law. When this can be obtained by such a suretiship, he is an enemy to the state, and a despiser of charitable works, who would condemn that suretiship as unjust. Therefore Paul also does not inveigh against this custom of the nations, but as commending it, he mentions it as a work of love, Rom. v. 5, 6, 7. Then was the time to censure, if it deserved censure. Although this should be no hindrance to suretiship before God. For he is sovereign. Human powers are limited. Among men none has such an absolute disposal of his life, as this surety, of whom we speak.

What is the reason, that suretiship may be allowed in money-matters, and not in corporal punishments? Sayest thou, *The money can become another's, and when*

<sup>i</sup> Contra Grot. p. 272.

<sup>k</sup> Deserv. par. 3. cap. 3. Crell. contra Grot. p. 272. Volk. lib. 5. cap. 22.

*one takes upon him the pecuniary penalty of another, then it is there held forth, as if he with ample right had presented this money to the guilty. But death and other bodily troubles, cannot be made another's. O Socinian witticism!*

It is not necessary to this suretyship, that the suffering become another's. It is enough, that the *guilt* be imputed to the *sufferer*, and the *suffering* to the *guilty*. He does not understand what suretyship is. It is not a gift to the guilty, not even in money-matters; but an obligation in his place. For otherwise it were no suretyship, but a proper payment; yea, then the surety should not engage himself to the Judge, but to the debtor, to give him, that he might pay for himself. Also the surety should not be bound to pay, if the debtor were not present. What absurdities!

Who durst say, that God hath no power with the consent of the person suffering, to afflict him? Our opponents confess this concerning the suffering of Christ. Is this in God's power, and right with him, then it is also right in him, to appoint the suffering of that person, substituting himself as a surety, to be a ransom for the guilty. For that appointment of the suffering to be a ransom, is merely an extrinsical relation, arising from the will of the Judge, and puts the sufferer to no other inconvenience, than the simple affliction. He who has power to honour one with a crown, has also a power with the consent of the Fathers who merited it, to give it to the children, on consideration of that merit. Thus it also is with the opposite part, to wit, suffering.

Finding then, that God exacts just punishment on account of the sins of others, from these, from whom on account of their own sins, he would have demanded either no punishment, or at least no punishment so severely, (as even Crellius teacheth<sup>1</sup>) we judge, that it is right with God to lay the deserved suffering upon the surety with his consent. This is the less unjust here, because the surety is most spontaneous.

As it is obvious what presses the Socinians to this persuasion, so it is also evident, what is the difference here<sup>m</sup>. It is this, whether suretiship for the sinner can have place *before God's tribunal*? We say yea, which we evince by the following proofs.

I. The First reason from the silence of the law.

Where the law of the supreme Judge does not forbid suretiship, it is *admissible* upon the pleasure of the Judge and according to it. We never read that the law of God hath excluded this suretiship at his tribunal.

II. The Second reason from the nature of the thing.

This suretiship is nothing else, but that he, who is absolute master of his life and condition, resign the right of his liberty, and with the consent of the Judge, give that life instead of another. He is not an absolute master of himself, to whom it is not lawful to pledge his life for another. He is not a sovereign Judge, who may not accept a lawful engagement.

III. The Third reason from equality.

<sup>1</sup> Cont. Grot. cap. 4. part. 5.

<sup>m</sup> Cocc. summ. Theol. cap. 22. num. 44.

Any person possessing *two lives* or bodies, and having forfeited the *one*, might he not, with the consent of the Judge, pledge the *other* in place of that which was forfeited? Yea, certainly. How can this suretyship be unjust? The surety, as is explained above, is in many respects one with the guilty, and so *his life* is as the *second* life of the guilty.

IV. The Fourth reason from the nature of debt.

Why may not one who is at his own disposal, with the consent of the Judge or creditor, charge himself with the debt of another? This by no means militates against justice, and suretyship in money-matters cannot otherwise be justified. Where it is not unjust to burden one's self with the debt of another, there it cannot be unjust to pay that debt for him, which is the same with this suretyship.

V. The Fifth reason from God's intention in punishment.

When the end of the threatening and of punishment can be obtained in suretyship, then suretyship is just to the highest degree. This end here is the restoration of broken order, the vindication of character, government, honour, holiness and justice. The supreme Judge can obtain this as well in the surety, as in punishing the sinner. He can not only obtain this, but he can moreover obtain the redemption of the guilty, and so confirm the highest love to them. This suretyship therefore, is not unjust, but pure justice.

VI. The Sixth reason from the promise set in opposition to the threatening,

Who durst teach that one who is at his own disposal, might not substitute himself to do those things for another, to which a prize is promised, to the end he may be partaker of that prize? Especially, when otherwise there is no hope of enjoying it? Then there would be a prohibition to do good. Therefore it must also be justified, that one, who is at liberty to dispose of himself, do with the consent of the Judge, bear the deserved punishment instead of the guilty; to the end the guilty may escape *that*, under which he otherwise would groan to eternity. It is just equal here in both cases. The strengthening of the law, by a promise and a threatening, has the same nature and power on either side.

VII. The Seventh reason from the nature of punishment.

The essence of punishment is, that it is a *penal* evil on account of the desert of the *moral*<sup>o</sup>. It belongs not to its essence, that the *penal* evil should originate from one's own sin, even as it belongs not to the essence of a reward, that it be given on account of one's own virtue. It is enough, that it be given on account of *virtue*. For this reason children receive the reward which their parents deserved. For this cause punishment is described, as being an avenging of the transgression. Nothing is limited here. Its substance therefore is preserved, when the transgression is avenged, whether that crime be one's own, or adopt-

<sup>o</sup> Cocc. summ. Theol. cap. 22. num. 44.

ed by suretiship. When the essence of punishment remains inviolated, then suretiship is just.

VIII. The Eighth reason from David's words, Psal, xlix. 7, 8,

He sings as follows. *None of them shall ever be able to redeem his brother: he shall not be able to give God his ransom: for the redemption of their soul is too precious, and shall cease for ever.* Observe, he allows a redemption by ransom, if the ransom be costly, according to the costliness of the redemption. Mark, how he teaches, that the redemption ceases, when the ransom does not intervene. These things justify this suretiship.

IX. The Ninth reason from the power of his consent who is at his own disposal,

This consent causes that the guilt of the guilty becomes his. By this consent therefore he is punishable, as for his own guilt. Here therefore no appearance of injustice remains. For this consent has as much power here, as the sinners consent to sin, to make the sinner punishable.

X. The Tenth reason from the sacrifices of the Old Testament.

It will presently appear from the following question, that the Old-Testament priests were sureties, and that the sacrifices made reconciliation by way of satisfaction. All which rests on the equity of this suretiship.

OBJECTIONS SOLVED.

*Obj.* It is against all justice, that a Judge demand, or allow, or punish, a surety; when the guilty is at hand, and can be punished himself.

*Ans.* When the surety, because of the debtor's inability, substitutes himself as principal debtor, and renounces all benefits, then according to justice he must be punished, though the debtor be present.

*Obj.* God has testified that the child shall not bear the transgression of the father, that *the soul which sinneth shall die*, that the righteousness of the righteous, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him. Ezek, xviii. <sup>p</sup>.

*Ans.* Shall the righteousness of the righteous be always upon him, how then was Christ afflicted? We might say with Crellius, that this chapter speaks not of all times, but of some extraordinary occurrences. Therefore it could not always prevent this suretiship. But we shall come somewhat nearer. These Jews suffered against their will. Here therefore it is promised, that they should not suffer against their will. This has no connexion with that suretiship, which takes place with the surety's consent.

*Obj.* God willeth, Deut. xxiv. 16. 2 Kings xiv. 6. that the son do not atone for the father's transgression, nor the father for the son's, who nevertheless are so nearly related to one another <sup>q</sup>.

<sup>p</sup> Socin. de Servat. part. 3. cap. 3.

<sup>q</sup> Ibid.

*Ans.* According to the interpretation which occurs, 2 Kings xiv. 6. I might say, that there it is forbidden, that the son and father be punished alike, when the father only hath sinned: which does not affect this difference. Taken at the farthest, it is here forbidden the Judge either to punish the son for the father, or the father for the son, at his own pleasure. This does not forbid suretiship. For this is not lawful to him even in money-matters, where without all controversy, suretiship is just. Here also God gives a law to man. It is contrary to the word of God, and to sound reason, to limit the supreme Judge by those laws, to which the subordinate is subjected. God may visit the iniquities of the fathers upon the children, and according to the doctrine of our opponents, slay the most innocent in virtue of his dominion. These things are beyond the power of men.

*Obj.* It is never received by law, or custom, that the punishment, which one must suffer in his body, may be suffered for him by another †.

*Ans.* The contrary appears in hostages. Also, it is enough, that such a law or custom may be received, and that God's right far surpasses human laws, or customs.

† Ibid.

T H E

SIXTH POINT OF DIFFERENCE.

*Whether the ancient Propitiatory-Sacrifices, made reconciliation for Sins, as a simple pre-requisite Condition? or by way of Satisfaction?*

**T**H E R E are many strong arguments, which assure us, that the sacrifices did not make reconciliation for any sin, as to the conscience.

*1st*, They were shadows, Heb. x. The spiritual reconciliation far surpasses the power of shadows.

*2dly*, They are purified and justified as to the flesh, Heb. ix. 10. &c. in opposition to which the justification as to the spirit is mentioned there.

*3dly*, According to the nature of all ceremonies, they were an hand-writing against sinners, Col. ii. 14, 15. This deprives them of all power, to take away sins as to the conscience.

*4thly*, Otherwise they should still remain in power, in so far as they were able to reconcile as to the conscience. For the disannulling of the old commandment is only for its weakness, Heb. vii. 18.

*5thly*, They were ordinances of the law, which made nothing perfect, Heb. vii. 19. That is, did not reconcile as to the conscience.

6thly, They were very meanly esteemed of God, as being in that respect of no value and virtue, Pfal. xl. 7, 8. Pfal. l. and li. This is not applicable to things, which truly reconciled.

7thly, They left conscience of sins remaining after the sacrifice was performed, Heb. x. 2. Conscience cannot remain, or be afraid, when one is assured of reconciliation. Or should the apostle intend, that they had conscience of *new sins*, and not of *those sins*, for which sacrifice had been offered? This is against his meaning. He writes, that they were not *once purified*, and that they retained conscience of sin. From whence he also concludes, that a better sacrifice was necessary. This being meant of new sin, could give no necessity for a better sacrifice. These new sins, could be expiated, as well as the former, by such sacrifices.

8thly, They were accused of weakness in the annual-sacrifice. In it there was a remembrance again of the sin of the whole year. See, Lev. xvi. Heb. x. 3. This sacrifice was offered for sins, for which offering had been made in the private sacrifices. This was an intimation, that they could not expiate as to the conscience. Otherwise such a repetition and renewed remembrance of sins, could have had no place.

9thly, They could not sanctify the sinner, Heb. ix. 9. x. 1. That is, communicate forgiveness, as is to be seen, Heb. x. 14. compared with verse 15, 16, 17. *To sanctify*, is in this epistle, to take away the guilt of sins. It is unnecessary to mention more reasons.

Twice does the apostle expressly write, that they could not take away, yea, never take away sins, Heb. x. 4, 11. The gloss which Socinus gives upon these words is too bare-faced. He writes, that the meaning is not, *That they had no power to expiate those sins for which they were offered, but that they had none to turn men from sin, sinners falling into former sins, and being thus constrained to offer sacrifices again*<sup>f</sup>. For to take away sins, never signifies to turn from sins, without taking away the guilt. How then should the not taking away, signify only a not turning from sins? This not taking away, the apostle opposes to forgiveness, verse 18. It signifies therefore an impotency to take away the guilt of sin. The apostle calls *that* impossible, which the Jews thought to find in the sacrifices. That was not the turning away from sin, but the taking away of guilt. It would also be trifling in the apostle to place impotency in a matter, for which the sacrifices were not instituted. They were not appointed, to turn men from sins, their relation was to guilt. In these words, the apostle also points out the reason, why those sacrifices behoved to be repeated, and why Christ's sacrifice is not, to wit, because the former sacrifices could not take away the sins which Christ's sacrifice does. Now, if by this the turning from sin were understood, then Christ's sacrifice was also to be repeated, because we daily fall into our first and our old infirmities.

<sup>f</sup> De Servat. part. 2. cap. 16.

You will ask with Socinus, why were sacrifices instituted for little sins, and not for great, if they did not expiate as to the conscience<sup>u</sup>? It is a bad principle of his, that sacrifices were instituted only for slight transgressions. The contrary is super-abundantly proven by our writers. For the present we shall allow it, and to the question we answer, that the reason hereof might be, that so it pleased God. We might also say, that thereby God might intend to point out their impotency with respect to expiation; for being instituted for little sins, they could not expiate even them as to the conscience.

You will again ask, to what purpose sacrifices, if it was known, that they could not expiate any sin as to the conscience? They served as types of a true propitiation which was to come, carried the sinner to the sacrifice of Christ; and yet they expiated, though not as to the conscience. The denying of one particular way, is no denial of every way.

As we therefore hold it for certain, that they did not expiate as to the conscience, so it is also indisputable with us, that they did expiate, to wit, as to the carnal state. See this, Lev. i. ii. iii. iv. v. vi. xvi. 2Sam. xxiv. The which we shall further illustrate in the following manner. Israel may be considered in two senses. Either in a spiritual, or in a carnal. This distinction is taught by the apostle, Rom. ii. 28, 29. This distinction the Jewish state requires. That peo-

<sup>u</sup> Prælect. cap. 16.

ple is sometimes represented spiritually, sometimes externally, or carnally. Hence also their ceremonies were instituted in two senses, either spiritual or carnal. See, Rom. ii. 28, 29. Heb. vii. and ix. verses 9, 13, 14. Spiritually, they were types of Christ's propitiatory-sacrifice and benefits. Carnally, the ceremonial law was in itself an instrument of the Jewish polity, and a law of carnal service commanded them in that state; being in this respect, also able, to purify them to the purifying of the flesh. See this in a particular instance. It is confessed, that the ceremonial washings may be considered in two senses, either spiritually or carnally. Spiritually, then they signified the inward purifying of the soul by the Holy Ghost. Carnally, then they purified as to the outward state. Thus also must the propitiatory-sacrifices be considered. Spiritually, then they are types of Christ's sacrifice, as this also is the spiritual consideration of the law ceremonies, when it is fitted to that which it typifies and signifies. Carnally, then they sanctify to the sanctifying of the flesh, Heb. ix. 9, &c.

You will ask, what benefit arose from that purifying of the flesh? That the sinner continued among the people, from which he must otherwise have been rooted out. This must be conceived as follows. Every ceremonial uncleanness deserved extirpation from among the people. Therefore, he, who in his uncleanness, had neglected the sacrifice, behaved to be extirpated from among them; as also he who had polluted himself with those abominations, for which

no propitiatory-sacrifice was appointed, Num. xv. 23, &c. From whence therefore, it appears, that this sacrifice made him to continue among the people, and propitiated for him to such a degree, that he was not, as unclean, extirpated from among them.

This explication of ours cannot be contradicted by the Socinians. They teach, that in those times the forgiveness of temporal punishment only was promised, and that sacrifices were offered for it. They did not then make reconciliation as to the conscience, but as to the external and carnal state. Whereby they therefore overthrow, all that they say of reconciliation as to the conscience.

It appears then, that they were indeed types and pledges of a future, a true spiritual reconciliation as to the conscience, but that they themselves reconciled only as to the external and carnal state. It comes now to be considered, how they effectuated this carnal reconciliation. Here a double way may be conceived, that is, that they brought it about, either as a simple preceding condition, upon the performance of which God promised this reconciliation, or as a reconciliation wrought out by way of satisfaction. What is to be chosen here, will instantly appear, in the clearest manner. It was seen above, that an uncleanness, for which no propitiation had been made, was punished with the extermination of the unclean. Instead of whom if the victim was slain, then this made him continue among the people: that victim being extirpated, while otherwise he would. Even as the ram was slain

in Isaac's place, and he preserved in life<sup>w</sup>. Here therefore the mere presence of the victim was not accepted, but its death and extirpation instead of the death and extirpation of the unclean. These things teach, that the sacrifices made reconciliation as to the carnal state by way of satisfaction. Here we see in the clearest manner, the law of retaliation. The clean beast instead of the unclean man, the life of the beast for the life of the man. This law of retaliation is the law of satisfaction<sup>x</sup>. Thus according to that law, tooth was given for tooth, eye for eye, in order to satisfaction. This has the greater place here, because thereupon the unclean goes free. He who contradicts this, gives to know that he does not understand what a satisfactory sacrifice is. Its essence consists in this, that the victim enters into the place of the guilty, and suffers what he ought to suffer; thus redeeming the guilty with the Judge's consent.

Socinus and his followers speak otherwise<sup>y</sup>. They teach, that the sacrifices properly and truly made expiation to God, for all those sins for which they were offered. How? *As an appointed condition, say they, which being fulfilled according to the law by the Jews, God according to his decree promised that he would hold them for clean, and declare them free from deserved punishment.* This they teach with a view to oppose the

<sup>w</sup> Cocc. in 1 Pet. i. 18 19. par. 168.

<sup>x</sup> Cocc. de fœd. par. 113.

<sup>y</sup> Socin. de Serv. part. cap. 10. 11. Crell. contra Grot. cap. 10. Volk. lib. 2. cap. 23. lib. 5. cap. 22.

fatisfaction of Jesus Christ. So many truths must *they* attack, who will make war against the satisfaction of our Saviour.

This then is the difference here, *Whether the propitiatory-sacrifices reconciled as a preceding condition, upon the performance of which, God promised freedom from punishment? or if they reconciled by way of satisfaction*<sup>2</sup>. The first is denied, and the last taught by us. Our opinion is thus proved.

I. The First reason from the name of the sacrifices.

In scripture the sin-offerings are called *sin*, Ex. xxx. 10. Lev. iv. 29, 33. v. 7, 8. x. 16, 17, 18. xii. 6, 8. & xiv. 13, 22. The word *sin*, when it does not signify the crime itself, is always used by the Hebrews for the punishment of sin. See, Gen. iv. 7. Zech. xiv. 19. It must therefore have this sense there, that they bare the punishment of sin, that is, made reconciliation by way of satisfaction.

*Evaf.* They were so called, either because they were offered on occasion of sin, or because man was obliged by sin to offer them, or because they were offered up to take away sin<sup>a</sup>.

*Ans.* This is not enough. For as is proved from the stile of scripture, it must here signify punishment. Used in the case of suffering, it can have no other signification.

II. The Second reason from the nature of the thing.

<sup>2</sup> Cocc. in Rom. iii. 24, 25, 26. Cocc. summ. Theol. cap. 61. num. 9.

<sup>a</sup> Crell. contra Grot. p. 72.

It is confessed on all sides, that God punishes none but the guilty. When the sinner does not suffer without guilt, how then can his sacrifice suffer without being charged with his guilt? How can the sacrifice suffer the same which otherwise he must have suffered in his own person? This teaches, that the sacrifices reconciled by way of satisfaction.

III. The Third reason from the form of the institution respecting sacrifice.

It is thus proposed to the sinner: *He shall offer a bullock for his sin which he hath sinned, &c.* Lev. iv. 3, 23, 28. Lev. vi. 7. Which can have no other sense than this, he shall in that manner make atonement for his sin by the priest. Thus it is also appointed, Lev. v. 3.—7. Here it is said, that he, who toucheth the unclean thing, shall be unclean and guilty, and it is commanded, that he bring unto the Lord for his guilt, a female from the flock, &c. which proves as clear as noon-day, that the sacrifice had guilt upon it, and so reconciled by way of satisfaction.

IV. The Fourth reason from the effect of the sacrifices.

They appeased God's wrath. How? This is to be seen, 2 Sam. xxiv. God's wrath discovered itself in slaying the people. This wrath was appeased by sacrifices, that is, by the slaying of the sacrifices. Thus it appears very visibly, that they reconciled by suffering instead of the people, that is, by way of satisfaction.

V. The Fifth reason from their justifying.

They sanctified to the justification of the flesh, Heb. ix. 10. That which justifies a guilty person, reconciles by way of satisfaction. For to *justify*, excludes all *pardon*; and consists in this, that one is declared righteous according to law.

VI. The Sixth reason from the character of the priests.

The priests were sureties for those for whom they sacrificed. For the priesthood includes suretiship, Heb. vii. 20, &c. Otherwise how could it be, that they made reconciliation for sins, and obtained forgiveness by sacrifices? and that immediately? How could it be said, Lev. x. 17. *That they bare the iniquity of the congregation*<sup>b</sup>? How could they transfer it, by the imposition of hands upon the victim, if they as sureties had not taken those sins upon themselves? Lev. xvi. Paul's words are plain, Heb. v. 1, 2. &c. where he teaches, that the priest was appointed by God for the sinner, to make reconciliation before God by sacrifice. Which plainly intimates this suretiship. He, who as a surety makes reconciliation for the guilty by sacrifice, reconciles by way of satisfaction. Suretiship has a reference to a satisfaction.

VII. The Seventh reason from the imposition of hands upon the victim.

Hands behoved to be laid upon its head, Lev. i. 9, iv. 15. xvi. 9. &c. Was this only a testimony, that the guilty resigned his right over that animal, and

<sup>b</sup> Cocc. summ. Theol. cap. 61. num. 9.

gave it to the priest? Then it should have taken place in all sacrifices. No where does this ceremony signify the resignation of right. It signifies, that *that* beast, upon which hands are laid, is placed in his stead who laid on hands. The resignation appeared sufficiently in giving of *that* beast to the priest. The intention of that ceremony therefore, can be nothing else, but the translating of guilt to the sacrifice. Wherefore the sacrifice after that time was also unclean, as being charged with the guilt of the transgressor. Therefore it was likewise commanded the priest, that he laying (his) hands upon the beast, should confess the sins of all the people, Lev. xvi. 21. Thus sins were transferred to the victim, and it made reconciliation for the guilty by its suffering, and its extirpation from among the people; which otherwise was the lot of the guilty. He is blind therefore, who does not perceive, that in this instance, reconciliation was made by way of satisfaction.

VIII. The Eight reason from the Hebrew words, *Capbar* and *Chittè*.

It is known to every Linguist, that these words are frequently used with respect to sacrifices. It is also manifest, that they sometimes point out a satisfaction. See, Gen. xxxi. 39. Ex. xxi. 30. Num. xxxv. 31, 32, Psal. xlix. 8. Prov. 6. 35. Here it is ordinarily translated by *reconciliation*: and must be understood of a reconciliation by way of satisfaction. For the sacrifices had a relation to God, as provoked by sin, 2 Sam. xxiv. Heb. v. 1. When the

guilty is reconciled to the Judge by blood, and that reconciliation is held forth by these two Hebrew words, then it can be understood of no other reconciliation, but that which takes place by way of satisfaction. The more, when it is effected by that suffering, which the guilty deserved, and when forgiveness follows immediately upon that sacrifice. All which is to be found here.

*Evaf.* God is also said to reconcile. Nevertheless he satisfies for none <sup>d</sup>.

*Ans.* God is never said to reconcile to the Judge, by the shedding of blood, and by suffering that which the guilty deserved.

*Adher.* The priests are said to reconcile. How then can this reconciliation point out a satisfaction <sup>e</sup>?

*Ans.* They wrought this as sureties, and so by way of satisfaction.

*Evaf.* The altar, the sanctuary, and other holy things were also reconciled, Ex. xxix. 37. and xxx. 29. Ez. xliii. 20, 22. no satisfaction could be (made) for these things <sup>f</sup>.

*Ans.* These things were reconciled, in so far as they were unclean. This arose from the guilt of men, and not from themselves. Thus that expiation was properly an expiation of the guilt of men. In this respect they behaved to be reconciled by way of satisfaction.

<sup>d</sup> Crell. contra Grot. cap. 10.

<sup>e</sup> Ibid.

<sup>f</sup> Ibid.

IX. The Ninth reason from the power of the Greek words *Hagiadzein* and *Katharidzein*.

Paul useth these words frequently in the case of sacrifices, Heb. ix. 13, 22, 23. They are translated by *sanctifying* and *purifying*. Our antagonists themselves being judges, they can signify nothing else with Paul, but to deliver the guilty from the guilt of sin. It occurs therefore, that we enquire, in what manner they effected that. According to the nature of these words, and their constant signification, this must be so conceived, that these sacrifices effected it by their own power. This, I say, is the proper sense and use of these two words, from which it is not lawful to recede. There should be no truth in this, if they had not reconciled by way of satisfaction, to wit, as to the carnal state. For to effectuate this, is peculiar only to sacrifices, reconciling by way of satisfaction. These only could immediately upon the act, take away sins.

X. The Tenth reason from the gross absurdities arising from the contrary opinion.

(1.) This effect is not so often ascribed to a mere preceding condition, as the sacrifices are said to reconcile. See, Ex. xxx. 15, 16. Lev. i. 4. xvii. 11. Neh. x. 33.

(2.) Then the shedding of blood was not necessary to the remission of sins. Heb. ix. 22. To a mere condition, God could as well have appointed to gather stones together, or to do any thing else, as to sacrifice.

(3.) Then God dealt more graciously with the Jews

than with the Christians. No forgiveness is promised to us upon the bare performance of such a work.

(4.) Then the sacrifices were not an *hand-writing* against the Jews, as Paul speaks, Col. ii. 14, 15.

(5.) Then it did not become God to appoint such continual slaughtering and massacre of beasts, and the smoke and smell of victims. There is nothing in these, which can be agreeable in respect of a mere preceding condition. But every thing is just, when we regard them as expiations by way of satisfaction.

(6.) Then there is no reason, why they ceased in and by the death of Christ.

(7.) Then it was not owing to the impotence of beasts, but to the will of God, that they did not take away the guilt of the greatest sins. He could with equal ease have appointed them for such a condition.

(8.) Then the reconciliation must needs be attributed not to the priest, but to him who brought the sacrifice. For that which any one obtains by fulfilling a condition, is chiefly attributed unto him. God's word speaks quite otherwise of the sacrifices. It attributes reconciliation to the priest. In conclusion of our proofs, we shall yet give a reason evidently strong.

XI. The Eleventh reason from God's express declaration.

Thus he speaks, Lev. xvii. 11. *For the soul of the flesh, is in the blood: therefore I have given it to you, upon the altar; to make reconciliation for your souls: for it is the blood, that shall make reconciliation for the soul*<sup>s</sup>.

<sup>s</sup> Cocc. de fæd. par. 113.

Thus God declares, that the soul and the life of the beasts come in stead of the soul and the life of the guilty; and so make reconciliation, that is truly, by way of satisfaction.

*Evaf.* It is only related here, that the blood, of which it was said, that the soul of the beasts is therein, makes reconciliation for the soul. This does not signify, that the blood is instead of the soul of the man <sup>h</sup>.

*Ans.* The words plainly signify these two things. *1st*, That the soul of the beast is in the blood. *2dly*, That God hath therefore given it upon the altar, to make reconciliation for the soul. Which can only have this sense, that God gives the soul of the beast instead of the life of the man, in order to reconcile him.

*Evaf.* These words (the soul of the flesh is in the blood) are not adduced, to teach, why the blood has virtue to make reconciliation for the soul (life) of the man <sup>i</sup>. They inform us of the first reason, why it was not lawful to eat blood, which was treated of before. This is pointed out by the particle *for*. This reason is repeated verse 14. and is to be found, Gen. ix. 4.

*Ans.* They inform us of this reason, yet so, that it is not fully handled there. The following words must be joined, *therefore, &c.* This added to the first, makes up the full reason. The Hebrew *accent*

<sup>h</sup> Crell. contra Grot. p. 483.

<sup>i</sup> Ibid.

*Sægolta*<sup>k</sup>, teaches this, and the subject matter proves it. For otherways it should be forbidden to eat

<sup>k</sup> Our author arguing here from the Hebrew accent, *Sægolta*, we may thence infer, that he believed the divine authority of the Hebrew accentuation. According to the usual doctrine on that head, *Sægolta*, is equivalent to our *Colon*: The accents serve to distinguish the parts of a sentence, and of consequence, to ascertain the true construction. For example, by them we learn, that the word *MAN* in Gen. iii. 22. is not the nominative to the verb *is*, but the accusative following the interjection: *Behold the Man, (who) was as one of us.* By them, it is evident, that in i Chr. iii. 17. *Affir* is not the name of one of Jeconiah's sons, but is joined to the word *Jeconiah*, as an adjective to its substantive, thus, and the sons of *Jeconiah the captive*; *Salathiel* his son. Compare Mat. i. 12. By them we are also taught to refute the Jewish Rabbi's who denying the divinity of Messiah, read Jer. xxxiii. 6. This is the name whereby *Jehovah* shall call him, *Our righteousness.* The accentuation shows, that the word *Jehovah* is not the nominative to the verb *shall call*, but stands joined with the word *our righteousness*, in the following manner, this is the name whereby one shall call him, *Jehovah is our righteousness.* So ch. xxxiii. 16. *And he who shall call her, is Jehovah our righteousness.*

In Jer. i. 7. after the word *not*, there should be a colon instead of a comma. *All that found them have devoured them; and their adversaries said, We offend not:* and then the prophet subjoins the reason, *Because they have sinned against the Lord, &c.* In the same manner, there should not be a comma, but a colon after the word *pierced*, Zech. xii. 10. *They shall look upon Me, whom they have pierced: and they shall mourn for Him, &c.* In the first Hemistich, it is Christ himself who speaks, *They shall look upon Me.* In the latter, it is the prophet, who adds, *And they shall mourn for Him.* As the vowel points determine the sense of the words, so do the accentual, the grammatical construction of the sentence. Strip the Hebrew Bible of these, and it becomes a heap of stones before the

blood, not for a *ceremonial* reason but for a *moral*, and thus still continue forbidden. When therefore this reason is assigned, verſe 14. and Gen. ix. 4. under it muſt be underſtood, that the blood being the ſoul of the beaſt, was given to make reconciliation, and for that reason might not be eaten, at that time. Otherways it were unlawful ſtill.

#### OBJECTIONS SATISFIED:

*Obj.* There is no communion in ſpecies or kind between man and beaſt, how then could *they* reconcile by way of ſatisfaction<sup>1</sup>?

*Anſ.* In order to reconcile by way of ſatisfaction as to the carnal ſtate, it is ſufficient that there be a communion, *1ſt*, Of genus, or ſtock. *2dly*, Of poſſeſſor and poſſeſſion. *3dly*, Of bodily life by blood.

*Obj.* God is Lord of all, nothing could be given to him by theſe ſacrifices, Pf. xxiv. 1. l. 8, &c<sup>m</sup>.

builder, ſuſceptible of any form. It is well known, that many Proteſtants deny the divine authority of the vowels and accents. Meanwhile they herein ſymbolize with the church of Rome. One would think their company would make them ſuſpect their cauſe. A Buxtorf, a Lightfoot, an Owen, a Boſton, &c. a Gill, may be conſulted on the controverſy. Whether benefit or bane ſhall ariſe to the church from Dr. Geddes's tranſlation of the Bible for the uſe of the Britiſh Catholics, time alone will tell. In his Proſpectus, printed at Glaſgow, 1786, he ridicules the Netherland and the Helvetian churches for their adherence to the Hebrew vowels.

<sup>1</sup> Socin. de Serv. part. 2. cap. 10.

<sup>m</sup> Ibid.

*Ans.* Because God is an absolute sovereign, therefore he can give these things to us in such a manner, that we may give them again to him. The texts adduced teach this. See also, Pſal. li. 17. Prov. iii. 9. Ezek. xvi. 19. Mic. vi. 6, 7. We ſhall answer further. In order to reconcile by way of ſatisfaction, it is not neceſſary that men give any thing to God. It is ſufficient, that there be ſuffering inſtead of the guilty; ſo the victim was extirpated inſtead of the guilty, who otherways ſhould.

*Obj.* It is written, that ſin is forgiven. Satisfaction and forgivenenſs are repugnant to one another<sup>m</sup>.

*Ans.* We ſhall ſhow in the ſequel, that they are not.

*Obj.* One victim only, which was often ſlain for a great multitude, could not by that death ſatisfy for ſo many men<sup>o</sup>.

*Ans.* *What can ſatisfy*, depends not on our judgment, but on that of the Judge. He only knows, how reconciliation and atonement muſt be made. That which the moſt holy Law-giver hath commanded relative thereto, muſt be enough to the ſinner: and that was to reconcile by way of ſatisfaction. For to that end it is only neceſſary, that the victim ſuffer inſtead of the guilty, and that he go free. The which is true, whether it ſuffer inſtead of one, or of many. It reconciled alſo according to the fleſh only, and not as to the conſcience.

<sup>m</sup> Ibid.

<sup>o</sup> Crell. contra Grot. cap. 10. part. 10.

THE SATISFACTION OF  
 J E S U S C H R I S T,  
 STATED AND DEFENDED  
 AGAINST THE SOCINIANS.  
 THE SECOND PART.

THE CHIEF DIFFERENCE.

*Whether the Lord Jesus Christ suffered the deserved Punishment of Sins, instead of Sinners, and in that manner satisfied the Law of God for them?*

**W**E have taught by many cogent arguments, that the punishment of sin is certain, when the rational creature hath sinned against God. Hence we conclude, that there is no medium in order to grace and salvation, but the suffering of deserved punishment<sup>a</sup>. It by no means becomes the supreme Judge, to save sinners, but in and by the display of his attributes, the judging of the sinner, the teaching that he is not like him, the making the filthiness of his sin to appear, and what it is to forsake his Creator, his Lord, his highest good<sup>b</sup>. So that the truth of

<sup>a</sup> Cocc. de fæd. par. 73.

<sup>b</sup> Cocc. summ. Theol. cap. 61. num. 5.

Christ's satisfaction for sins, is as certain with us, as is the redemption of believing sinners.

Therefore we shall now attempt the further illustration and confirmation of this most important point, and likewise explain the special character of God the Father, as also that of the Son, in the work of redemption,

Man had sinned against the law of God, and so deserved certain punishment. The chief conducting of this matter, belongs only to the supreme Judge and Law-giver. For this reason Holy Scripture introduces the Father, in respect of the work of redemption, as the Judge and supreme cause of the sufferings of Christ<sup>c</sup>. This is not only taught, John xix. 10, &c. 2 Cor. v. 21. But it is very emphatically hinted, Isa. liii. 6. *Nevertheless, the Lord made the iniquity of us all to run upon him.* The word *iniquity*, must there be explained, of the *punishment of iniquity*. There it can have no other sense. How did God cause it to run upon him, if he did not as a Judge lay that punishment upon him? Perhaps you will say with Socinus, that the sense of this text is, *That the Lord with or by him, met with all iniquity, and so drove away the punishment of iniquities from us by Christ*<sup>d</sup>. You are mistaken. The Hebrew word never signifies simply *to meet with*, but *to make to meet with*, or *to make to run upon one*. It is of the conjugation *Hiphil*,

<sup>c</sup> Cocc. de fæd. par. 89, 92,

<sup>d</sup> De Serv. part. 2. cap. 5.

which according to the uniform judgment of those acquainted with the language, expreffes a double action. Wherefore Socinus carries a fonder tongue, when he there writes, that the fenfe of the place can alfo be this, *The Lord hath made all our iniquities to meet with him*; that is, *God hath made our iniquities to meet with Chrift, and they took hold of him, when he intended to die for fins*. How could God do that, without effecting it as an avenging Judge? It is not fufficient to this purpofe, that one fuffer a bitter and a shameful death on occafion of fins, as Crellius dreams <sup>f</sup>. For it is never faid of a mere occafion, that the Law-giver makes punifhment to meet with fuch a one, much lefs that he makes the punifhment of fin to meet with him; as the words *our iniquity* fignify, that is our punifhment, or the punifhment of the guilty perfons. This is the work of an avenging Judge.

You will afk with Crellius <sup>g</sup>, why cannot the fenfe of the place be, *That God by Chrift threw fome obftacles in the way of fins; as his fuffering, and the glory following thereupon*? Not, for this reafon, becaufe the original word never fignifies fimplly to meet with, much lefs to caft a fimple impediment in the way; and becaufe then the victory againft fin would be given to the Father, while neverthelefs the fcope, and all the words of this chapter, attribute it to Chrift in diftinction from the Father. It appears therefore, that the Father, in the work of redemption, and in the

<sup>f</sup> Contra Grot. p. 62.

<sup>g</sup> Ibid.

matter of Christ's suffering, comes in as an avenging Judge. Wherefore it is also taught, that in this work he intended the *demonstration of his justice*, Rom. iii. 24, 25, 26. Thus the Judge worketh, and it is peculiar to him alone, so to work.

The character of Christ is of more extensive consideration: which we shall therefore illustrate in some particular branches.

For first, We must carefully remember the dignity, of his person<sup>h</sup>. It is clearly and strongly proved by our Divines that there are two natures in him, the divine and human<sup>i</sup>. This is plainly to be read, Isa. xxxv. 4. xl. 9, 10. xlv. 17, 18. Mal. iii. 1. Rom. ix. 5, 6. 1 Tim. ii. 5. Hereby he was fit and sufficient to atone, and to satisfy for the filthiness of sin. Its abominable nature consists in this, that it is an injury to infinite Majesty. This is perfectly repaired, by the suffering of a person of infinite worth, because the party suffering answers to the party injured, and also the punishment is suitable to the crime. Add here, that in sin, God is considered as the *object* against which it is committed; but in the satisfaction, the person satisfying is regarded as the *subject*. Therefore Christ's Godhead can communicate the greater worth to his suffering, by how much the *subject* is nearer to the act or operation, than the *object*, which is only assaulted or attacked by this or that act. The divine nature which is impassible, belongs to the es-

<sup>h</sup> Cocc. de fæd. par. 79, 80.

<sup>i</sup> Cocc. in 1 Pet. i. 18, 19. par. 183.

fence of the *subject*. The higher the suffering subject is, the more is he injured in his Majesty by that suffering, and is also fit and sufficient to satisfy for those sins, whose filthiness and weight arises from the disregarding of the Law-giver.

Secondly, We must view Christ, not as a private, but as a common and a public person, who in the days of his flesh, represented many others, both in doing and suffering <sup>1</sup>. How could it otherwise be said, that his death is the *death of us all*, 2 Cor. v. 15. *That we are crucified, dead, and buried with him*, Rom. vi. if he had not represented us in his suffering? Paul removes every doubt, when he sets Adam and Christ in opposition to one another, and introduces Christ as the *second* Adam, Rom. v. How could Paul from Adam's offence infer the necessity of our reconciliation by Christ, if Adam's fall had not included us all by representation? The opposition teaches, that Christ also is such a public person, who sustained or represented the persons of others.

Thirdly, We must not only observe in Christ, that he was a man of sorrows, but also the singular nature of his suffering <sup>m</sup>. According to the evangelic writings, he suffered the deprivation of every pleasant good, and the infliction of all kinds of bitter evil. His suffering was a kind of suffering, *1st*, Accursed according to the law, Gal. iii. 13. *2dly*, Shameful, Psal. xxii. 7, 8. Mat. xxvii. John xix. *3dly*, Pain-

<sup>1</sup> Cocc. de fæd. par. 88, 89, 90.

<sup>m</sup> Cocc. summ. Theol. cap. 60.

ful, sweating blood, Luke xx. *4thly*, Not only outward, but chiefly inward in the soul, Mat. xxvi. 37, &c. *5thly*, Did not befall him by chance, but was inflicted on him by God the Father, John iii. 16. Rom. viii. 32. Wherefore he also offered up that doleful complaint unto him, Mat. xxvii. 46.

Now, when we represent to ourselves these things which at present are said and proved, we see clearly and distinctly, that Christ instead of sinners, suffered the deserved punishment of sins. This we shall demonstrate from every article.

Who can conceive, how God the Father should, be considered as an avenging Judge in the sufferings of Christ, if these sufferings were not a true satisfaction for sins? God's wise justice, Christ's perfect holiness, the innate idea of equity, require that the Father cannot come in here as an avenging Judge, but in case of satisfaction for our sins. Also who can apprehend, that the Godhead united itself to the manhood, without the highest reason and the utmost necessity? This can be nothing else, but to satisfy for our sins. Who can agree, that an innocent person should in his sufferings sustain the person of the guilty, and that to redeem the guilty, and that yet these sufferings for the guilty should not be a satisfaction for their sins? Who can admit, that such suffering in soul and body, which in itself is a punishment of sins, should be inflicted by the Father upon Christ, if he therein did not suffer the punishment of sins? Or must we represent God to ourselves

as a King, who makes his Son to suffer with his own consent, that which is appointed for the punishment of sin, yet without satisfying; but only to assure the criminals of his father's favour<sup>o</sup>? How should this happen? *that he should travel to a desolate island, where the rebels are in virtue of their banishment, and that to assure them of his father's affection?* This travelling to that island, is no suffering to that son. Such a journey may be a delight and a recreation to him. Is he banished thither for the banished, to redeem them, and does he take that voluntarily, this shall certainly be a satisfaction for their crimes. God's truth does not permit here, that he inflict upon the innocent, that which is appointed for a punishment to the guilty. His rectoral office does not suffer, that the righteous be as the wicked, that there be the evil of punishment without the evil of sin, the *penal* evil without the *moral*; much less therefore, that the innocent meet with, the same evil, yea, the same anguish of soul, which is threatened to sinners.

As by these things we plainly see, that Christ, suffered the deserved punishment, instead of sinners, so they very clearly unfold to us, the special nature of that most important matter.

Since God the Father comes in here as a Judge, this teaches us to whom the ransom is given. Such a redeeming ransom must be given to the Judge. To whom also belongs the ordering of the time, person and quality of the suffering. As to the time, when

<sup>o</sup> Socin. de serv. part. 3. cap. 9.

he will go on with the execution: as to the person, permitting, by virtue of his sovereignty, a sufficient surety, in order thus to exercise his mercy without the infringement of his justice, and to save the sinner in a consistency with the right of the law: with respect to the quality of the suffering, as he who only knows, what the threatening in its utmost extent contains, and how it must be satisfied.

Hence it can also be conceived, how the Father could demand from the Son the deserved punishment of sinners, without being angry at him. No judge is angry with the surety, he only enforces the payment of that debt, for which the surety hath pledged himself. The foundation of God's wrath is the same with that of his hatred. This is the filthiness of sin. The filthy sinner, therefore, is the only object of God's hatred and wrath, and not the surety.

We can now also conceive, how Christ's sufferings can be good in law for sinners. As God and man he was sufficient for that purpose. As a public and common person he sustained our persons, and by that means there was such a close connexion between him and us, that we are justly reckoned to have suffered in him, and our sin to be judged or punished in his flesh, See Rom. viii. 2, 3.

Hence we now conclude, that Christ in our stead satisfied for our sins. For he in our stead suffered for us, that which we had deserved. He suffered that which the law threatened to sinners, and that which

the curse inflicts upon them, and so satisfied their demand to the full.

Perhaps you will object, *The law threatens eternal death, and also ask, whether Christ suffered that, and how then he is risen from the dead?* I might answer with Volkelius <sup>p</sup>, that it ought to be sufficient here, to suffer as much as eternal death comprehends, though eternal death itself be not suffered. A little piece of gold payed by the surety, satisfies for the debt of a greater quantity of silver. In payments men value the equal worth. I will come somewhat nearer. The law threatens a curse, yea, an infinite curse. Now that *that* curse brings on eternal death or torment, arises from the infirmity of the sinner, he not being able thoroughly to suffer all at once. But when the surety is sufficient, thoroughly to bear the curse, then the demand of the law is most strictly satisfied. Socinus pleads boldly against this doctrine, and is strengthened therein by Ostorodus, Smalcus, Volkelius, Crellius, Slichtingius, and the whole Socinian band. This is to be found in their Racovian Catechism, cap. 8. quest. 15. The *Polish Knight* allows a satisfaction indeed, but no satisfaction for sin; wherefore he writes thus, *We firmly believe, that Christ in order to obtain the forgiveness of sins, so satisfied the divine will for us, that there is nothing wanting to the most perfect satisfaction.* Their Crellius seems to be mild, when he writes, *We are said not to acknowledge the satisfaction of Christ. We acknowledge such a satisfaction, as is*

<sup>p</sup> De ver. rel. lib. 5. cap. 22.

worthy of God, and agrees with holy writ<sup>a</sup>. This he explains in the following manner. *Christ perfectly fulfilled the will of God, and performed all that was enjoined him of God for our salvation. Thus he perfectly satisfied God for us, that is, for our sake, to our highest and eternal good.* But the following clause overthrows all, *though not in our place and stead.* What then, can this man speak of a satisfaction worthy of God! that is only becoming God, where satisfaction is made for sin in our stead. For therein God displays the power and glory of his name, being merciful, and nevertheless by no means holding the guilty guiltless, Exod. xxxiv. 5, 6, 7. In this satisfaction which we teach, God's mercy is glorified above all measure as he did not spare his Son, that he might spare men. This surpasses that kind of mercy, which would be seen in the simple remitting of sins without a satisfaction. Here the love is much higher, and greater far the gift. Mercy of another nature, would be a neglect of office, and so no virtue, but a vice. Where sin is punished because of its filthiness, there the attribute of Mercy cannot be seen, if satisfaction be not made to the demands of justice. Here these two must go together, Psal. lxxxv. 11. lxxxix. 15.

Ah, had the Socinians remained by that denial! They are fallen so far, that they are not afraid to belch out infernal blasphemies against this salutary truth. See, Soc. de Servat. part. 2. cap. 4. Catech. Racov. cap. 8. q. 12. Smalc. contra Franz, pag,

<sup>a</sup> Crell. contra Grot. pag. 343.

153, &c. Ostor. institut. cap. 37. Volk, lib. 5. cap. 22. pag. 570.

We confess, that these words, *satisfaction for sins* by Christ, are not found in the Holy Scriptures. Nor is this strange, because they were not written in our language. The thing is sufficiently held forth in other words and phrases. He is wilfully blind, who does not see, that this salutary truth is proposed in stronger expressions. This we shall point out in the sequel, plainly and at large.

It is intolerable audacity, when they dare write, that *this satisfaction is impossible*<sup>r</sup>. Thus the creature intrudes into the rectoral office of God, to whom only it belongs, to judge concerning such things, and who only knows, how and in what manner his law can be satisfied. Much less does it become the guilty, to assume to themselves such a judgment concerning the power of the Sovereign Judge. How the Holy one of Israel must be sanctified as a hater of sin, and an avenger of the law, can be revealed by himself only. Wherefore in this matter we depend solely upon the divine declaration, wherein not only the simple *possibility*, but the *certainty* of the satisfaction is clearly and distinctly taught us. In opposition to this foolish fancy of impossibility, we assert, that the Mediator could suffer such and so great things, that by them the suffering Son of God, truly sanctified God, and so satisfied the curse of the law, and the justice of God.

<sup>r</sup> Soc. de Serv. part. 3. cap. 6.

The sum of what is said is this, that in the work of redemption we conceive of the Father as a Judge, of the Son as a surety instead of sinners, taking upon him, with the Judge's consent, to suffer for us that punishment, which we had deserved.

This now also unfolds to us wherein the difference properly lies. Not whether Christ suffered for us, nor whether he perfectly satisfied the will of God for us, but *whether he instead of sinners bore the punishment, which they had deserved, and so satisfied for sins* <sup>t</sup>? Hereupon we say *yea*, in opposition to the Socinians, who uniformly deny and attack this truth. That it may appear to the world, that we do not build upon a loose foundation, we shall, to the glory of our Redeemer, (*Goel*) and to the honour of our Surety, further exhibit our proofs, and defend them against all evasions.

I. The First proof from those texts, which say, that Christ was made sin and a curse for us<sup>t</sup>, 2 Cor. v. 21. *God hath made him to be sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him*, Gal. iii. 13. *Christ hath delivered us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us*. The word *sin*, when it does not signify the pollution of sin, always denotes *punishment, or a satisfactory sacrifice for sin*, Gen. iv. 13. Zech. xiv. 19. This signification never fails, when suffering is spoken of. Here it cannot signify the filth of sin, because

<sup>t</sup> Netherland Confess. art. 20. Cocc. summ. Theol. cap. 61. num. 4.

<sup>t</sup> Cocc. de fæd. par. 105.

Christ knew no sin, and God infuses no corruption into any holy person. It is here also joined to suffering, and is the reason that the guilty are thereby made the righteousness of God in him. Here, therefore it is taught, that he bore the deserved punishment of our sins. The second testimony is of no less force. None can be cursed, much less called a curse, without being under the power and the guilt of sin. None can be called a curse of the law, without lying under the demand and the debt of the law. Much less, without his being made a debtor for those, who according to the law were accursed: least of all, redeem them from the curse in that manner. The least word here is full of emphasis, to point out this satisfaction, as teaching, that for us he bore the force of the curse against finners.

*Evas.* On 2 Cor. v. 21. Christ is called sin, because he was treated as a sinner <sup>w</sup>.

*Ans.* The word *sin*, never has that signification in the Holy Scriptures, to wit, of being treated simply as a sinner. This word is spoken of Christ, in distinction from the apostles, verses 19, 20, 21, who nevertheless were treated as sinners by the world, even according to the direction of God. Here it is said, that God made him to be sin. God cannot treat one perfectly holy as a sinner, if he have not taken the debt of sinners upon him. Also how for us? How infer from thence, that we are the righteousness of God in him, if here it have no other signification,

<sup>w</sup> Soc. de serv. pag. 1. cap. 8.

but to be treated as a sinner by men, although according to the counsel of God? Hence we conclude, that these words, *he knew no sin*, signify, *he deserved no punishment*: therefore, to be made sin by God, signifies, by virtue of opposition, that God laid the punishment of sin upon him<sup>x</sup>.

*Adher.* *Sin* taken for *suffering*, signifies sometimes only such suffering, as is inflicted by occasion of any one's sin, without having the essence of proper punishment. For which reason he may also be called *sin*, who suffers only on occasion of the sin of another<sup>y</sup>.

*Ans.* The word *sin* never signifies in the Holy Scriptures such suffering. It always means a true punishment. This also hath its reason. For outward suffering cannot be called sin, as it is not the punishment of sin. This manner of speaking acknowledges sin as the meritorious cause of that suffering. When therefore a person is made, or called *sin*, it teaches that he suffers the punishment of sin.

*Adher.* This signification occurs in the word *sinner*, 1 Kings i. 21: for which here stands the word *sin*<sup>z</sup>.

*Ans.* The word *sin* is not read there, nor to be made *so of God*, concerning which words the present dispute turns. Yea, the sense of that text is, that they should be punished as real sinners. For they should be charged with high treason against King Adonijah.

<sup>x</sup> Cocc. in hunc locum.

<sup>y</sup> Crell. contra Grot. p. 72.

<sup>z</sup> Crell. *ibid.*

*Adber.* To be righteousness in Christ, is only to be treated as one truly righteous, without the merit of true righteousness; therefore to be *sin*, signifies to be treated as a sinner <sup>a</sup>.

*Ans.* This must be proved and not asserted by Crellius without proof. *The judgment of God is according to truth.* He treats none as righteous without the merit of true righteousness, otherways it cannot be called righteousness, much less, the righteousness of God. Merit is requisite to righteousness <sup>b</sup>.

*Evas.* On Gal. iii. 13. These words say only, that Christ hath redeemed us from the true curse of the law, whilst he for our sake fell into some curse of the law. Paul here seeks to be pleasant by the little word *curse* <sup>c</sup>.

*Ans.* I say with the much renowned Cocceius, the Lord rebuke thee, Satan <sup>d</sup>. For seeks Paul here to be pleasant only, then he uses no demonstration of the Spirit. We shall clearly show the absurdity of this interpretation. *1<sup>st</sup>*, He who suffers only a kind of death accursed according to the law, and so falls into some curse of the law, may not be called accursed. Not external death, but the cause of death, to wit, sin, is the cause that any one may be so called. Much less then, may *he* be called a curse. *2<sup>dly</sup>*, To be justly called a curse it is requisite that he be under the power both of sin and of the law. In such a state

<sup>a</sup> Crell. *ibid.*

<sup>b</sup> Cocc. in hunc. locum.

<sup>c</sup> Soc. de serv. p. 2. cap. 1. Crell. contra Grot. cap. 75.

<sup>d</sup> Summ. Theol. p. 646.

none can be guiltless, unless he satisfy for the sin of another, and in opposition thereto God's immaculate holiness be displayed. *3dly*, Here it is said, that he was made a curse for us. For him to be under the curse, to become a curse, can have no other sense, then to take the deserved curse upon him. *4thly*, Our redemption from the curse of the law, is inferred by Paul from thence, because Christ was made a curse for us. There is no consequence from thence to such a certain redemption, if Christ did not suffer the curse which we deserved. *5thly*, The Lord Christ could not be called a curse by Paul, but in relation to the law, and in relation to God as the law-giver. Wherefore Paul also applies to Christ, that which is written in the law, *Cursed is every one who hangeth on a tree*. How cursed, but according to the law? How Christ a curse according to the law, if he did not bear our curse for us? *6thly*, That which Paul here writes concerning Christ, is peculiar to Christ. For who durst say, that every man is made a curse for us? To suffer one kind of death, which according to the law was accursed, and so in that sense to fall into some curse of the law, as Crellius and Socinus speak, is not peculiar to Christ. This is also to be seen in the apostles and other martyrs. We conclude with Cocceius, *every curse of the law is a punishment of sin<sup>e</sup>*.

*Adher.* The curse of the law is eternal death. This was not suffered by Christ. For the death of the cross, whereof Paul speaks, was temporal death.

<sup>e</sup> Summ. Theol. pag. 646.

*Ans.* The curse of the law is eternal death to mere creatures, because they cannot bear that curse at once<sup>f</sup>. It is otherways with a sufficient surety. He can satisfy the curse, and for that reason cannot be holden of death. He therefore satisfies the demand of the law in the strictest manner.

*Adber.* Then Christ the most beloved and most innocent Son of God, was properly accursed and hated by God his Father; and that indeed at the very time, when he was singularly obedient to him, and finished that work, which was acceptable to him, and for which he also was beloved, and exalted by him<sup>g</sup>.

*Ans.* He who as a surety becomes a curse for another, is not therefore hated of the Judge. The work of suretiship suits only the most beloved and most innocent Son of the Father, and it is highly proper that he be also beloved and exalted by the Judge for the fulfilling of that suretiship.

II. The second proof from those texts, which teach that Christ suffered for sins<sup>h</sup>. *He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities*, Isa. liii. 5. *Delivered for our offences*, Rom. iv. 25. To suffer for sins, signifies always in the Holy Scriptures, to be punished for sins. See, Deut. xviii. 12. Lev. xxvi. 18, 28. 2 Kings xxiii. 26. Psal. cvii. 17. Jer. xiii. 22. This is also the meaning of that phraseology in all languages. Yea, that manner of speaking, signifies

<sup>f</sup> Cocc. Summ. Theol. cap. 61.

<sup>g</sup> Crell. contra Grot. pag. 76.

<sup>h</sup> Cocc. summ. Theol. p. 648. 649.

in all languages, that sins are the previous and meritorious cause of that suffering. Therefore the sense of these texts is, that Christ bore the punishment of our sins, and so satisfied in our stead. *He died for our sins according to the scriptures*, 1 Cor. xv. 3. *He gave himself for our sins*, 1 Pet. iii. 18. These words, *for sins*, joined to words of suffering, always teach that *that* suffering is a true punishment of those sins. See this, Isa. xxx. 12, 13. Jer. iii. 8<sup>h</sup>.

*Evaf.* To suffer for sins, is nothing else but to suffer on occasion of sins. See, 1 Kings xiv. 16. Pf. xxxix. 12<sup>i</sup>.

*Ans.* It never has this sense in holy writ, and such a sense militates against that manner of speaking in all languages. Also it has not this sense in the two texts objected. For the people were truly punished for Jeroboam's sin. God punishes idolaters, as well in their posterity, as in themselves. See this explained, 1 Kings xv. 30. Thus also David speaks, Pfal. xxxix. 12. Not of a simple chastising, (although that word likewise signifies to punish, Pfal. xciv.) but of chastising with punishments. The sense is, *Wilt thou, O God, punish man according to the demerit of his sin, then thou causest his comeliness to melt like a moth.* See the like sense, Pf. cxxx. 3. Simple chastisements are not so heavy, as these punishing chastisements, of which David here speaks. Read this, Pfal. ciii. 9.—13. 1 Cor. x. 13.

<sup>h</sup> Cocc. in hæc loca. Summ. Theol. cap. 61.

<sup>i</sup> Soc. de Serv. pag. 2. cap. 7.

*Evaf.* On Rom. iv. 25. *For sins*, signifies here a *final* cause. The sense is, to do away sins. Thus the following words, *for our justification*, signify a *final* cause<sup>k</sup>.

*Ans.* According to the peculiar interpretation of Crellius, the particle *for*, cannot be equally taken in both members. In the first member he thereby understands *to do away*. This can have no place in the second. For Christ did not rise to *annihilate* our justification, but to effectuate it. Sins are evils, and for that reason cannot be a final cause. This is always something good. To do away sins, is indeed something good, but it must be proved by strong arguments, that this is understood here. These words, *for sins*, joined to words of suffering, never have this sense in the Holy Scriptures. They always teach, a preceding, moving, meritorious cause of that suffering.

*Evaf.* David was indeed punished for his sin, but he did not therefore satisfy for his sin. See, 2 Sam. xii. 13<sup>l</sup>.

*Ans.* Was he punished, he in so far also satisfied. For to suffer punishment, is to satisfy. However, he was not properly *punished*, but *chastised*. The righteous God cannot punish Christ for the sins of others, much less to redeem the guilty, but in relation to a true satisfaction for sins. We conclude with Cocceius, *Certainly, since the death of Christ has such*

<sup>k</sup> Crell. contra Grot. pag. 10.

<sup>l</sup> Socin. de serv. part. 2. cap. 7.

a relation to our sins, that he is said, to have died for them, it can then, signify nothing else, but the guilt of sin, as the cause of dying in order to satisfy<sup>m</sup>.

*Evaf.* These words, 1 Cor. xv. 3. Gal. i. 4. 1 Pet. iii. 18. teach only a *final* cause, that is, that Christ died that we might know and receive the redemption from sins, which is tendered to us by the kindness of God. So these words signify a final cause, Rom. viii. 3. Heb. x. 26°.

*Ans.* Sins can be no end, because they are evil. Every end is good. That Crellius, in order to prove this, will have something understood here, is without foundation, and never has place when these words are joined to words of suffering. The texts, Rom. viii. 3. and Heb. x. 26. cannot serve him; because the words there, according to his opinion, are not joined to words of suffering. We judge, that they both teach, not a *final* cause, but an antecedent moving cause. For Christ was sent because of sins, and sanctified to be a sacrifice. Nay, more, Cocceius very well observes<sup>p</sup>, that no final cause can be understood here, if Christ did not die for sins; as a cause, demanding the death either of the sinner, or of the surety. For in such ways of speaking, when these words signify an end, it must be called an antecedent moving cause of the suffering adjoined; and when it can deserve that suffering, it always signifies an antecedent meritorious cause. We again con-

<sup>m</sup> Summ. Theol. pag. 649. cap. 61.

° Soc. de serv. part. 2. cap. 7. Crell. contra Grot. p. 11.

<sup>p</sup> In 1 Cor. xv. 3.

clude, with Cocceius, *Certainly, since the death of Christ is so referred to our sins, that he is said to have died (περι, υπερ) for them, it can then signify nothing else, but the guilt of sin, as the cause of dying in order to satisfy* <sup>p</sup>.

III. The Third proof from those texts, which say, that Christ died for sinners <sup>q</sup>. *When we were yet without strength, Ghrift died in his time for the ungodly. For scarcely for a righteous man will one die, yet, peradventure for a good man one will even dare to die : but God commendeth his love towards us, that Christ died for us, when we were yet sinners, Rom. v. 6, 7. 8. As they who judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead, 2 Cor. v. 15. Christ hath also suffered once for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, 1 Pet. iii. 18. We say with Cocceius, That these texts, teach an exchange, or substitution of the surety in our stead* <sup>r</sup>. This we shall show upon every passage. According to Paul's judgment, Rom. v. Christ died for us in that sense, in which it seldom happens, that one dies for a good man ; and scarcely occurs, that one dies for a righteous man. To die for their advantage, happens daily. To die in their stead, is something unprecedented, and only resembles that love of God, which Paul so highly extols ; and is also only fit, to teach the certain reconciliation of those, for whom Christ died, which reconciliation he draws from

<sup>p</sup> Sum. Theol. p. 649. cap. 61. num. 11.

<sup>q</sup> Cocc. in hæc loca.

<sup>r</sup> De fæd. par. 108. 114. 120.

thence. How could Paul conclude from thence, 2 Cor. v. 15. that they were all dead for whom Christ died, if he did not die a surety in their stead? How also, that they should live to him as their Lord? This is to be seen, 1 Pet. iii. 18. How the just for the unjust, but that he, not having deserved this, came into that state, which we had deserved? This is something else, than to die merely for one's advantage.

*Evaf.* To die *for us*, is as much, as to die on our account. Compare, Rom. xiv. 15. 1 Cor. viii. 11<sup>f</sup>.

*Ans.* He who dies on one's account, may also die in his stead; and then he dies first in the full sense on his account, when he dies in his stead.

*Evaf.* That *to die for us*, is not to die in our place, you may learn from those texts, which say, that Christ suffered for sins. He could not die in the stead of sins<sup>t</sup>.

*Ans.* They may teach you, that they do not signify to die for our good. For he could not suffer for the good of sins. Here we must make a distinction between faults and persons, between suffering for faults, and for persons. This is gravely explained to us, 1 Pet. iii. 18. Where it is both said of Christ, that he suffered *for sins*, and *for the unjust*: for the unjust, to bring them to God: which is not applicable to sins.

*Evaf.* Christ suffering for us, hath therein given us an example to follow him. 1 Pet. ii. 21. Had he suf-

<sup>f</sup> Volk. lib. 5. cap. 22.

<sup>t</sup> Soc. de serv. part. 2. cap. 8.

ferred in our stead he could therein have left us no example<sup>w</sup>.

*Ans.* Why not? Or could we therein have had no example of imitation, when necessity demanded it, and we could thereby promote the glory of God, and deliver our neighbours? However Peter means no more, but that Christ, in his patience, displayed in his suffering for us, hath left an example to us. By suffering patiently in one's place, a man may be an example of patience to another, without obliging him thereby to an equal state or kind of suffering.

*Evaf.* Paul also suffered for the Colossians, Col. i. 24. but not in their stead<sup>x</sup>.

*Ans.* Christ suffered for us in another sense, 1 Cor. i. 13. We stand not upon the simple words, *to suffer, or to die for one*; but prove from the circumstances of these texts, that they teach, that Christ suffered in our stead.

*Evaf.* On Rom. v. Paul teaches that Christ so died for us sinners, as he could die for the righteous. He could not die instead of the righteous<sup>y</sup>.

*Ans.* This is a gross falsehood. For then he himself did not die to put away our sins. For this cannot be said of the righteous. Here God's love is only extolled, from a comparison of things, which either occur, or do not occur in human actions.

*Evaf.* Upon 2 Cor. v. 15. Is your interpretation

<sup>w</sup> Socin. præl. cap. 20. Crell. contra Grot. pag. 464.

<sup>x</sup> Soc. de serv. p. 2. cap. 8.

<sup>y</sup> Socin. præl. cap. 20.

good, then all men are actually delivered, immediately upon the death of Christ <sup>z</sup>.

*Ans.* The death of the surety gives right and not always immediate efficacy; although all these for whom he died, are actually delivered from the curse of the law.

*Adber.* Paul means to say this, Because Christ died for us, therefore we must, for his sake, also die unto sin. See the like manner of speaking, Rom. vi. 6. vii. 4. xi. 26 <sup>a</sup>.

*Ans.* It is against all reason, against all custom, against the stile of holy writ, to represent a duty as done, when it is not done, and according to the judgment of our antagonists, will always be neglected by the most. The language of the apostle, used in the matter of suffering, always teaches a *substitution* of the surety, instead of the guilty.

*Adber.* It is likewise written there, *That he was raised for us.* Is that also to say, in our stead <sup>b</sup>?

*Ans.* This is not written there. The words *for them*, are joined only to the word *died*. But granting it were so, the difference of the subjects would lay us under a necessity, to explain it differently. Also this does not serve the purpose. For we go not upon the simple words, *to die for us*, but upon the reasoning of the apostle, concluding from thence, *That we were all dead.*

<sup>z</sup> Crell. contra Grot. p. 462.

<sup>a</sup> Crell. ibid.

<sup>b</sup> Socin. præl. cap. 20.

*Evaf.* John writes, that we are also bound, *to lay down our lives for the brethren*, 1 John iii. 16. Nevertheless we do not satisfy for them <sup>b</sup>.

*Ans.* This is not strange. We do not die for the brethren, in the same manner, as Christ did, 1 Cor. i. 13. He died of his own accord for us, with the approbation of the Judge, suffering in our stead. This teaches, that he satisfied for our sins, in our stead. As he also would satisfy for the brethren, who should die in such a manner for them.

IV. The Fourth proof from those texts, which say, that Christ gave himself, or his soul to be a ransom for us <sup>c</sup>. *He came to give his soul a ransom for many*, Mat. xx. 28. Mar. x. 45. *He gave himself a ransom for all*, 1 Tim. ii. 5. 6. This language cannot be allowed, when a man does not satisfy for the debt of another. The original words, are also too emphatical. They teach, that this ransom was given instead of the guilty, as appears from the words *anti polloon* and *antilutron*.

*Evaf.* If this be the sense, then Christ had remained a prisoner in our place, because we deserved the prison of eternal death <sup>d</sup>.

*Ans.* This stands upon that false foundation, which is refuted above, to wit, that the surety behaved to suffer for ever. Eternal death relates to sinners only. The surety conquered that death.

<sup>b</sup> Soc. de ferv. p. 2. cap. 8.

<sup>c</sup> Cocc. de fæd. par. 105.

<sup>d</sup> Soc. de ferv. p. 2. cap. 8. Crell. contra Grot. p. 454.

*Adher.* Then we are delivered immediately after Christ's death. While nevertheless many perish, for whom he died <sup>e</sup>.

*Ans.* We are actually delivered from the curse, and of those who are delivered, none shall perish.

*Adher.* Christ did not say, that his person, but that his soul was given to be a ransom for many. Here, therefore, there is no exchange between person and person, but between price and person. A price, as gold and silver, does not come instead of the prisoner.

*Ans.* To give his soul, is the same with giving himself to be a ransom. See, 1 Tim. ii. 5. Tit. ii. 14. Here, therefore, there is an exchange between person and person.

*Evaf.* The word *ransom*, is here taken improperly, as in, Prov. xiii. 8. xxi. 18 <sup>f</sup>.

*Ans.* The proper sense of the word, and its ordinary use is for us. In such ways of speaking, as this, it cannot be taken improperly. Also in the texts objected, the word *antilutron*, is not found, and there also a true ransom is taught, or at least an exchange of one instead of another. For the riches of the rich ransom him from many dangers, and for that reason, restrain those men, who otherwise are inclined to trouble him. So also the wicked oft come instead of the righteous, and he remaineth free. We conclude, therefore, with Cocceius, *The ransom blots out the*

<sup>e</sup> Idem p. 451.

<sup>f</sup> Soc. de serv. p. 2. cap. 2. Crell. contra Grot. p. 422.

guilt : and if it do not satisfy for the guilt, it is not accepted<sup>h</sup>. See this very clearly, Pſal. xlix. 8, 9, 10.

V. The Fifth proof from thoſe texts, which ſay, that Chriſt carried our ſorrows<sup>i</sup>. Surely, he hath taken our ſickneſſes upon him, and carried our ſorrows, Iſa. liii. 4. He bare the ſin of many, verſe 12. Who himſelf bare our ſins in his own body on the tree, 1 Pet. ii. 24. The words, to bear ſins, joined to words of ſuffering, and ſpoken of a ſuffering perſon, always ſignify in holy writ, to ſuffer the puniſhment of ſin. See, Exod. xxviii. 43. Lev. v. 1. 18. xx. 17. 20. xxiv. 15. It hath its reaſon, becauſe the word ſin, there can only ſignify the puniſhment of ſin, as, 2 Kings vii. 9. He who ſpontaneouſly, with the pleaſure of the Judge, ſuffereth the puniſhment of the guilty, ſatisfies for their ſins. Therefore we ſay, That he carried our ſorrows. We finners ſay this of that innocent one, who by his ſuffering delivered us from our ſorrows. Thoſe words therefore ſignify, that he ſuffered, that which we deſerved.

*Evaf.* To bear, ſignifies ſometimes ſimply to take away ; and to bear ſin, to take away ſins, as Exod. xxxiv. 7. Num. xiv. 18. Where it is interpreted by forgivenefs<sup>k</sup>.

*Anſ.* To bear ſins, when ſpoken of a perſon ſuffering, ſignifies always to bear the puniſhment of ſin. In the texts cited, it is not a ſuffering perſon, but the

<sup>h</sup> De fæd. par. 105.

<sup>i</sup> Cocc. in hæc loca.

<sup>k</sup> Soc. de ſerv. p. 2. cap. 4.

Lord who is spoken of. Although by the Lord, men very fitly understand the angel of the covenant. For in Exod. xxxiv. *He* is distinguished from the Father, and in Num. xiv. *He* is spoken of who was tempted in the wilderness, 1 Cor. x. 9. Thus in these texts there might be an allusion to the approaching satisfactory sufferings of Christ.

*Adber.* The word is thus explained, Mat. viii. 16. 17. For Christ did not suffer those sicknesses, but healed them, and took them away<sup>1</sup>.

*Ans.* Is the meaning of this prophecy exhausted by *that healing?* that be far. Isaiah writes, surely, he hath taken our sicknesses upon him. Men do not speak thus of one, who only healed sicknesses. Much less, will they say of such a one, that he was *a man of sorrows*, and that *he carried our sorrows*. It is true, he suffered not those very sicknesses, which he healed. But he suffered the curse, in which all those evils were comprehended. He suffered all things in their *cause*, that is, in the *curse*.

*Adber.* That Christ hath born our sins, is related by Isaiah as happening after his death, chap. liii. 12. At that time he did not bear our punishment<sup>m</sup>.

*Ans.* This is false. He there asserts, *the travail of his soul*, whereupon it follows as a reward, *that he should have a portion of many*.

*Evas.* He is very beautifully said to bear sin, who suffers death, or any other evil, because of sin, al-

<sup>1</sup> Ibid.

<sup>m</sup> Crell. contra Grot. p. 56.

though there were no true punishment therein. See, Num. xiv. 33. Lam. v. 7<sup>o</sup>.

*Ans.* This is against the stile of God's word, and against the circumstances of the texts, which are adduced by us for a proof. It is also against the two texts objected. God punishes the sins of the fathers upon the children, Num. xiv. This they also mean to say, Lam. v. For they confess, first the sin, *our fathers have sinned, and are no more.* Hereupon they add these words, *and we have borne their iniquities.* To confess sins, and to say of them, that they were borne by suffering, signifies always a true punishment. Otherways they would not justify God in his judgments. Which however was their intention, as appears, verse 16. This must be apprehended in the following manner. God has threatened to visit the iniquity of the fathers upon the children: which is a true punishment, if not of the children, at least of the fathers in the children. He who suffers what is threatened, suffers a true punishment.

*Evaf.* The goat in Lev. xvi. Is said to bear the sins of the congregation. Not that he bore the punishment of sin, but because the Lord thereby signified, that the sins of the people should be so taken away, as if the goat had carried them away<sup>p</sup>.

*Ans.* It is not said of the goat, that he bore sin, but that he should *bear it unto a land not inhabited.* Lev. xvi. 22. This manner of speaking, differs much,

<sup>o</sup> Idem pag. 45.

<sup>p</sup> Soc. de Serv. p. 2. cap. 4.

from *simply bearing sin*. Also does Socinus mean, that this goat did not suffer? We urge this manner of speaking, when used concerning suffering persons. Why did not the goat bear sin? Did not Aaron behave to lay his hands upon *his* head, and thereupon to confess all the sins of the people, Lev. xvi. 21? Thus he laid sin upon the goat. You will say, he did not suffer. Why not? Did he not suffer in his fellow-goat, which as his co-partner, made up with him the sin-offering? See Lev. xvi. 5. Say not the Jews, that *that* goat came to a miserable death? Was he not driven into a separated land, instead of sinners, who had deserved to be exterminated from among the people? Thus he was exterminated from the land, and suffered according to the fleshly state.

*Evaf.* Upon 1 Pet. ii. 25. The original word, translated *bearing*, must be interpreted by *taking away*, as Heb. ix. 28<sup>q</sup>.

*Ans.* I cannot see, that in Heb. ix. 28. a simple taking away of sin is understood. The sense is, that Christ, suffering once, was offered to bear sin; or by suffering to bear it away. The words by no means teach the end of Christ's sacrifice, separate in the whole from the sacrifice itself, as Crellius thinks. They declare, that Christ, in suffering, offered up himself, in order to bear the punishment of sin in that offering, and so to take away sin. For what is more certain, than that he, who after his death shall be seen without sin, being said to bear sins, is under-

<sup>q</sup> Socin. de ferv. p. 2. cap. 6.

stood to bear the curse or punishment of sin? Certainly, it cannot be understood here, of a simple taking away. For *to bear sin, and to be seen without sin*, are here opposed to one another<sup>r</sup>. If this should only signify to take away sins, or the punishment of sins, then he should be most manifested as taking them away, when he shall be seen without sin. This would likewise wholly overthrow the opposition which the apostle institutes here. Also the text in Peter can by no means admit of this interpretation. Peter speaks of bearing sins *in the body*. Observe, not *by*, but *in* the body. In the original text stands *en* or *in*. It cannot denote an instrument here. For that manner of speaking, of bearing any thing in his body, always expresses the suffering subject. This is also taught by the addition, *upon the tree*. Or as it stands in the original text, *above upon the tree*. These words can make no good sense, when this is interpreted of a simple taking away. What sense would this be? *He hath taken away our sins in his body upon the tree*. Peter also speaks of that which happened on the cross. The taking away of sins was not finished at that time. It still happens every day. He also teaches, that this bearing took place in *suffering*, and that in the body upon the tree. It therefore has a reference, not to a simple taking away, but to the bearing, or suffering of the punishment of sin.

*Adher.* Then Peter could not infer from thence,

<sup>r</sup> Cocc in Heb. ix. 28.

that we must forsake sin, for this does not follow from such a sense. If one pay another's debts, it does not follow from thence, that he who paid them, intends that no new debts should be contracted †.

*Ans.* Is not this consequence good? Christ bearing the punishment of our sins, delivered us thereby from the bondage of sin, as the punishment of sin, John viii. 34, 35. 1 Pet. i. 18, 19. So then we are bound, to die more and more to sin. Must he not be thankful, whose punishment is suffered by a surety? Must not that thankfulness agree with the nature of the benefit? He demands therefore, that we do not provoke him, but obey his will; that is, die to sin, and live to righteousness. Christ bore our punishment for that end, Luke i. 74, 75. The end, which such a deliverer aims at, is urged with great reason. And with good foundation it is concluded from thence, *that we must die to sins.* Who also will be willing to pay for another, on account of his inability, and to free him from his debts, without intending at the same time, that the party freed do not again burden him with new debts? This bearing of punishment certainly includes in it the taking away of punishment. Make this simple taking away a good consequence, then also our interpretation, because we comprehend this taking away in it. It is so much the stronger, because we shew at the same time, how dear this taking away costs Christ, he having first been under a necessity to bear the punishment of our sins. We again

† Socin. de Serv. part. 2. cap. 6.

conclude with the words of Cocceius<sup>c</sup>, *To bear sin is to suffer the curse of the law. Here Christ is represented to us, not as only excluding new sins by his sufferings, but properly bearing the old; and as charged with those sins, which we had committed, and thus the truth of Christ's satisfaction is taught here.*

VI. The Sixth proof from those texts, which say, *That Christ hath redeemed us with a ransom*<sup>u</sup>. *Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, Titus ii. 14. Knowing that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, such as silver or gold, from your vain conversation, which was transmitted to you from the fathers; but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot, 1 Pet. i. 18, 19. To give up himself, to redeem one, is the fittest manner of speaking, to intimate, that one is redeemed by a true satisfaction. Also Christ's blood could not be opposed to silver and gold, which are a price of redemption, much less be extolled as vastly more precious, if that blood were not a true ransom in our redemption. These words always signify a proper payment, when the thing, which is the ransom, is denominated by them. To these places may be added, Eph. i. 7. Col. i. 14.*

*Evaf.* Upon Tit. ii. 14. This manner of speaking is indeed very fit to hold that forth. Nevertheless, it is not always signified thereby, but when there is one

<sup>c</sup> In Heb. ix. 28. and 1 Pet. ii. 24.

<sup>u</sup> Cocc. de fæd. par. 105. & in Tit. ii. 14. & 1 Pet. i. 18, 19.

who receives that price, and one who is given. Here there is none to whom the price is brought <sup>w</sup>.

*Ans.* It is therefore very base to enervate such words. Were there not one here, to whom the ransom of redemption was given, then that manner of speaking might not be used. To God as the Judge, this ransom is paid. The Judge receives here, as far as in the matter of suffering, a reception can have place. It consists in this, that with his pleasure, in order to satisfy the law, the surety suffer instead of the guilty, and he esteems and accepts of that suffering as a fulfilling of the righteousness of the law. Therefore we read, that Christ offered up himself to God, Eph. v. 2. Heb. v. 1. x. 5, &c. It shall be shown afterwards, that Christ's sacrifice was satisfactory. Let him who would be fully informed of this, read, Psal. xlix. 7, 8, 9, 10. There it is taught, that this ransom was given to God.

*Adher.* God had not imprisoned us, and we are not redeemed from him, but from sin, Tit. ii. 14. 1 Pet. i. 18, 19. and from the curse, Gal. iii. 13, &c.

*Ans.* God as a Judge, kept us prisoners, and had shut us up under sin, and the curse, Rom. ii. 32. A ransom to redeem such, must be given to the Lawgiver and Judge only <sup>x</sup>.

*Adher.* God himself procured the redemption, Luke i. 68 <sup>y</sup>.

<sup>w</sup> Crell. contra Grot. p. 426.

<sup>x</sup> Cocc. in 1 Pet. i. 18, 19.

<sup>y</sup> Crell. contra Grot. p. 411.

*Ans.* A fovereign may, as a lord, appoint a ranfom for his debtor, which fhall be given to him as a Judge. The rectoral office by no means binds his hands. The Lord, to whom it was offered, provided a ram for a burnt-offering inftead of Ifaac, Gen. xxii. The fame takes place here. For this ranfom was fo precious, that it could be provided by the fupreme Judge only.

*Evas.* Upon 1 Pet. i. 18, 19. Eph. i. 7. Col. i. 14. Redemption is through Chrift's blood, becaufe it intervenes. If one fay, that he had purchafed the liberty of his native country, not with gold or filver, but with his blood, which is much more precious; becaufe in fighting for his country, he had fhed his blood, would he therefore intend, that his blood was as certainly, yea, more properly a price, than gold or filver<sup>z</sup>?

*Ans.* This redemption is afcribed to the blood of Chrift as peculiar to it: which cannot confift with the interpretation of our adverfaries. For it muft then alfo be attributed to his conception, birth, life, doctrine, miracles, refurrection, afcenfion, yea, to every thing that intervenes: contrary to the uniform ftile of holy writ, which attributes this to the blood of Chrift. Where is it read, that when one is faid, by his blood to redeem thofe, who had deferved death, and that not accidentally, but becaufe he fpontaneously, and according to the pleafure of the Judge, fheds his blood for fuch, that then that blood would be no true price, but only fomething intervening? Therefore the in-

<sup>z</sup> Crell. contra Grot. p. 11.

stance objected is not to the purpose. *1st*, Because *that* shedding of blood happens accidentally. *2dly*, The native country is not under the guilt of death. *3dly*, Here there is no approbation and consent of the Judge.

*Adber.* When one thing is compared to another, that does not immediately prove, that it hath properly the same power as the thing with which it is compared. The *word of God*, is compared to a *sharp sword*, and a merchandise is ascribed to wisdom, *better than that of gold or silver*, Heb. iv. 11, 12. Prov. iii. 14, 15. Nevertheless, there the one is properly meant, the other improperly <sup>a</sup>.

*Anf.* We argue not from the simple comparison, but from the whole of the phrase, which always expresses the paying of a true ransom. Also those comparisons teach, that *that* which is external in the one case, is spiritual in the other. Here therefore, there must be a spiritual redemption by a true ransom, as gold or silver are a true ransom in an external redemption. We again conclude with Cocceius <sup>b</sup>, *Peter teaches a true ransom, saying, but by the precious blood of Christ. And speaking thus, he takes it for certain, that it was necessary, we should be redeemed by such a ransom.*

VII. The Seventh proof from those texts which say, that Christ purchased sinners with a price <sup>c</sup>. *He purchased the church with his own blood*, Acts xx. 28. *For ye are dearly bought*, 1 Cor. vi. 20. *Ye are dearly bought*,

<sup>a</sup> Ibid.

<sup>b</sup> In 1 Pet. i. 18, 19.

<sup>c</sup> Cocc. in fæd. par. 105.

1 Cor. vii. 23. or as it reads in the Greek, *bought with a dear price.* He who buys a guilty person with a costly price, that price being a spontaneous shedding of his blood, satisfies thereby for the guilty. This is likewise the difference between a proper buying and an improper, that in the first there is a true price, and the last is without price. See this, Isa. lv. 1, 2. Where therefore the buying is made by a costly price, there is a true payment, or satisfaction.

*Evaf.* Here the price can be given to none. Therefore it is to be understood improperly <sup>d</sup>.

*Anf.* This is all answered in a preceding proof. Whoever read, that one is bought with a price, if that price is not given to any? Here he receives a price, who lays the sinner under the curse, and who forgives sin, that is the Judge.

*Adber.* We are bought to be servants unto God, 1 Cor. vi. 20. vii. 23. 2 Pet. ii. 1. Jude 4. Rev. v. 9. xiv. 6. Men give no price to him, for whom the thing is bought, and whose property it becomes <sup>e</sup>.

*Anf.* No price can be given to the supreme Judge, but the person bought must always become his property thereby, in order to serve him. The creature cannot cease to be his subject, and without that, the person bought can neither be, nor continue, happy and free from punishment.

*Evaf.* We are said to be bought with a dear price,

<sup>d</sup> Socin. de Serv. p. 2. cap. 2.

<sup>e</sup> Crell. contra Grot. p. 412.

but improperly, because here something intervenes, to wit, the blood of Christ <sup>f</sup>.

*Ans.* It is a desperate cause, when men must always violate words, to defend their opinion. To buy a thing with a price, is never taken improperly, and the difference between a proper and an improper buying, is the price. This is plainly named here. Also without this buying, Paul could not conclude that we *belonged to another*. This is only the effect of a true and a proper buying.

VIII. The Eighth proof from those texts, which say that Christ hath reconciled sinners unto God by his suffering <sup>g</sup>.

*For if we being enemies were reconciled unto God by the death of his Son, much more shall we when reconciled, be saved by his life, Rom. v. 10. and that he might reconcile them both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity on the same, Eph. ii. 16. And that he having made peace by him, through the blood of his cross, by him, (I say) might reconcile all things to himself, be they things which are in earth, or things which are in the heavens, and you who formerly were alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, hath he now also reconciled, Col. i. 20, 21. See also, Rom. iii. 25, 2 Cor. v. 18, 19. Our antagonists must confess, that these four things are taught in these texts. 1<sup>st</sup>, That Christ hath reconciled guilty sinners. 2<sup>dly</sup>, With the will and consent of God, against whom they had*

<sup>f</sup> Crell. contra Grot. p. 430.

<sup>g</sup> Cocc. in hos textus. & summ. Theol. cap. 61. num. 20.

finned. 3dly, By his suffering. 4thly, And that spontaneously taken upon himself. So that it is unnecessary to answer their particular evasions. For from thence the truth of Christ's satisfaction clearly appears. For he certainly satisfies, who by a spontaneous suffering of death, reconciles a capital offender to the Judge, against whom he hath finned.

*Evaf.* It is not taught there, that *God is reconciled to us*, but *we to God*. This lets us know, that God was not against us, but we against him, and that for this reason he was not to be reconciled, but we alone behoved to lay aside our enmity<sup>d</sup>.

*Ans.* It turns out to one, whether I say, God is reconciled to us, or we to him. For he is also reconciled to such, as are reconciled to him. This likewise has place in the common manner of speaking. Thus it is said, that the wife should be reconciled to her husband, whom she had injured, 1 Cor. vii. 11. There are also important reasons, why the Spirit of God writes, not that, he is reconciled to us, but we to him. 1st, It is most convenient, that the offender be said to be reconciled to the offended, because he hath need of reconciliation with him, whom he hath injured. 2dly, The reconciliation imports no change in God, as it does in men. He is without change, wherefore the reconciliation only causeth his will, which was from all eternity, to be accomplished in a good and holy manner. He is most fitly said to be recon-

<sup>d</sup> Socin. de Serv. p. 2. cap. 8.

ciled, in whom the change takes place. 3dly, God hath shown himself reconcilable, in providing the atonement, appointing the surety, esteeming and admitting of his satisfaction. In such cases it is fittest to say, that the guilty is reconciled to the Judge. The which therefore also implies, that the Judge is reconciled to him.

*Evaf.* Christ is said to have reconciled us to God, because he taught us the way how we should turn to God, and so become his friends, that is, be reconciled to him; and because he confirmed this doctrine by his death<sup>e</sup>.

*Ans.* Then in the work of reconciliation, Christ should not be a whit superior to the apostles, who also taught this way, and sealed it with their blood. Nevertheless, Paul attributes the reconciliation to him only, in opposition to them, 2 Cor. v. 18, 19, 20. Then the reconciliation behoved not to be attributed to the blood and death of Christ. His miracles also confirmed it; yea, his resurrection confirmed it more strongly than his death. Paul, however, writes, that his death reconciled us, in opposition to his resurrection. We say therefore, that this interpretation militates against the sense of the word *reconcile*, against uniform custom, and against the nature of the thing. For he who only points out a way, does not walk in it. He who only shews the way whereby reconciliation may be effected, does not reconcile. It is never

<sup>e</sup> Catech. Racov. cap. 8. q. 32.

said, that we are reconciled by any thing that is in us. But according to this interpretation, the most and the principal part of the reconciliation behoves to be ascribed to us. For then we should be the nearest causes of actual reconciliation. The apostle removes every doubt, Rom. v. 10, 11. Col. i. 21. He writes, that we being *sinners* and *enemies*, were reconciled to God by the blood of Christ. *Observe*, it is not, *having been*, as Crellius wrests these words, but *being*. To reconcile such in that state by his blood, must take place by a satisfaction, as Cocceius writes in his sum of Theology, p. 657. num. 20. chap. 61.

*Evaf.* A reconciliation by satisfaction diminishes the love of God, which is so highly extolled, Rom. v.

*Ans.* It magnifies that love. It must come from the highest love, and be performed by its most excellent operations.

*Evaf.* God is said to reconcile us by Christ. How can this reconciliation consist in a satisfaction to his justice for our sins?

*Ans.* It is *by Christ*, being by his blood and suffering, Rom. v. 10, 11. Col. i. 20, 21. The supreme Judge cannot be satisfied, but by a surety, who is appointed by himself, and so must in that case be said, to reconcile us by that surety.

*Adher.* The reconciliation is placed *in not imputing sins*, 2 Cor. v. 18. This cannot consist with the satisfaction.

*Ans.* The contrary is true. Where the surety satisfies, there guilt may not be imputed to the guilty.

We conclude and assert with Cocceius, *That the reconciliation is a sanctifying of God, and a satisfaction* <sup>f</sup>.

IX. The Ninth proof from those texts, which say, that Christ suffered the punishment of our sins <sup>g</sup>. *The punishment which bringeth peace unto us, was upon him, and by his stripes we are healed, Isa. 53. 5. By one righteousness* (a full compensation for the injury of sin, stands in the original text, as is observed upon the sense of the word) *grace comes upon all men to justification of life, Rom. v. 18.* Thus it is plainly taught, that Christ in our stead satisfied for sins. For he satisfies in that manner, who bears the punishment, which brings true peace to the guilty.

*Evaf.* The Hebrew word *Mufar*, which is read in Isaiah, and here interpreted *punishment*, signifies mere *suffering only*. So that the sense is, Christ suffered those oppressions, which brought peace to us, that is, happiness and rest <sup>h</sup>.

*Ans.* *Mufar* signifies *punishment*, and not mere oppression. In the preceding and following text, sin is represented, as the cause of this *Mufar*. In which manner of speaking, it always signifies *punishment*, yea, can signify nothing else. This *Mufar* produces certain peace, and so frees us from punishment. This is the proper fruit of true punishment, suffered by the surety.

*Adher.* The word *peace*, placed in opposition to

<sup>f</sup> In Rom. v. 9.

<sup>g</sup> Cocc. de fæd. par. 93, & 105. Summ. Theol. p. 648, & 652.

<sup>h</sup> Socin. de Serv. p. 2. cap. 5.

this, compels us to interpret *Mufar* by *chastisement*, and not by *punishment*. For there is no real opposition between peace and punishment, but truly so between peace and oppression, because the word *peace* here, signifies no reconciliation, but only rest and happiness. For no mention is here made of an enemy<sup>i</sup>.

*Ans.* It cannot signify *chastisement* here, because that can have no place in an innocent person, as there is nothing in him to be corrected. By this *Mufar* is also understood the death of Christ. In the suffering of death there is no chastisement for an innocent person, but a true punishment. The reason adduced by Socinus is of no strength. Here peace with God is spoken of. How can a sinner have peace with him without a propitiation? The enmity is taught clearly enough, as sins are mentioned, verses 4, 5, 10, 12. and so there is the strongest opposition between this peace and this *Mufar*. For without this true punishment, there is neither peace, nor rest, nor happiness for the sinner.

*Evaf.* Upon Rom. v. 18. Perhaps the Greek word never signifies an ample compensation for an injury done<sup>k</sup>.

*Ans.* It must have that sense here. For it is set in opposition to the offence (*paraptooma*) as a reparation of that which the offence destroyed. It is also set in opposition to that *dikaiooma*, or *right of God*, which is

<sup>i</sup> Ibid.

<sup>k</sup> Socin. de serv. p. 4. cap. 6.

spoken of Rom. i. 32. It makes atonement for the deserved punishment, and signifies a meritorious right in opposition to that right. Otherways also Paul could not from thence infer the justification of sinners. For to justify the guilty, is no act of *pardon*, or of mercy, but a judicial act of a righteous Judge.

*Adher.* This *dikaiooma*, is interpreted, verse 19. by obedience in opposition to Adam's disobedience. Therefore it is no reparation of an injury<sup>1</sup>.

*Ans.* Yea, it is therefore a reparation of an injury. For in it obedience must have place, Philip. ii. 6. &c. and it is opposed to Adam's obedience, as a reparation of that injury, which was thereby done to God.

*Adher.* Then the apostle should have opposed it, not to the offence (*paraptooma*) but to the injury (*adikema*).

*Ans.* It is just the same. For every offence is an injury to God, and every injury to God is an offence. In sin he alone is injured.

*Adher.* Then the comparison with Adam, which the apostle institutes here, cannot stand<sup>m</sup>.

*Ans.* It stands most firmly, and we are taught how this evil is redressed.

X. The Tenth proof from the covenant between the Father and the Son°. Of this we read, Isa. liii. 10, 11. *When his soul shall have made itself an offering for sin, (a satisfaction, or price of satis-*

<sup>1</sup> Ibid.

<sup>m</sup> Ibid.

<sup>o</sup> Cocc. de fæd. par. 88. 93.

faction is the sense of the Hebrew word) *he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand. For the travail of his soul he shall see it, and be satisfied.* This covenant is also taught, John x. 14, 15. &c. *I lay down my life for the sheep. I have yet other sheep, which are not of this fold, these I must also bring in, and they shall hear my voice, and there shall be one flock and one shepherd. Therefore the Father loveth me, because I lay down my life, that I may take it again. No man taketh it from me. But I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father.* This covenant is repeated, Heb. x. 5. *Therefore coming into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldst not, but a body hast thou prepared me.* (That is, according to David's explication, Psal. xl. Thou hast bound me as a voluntary servant, to thy service, under the bond of the reward of my suffering for sinners,) *burnt offerings and offerings for sin, have not pleased thee. Then said I, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God.* What will? This is explained, verses 10, 14. of the voluntary offering of himself, which sanctifieth, which perfecteth, the sinner, and brings in certain forgiveness, verses 17, 18. In this covenant, the Father agrees to this satisfaction, the Son promises to give it. That which is demanded and promised, is performed; therefore Christ in our stead, satisfied for sin.

*Evaf.* Upon Isa. liii. 10. Christ gave his soul to be

an offering for sin, because he suffered on occasion of guilt, and to destroy it.

*Ans.* This is not enough. The word *ascham*, when it does not signify the *fault*, the cause of *guilt*, or the obligation to punishment, then it signifies a satisfaction for the guilt <sup>p</sup>. Here, therefore, it signifies a satisfaction for sin, because it admits of no other signification. For Christ did not make his soul to be sin, nor in order to make the world guilty. Joh. iii. 17. The word *sin*, not only demands this interpretation, but also that which is added there, as *to see his seed, for the travail of his soul, and to justify many*. Such certain fruits arise only from a true satisfaction.

*Evaf.* Upon John x. 10, 11, &c. A good shepherd does not die *instead of the sheep*, but only, if necessity urge, *to save them* <sup>q</sup>.

*Ans.* Every similitude is not equality. It is not seen, that a shepherd allows himself willingly to die, as well as Christ, or that he saves his sheep by being slain, as indeed Christ redeemed his sheep in that manner. There are no beasts here, but rational creatures, who by their sins deserved death. Christ did not die for them accidentally, as country shepherds do, but he willingly laid down his life for them. He pledged his life for them, which proves, that he satisfied for them. For they were sinful sheep, who had deserved death, and hereby he preserved them in life, verses

<sup>p</sup> Cocc. summ. Theol. cap. 61. num. 4.

<sup>q</sup> Soc. de serv. p. 2. cap. 8.

16, 26, 27, 28. This is only the virtue of a satisfactory engaging.

*Evaf.* Upon Heb. x. 5, &c. By the word world, is not understood this world, but heaven<sup>r</sup>.

*Ans.* The word *world*, placed simply, never signifies *heaven*. No, not in Rom. iv. 13. which text Volkelius adduceth here. There the Gentiles are understood, who are Abraham's *inheritance*. Much less, *is coming into the world*, ever taken for entering into heaven. When spoken of Christ, it never has that sense. See John iii. 19. xii. 46. xviii. 37. 1 Tim. i. 15. Yea, it is opposed to heaven, John xvi. 28. It militates also against all the several circumstances of the text. Coming into this world, he did the will of the Father. *I come*, said he, *to do thy will*. This is not applicable to heaven, but to his coming to this earth, and here *that world* is spoken of, into which Christ coming, his ears were bored, Pf. xl. 7. This signifies a bond and a servile state, as may be seen, Ex. xxi. 6. which does not agree to Christ's state in heaven.

*Adher.* Paul speaks of that world, into which Christ coming, he immediately offered up himself. This did not take place upon earth.

*Ans.* Paul does not write, that he offered himself immediately. He only tells, that in coming, he was prepared for that purpose. This agrees to the earth. See John vi. 38, 39. and xviii. 37.

*Adher.* The Greek word rendered *prepared*, signi-

<sup>r</sup> Volk. p. 465.

fies to make a thing perfect in all its parts. This does not agree to Christ's body here upon earth.

*Ans.* Yea, even this is applicable to his body, here on earth. It was perfect in all its parts in its first formation. David calls this the boring of Christ's ears, Pſal. xl. 7. This fervile ſtate of Chriſt had place only on this earth.

XI. The Eleventh proof from thoſe texts, which teach that Chriſt became a ſurety for ſinners<sup>†</sup>. *His glorious one ſhall be of him, and his Lord ſhall proceed from the miſt of him. I will cauſe him to draw near, and he ſhall approach unto me. For who is he, who ſhould become a ſurety with his heart, to draw near unto me, ſaith the Lord?* Jer. xxx. 21. The word in the original text here, is very properly tranſlated *to become a ſurety*. See Gen. xliii. 9. xliv. 32. Prov. xi. 15. xx. 16. xxvii. 13. When the ſame (*puniſhment*) was required, then he was afflicted, Iſa. liii. 6. How could puniſhment be required, if he had not bound himſelf to it by ſuretſhip? *Being made under the law, that he might redeem them who were under the law*, Gal. iv. 4, 5. *Of ſo much a better covenant is Jeſus become a ſurety*, Heb. vii. 20. He therefore ſtepped into our place, and as a ſurety ſatiſfied for us.

*Evaf.* Upon Iſa. liii. 6. The Hebrew word *Niggas*, may be fitly tranſlated oppreſſed or ſtraitened, and not properly required<sup>‡</sup>.

<sup>†</sup> Cocc. in hos textus. De fæd. par. 88, 93, 154.

<sup>‡</sup> Crell. contra Grot. p. 63.

*Ans.* The proper signification of the word is to exact. See, Deut. xv. 2. 2 Kings xxiii. 35. Isa. lviii. 3. Zech. ix. 8. From which there is here no reason to recede. It cannot be translated afflicted, for then it would run, when he was afflicted, he was afflicted: which is ridiculous. Every thing flows very sweetly in the following manner, *The Lord hath made all our iniquity to run upon him, when this (the iniquity or punishment) was exacted (of him as the surety) he was afflicted.*

*Evaf.* Upon Gal. iv. 4. To be under the law, does not signify, to place himself under the debt of the law, being free from it before. It only speaks duty or perseverance in holiness, and that he was subject to the law, as every rational creature is <sup>w</sup>.

*Ans.* *To be under the law*, is not simply here, to be obliged to be holy <sup>x</sup>. For then were Christ even now, with all the angels and the inhabitants of heaven, still under the law. In Paul's epistles these words always signify, to be under the debt of the law, or under a law enforcing the payment of debt, Rom. iii. 19. vi. 14. How also could Paul otherways conclude from thence, the redemption of those persons who were under the law? We are not redeemed, to be henceforth unholy, or not to obey the law. We are delivered from the the debt and curie of the law, because Jesus as a surety satisfied it for us.

*Evaf.* Upon Heb. vii. 22. It is not said here, that

<sup>w</sup> Soc. de serv. p. 2. cap. 24.

<sup>x</sup> Cocc. summ. theol. cap. 59. num. 5. p. 620.

he became a surety for us to God. He is called a surety of a better covenant, because he not only published the new covenant (of which he is the interpreter and messenger by divine appointment) but also fully confirmed it by his blood. He is therefore a surety, not on our behalf to God, but on God's behalf to us <sup>a</sup>.

*Ans.* Who is not seized with horror at such language <sup>b</sup>! How durst a Christian say, that a man (a mere man according to the doctrine of our antagonists) should be surety on God's behalf to us? A surety for God to men? How, shall our faith be stronger in a man, than in God? Shall we believe God because of a man? Shall we who dare not stay upon God, presume to trust in a man? Is not God a thousand times more worthy of credit than man? How, should Christ be a surety for God to us, when God by an oath, and other arguments excites us to believe in Christ? Were this the meaning, how then could Paul call him the *testator*, Heb. ix. 15.? The text, Heb. vii. 22. speaks of a suretiship, which was absolutely necessary for us. It is not necessary that there should be a surety to us on God's behalf, because all the Fathers before the coming of Christ, believed without such a surety. The apostle calls him a surety, in as much as he is a *priest*. He is not a priest on God's behalf to men, but on mens behalf to God, according to, Heb. v. i. We adhere therefore, to the power

<sup>a</sup> Crell. contra Grot. p. 480.

<sup>b</sup> Cocc. de fæd. par. 155, 156, 157, 158.

of the original word (*engguos*) surety. It comes from a word, which signifies, *to promise by striking hands*, a thing which takes place in suretiship, Prov. xxii. 26. Hence it signifies such a surety, who takes upon him the payment of another's debt, as well in civil matters, as in criminal. So it is used by Greek authors concerning *Eucritus*, who remained a surety with Dionysius the tyrant, for *Erephenus*. No man can undertake to perform this for God to men. It is true, Paul does not write, *That he is our surety to God*, but that *he is the surety of a better covenant*: That is, for us<sup>c</sup>. For he is so called, because he bound himself to fulfil the necessary condition, without which, the grace and promises of God could not belong to us, consistent with his justice; and which being now fulfilled, they certainly descend upon us, as by virtue of the atonement, and testamentary disposition of the covenant, so by the oath of God. Surely, if the matter were not thus explained, then Christ should only be a higher degree above Moses, Aaron, John the Baptist, and other holy apostles, as they also published and sealed the promises of God<sup>d</sup>. Are they also sureties of the New Covenant? Yea, of the New Testament?

XII. The Twelfth proof from Christ's true and proper priesthood<sup>e</sup>. That he was a true and a proper priest is thus proved.

*1<sup>st</sup>*, He was made a priest with the *swearing of an*

<sup>c</sup> Coc. de fæd. par. 89.

<sup>d</sup> Cocc. de fæd. par. 159.

<sup>e</sup> Cocc. in Heb. v. 7. 8.

*oath*, Heb. vii. This does not agree to an improper priest.

*2dly*, David speaks to him as *a priest after the order of Melchisedek*, Psalm cx. 4. Men do not speak thus to an improper priest. Much less do they assign to him an order of a proper priesthood, and that in opposition to another order, to wit, the order of Aaron, as is done, Heb. vii. Some similitude between him and Melchisedek, is not sufficient for this purpose. For this is also to be found in the order of Aaron. Mere similitudes are no order, but on the contrary they are proofs, that *that thing* is not of *that order*, to which it is only like.

*3dly*, Paul extols Christ's priesthood above the ancient priests, Heb. vii. 8, 9. An improper priest may indeed be more excellent in other respects, but in the matter of the priesthood, he is far beneath a proper priest.

*4thly*, The work of a proper priest is required of Christ, Heb. viii. 3. Is he an improper priest, then there is no consequence in the apostle's reasoning. For because the work of a proper priest, is to offer sacrifice, it is not therefore the work of an improper priest.

*5thly*, The ancient priesthood represented and shadowed forth the priesthood of Christ. The figure represents the truth, and the shadow is a shadow of that which is true and proper.

*6thly*, Paul gives us the description of a proper priest, Heb. v. 1. and applies it to Christ, verses 3, 4. &c. He to whom this description belongs, is a true

and a proper priest. *Christ therefore performs the work of such a priest.* It is shown above, that the priests substituted themselves as sureties for those guilty persons, for whom they sacrificed. He therefore being a proper priest, also satisfied for us as our surety. See, Heb. vii. 22.

*Evaf.* Paul speaks only of two offices of Christ, Heb. iii. 1. to wit, of his prophetic and priestly: it being his intention to hold forth the excellency of Christ's office. Therefore, there must be no difference between the priesthood, and the kingly office of Christ, but the one is contained in the other<sup>f</sup>.

*Ans.* He who designs to hold forth the excellency of any one's office, is not bound to name all things every where. The apostle is satisfied with shewing two important offices, if indeed he omits the third; and the more as the third is mentioned before (it was held forth, Heb. i. 2, 3, &c.) and he means to speak more at large in that place concerning these two. Why do not you conclude from this text, that Christ's kingly office is one with the prophetic? A thing you could conclude with equal ease. We say therefore, it is taught here, that he is as certainly a proper priest, as he is a proper prophet. Otherways the name of a high priest, could not, in this text, be ascribed to him with such emphasis.

*Adber.* Is he a proper priest, why then is not that

<sup>f</sup> Crell. contra Grot. p. 544.

name given him by other sacred writers, as well as by the author to the Hebrews <sup>g</sup>?

*Ans.* Is God obliged, to allow a name properly meant, to be mentioned by all the sacred writers? Cannot one writer use a name as properly, as ten? Cannot other writers express the *thing*, though they omit the *name*? When one author uses a name often, is not this as much, as if that name were read once in different authors? Have not the sacred writers written as occasion offered? Does not this author write to the Jews, to whom the priesthood was peculiar? Is it then so strange, that the subject is fully anatomized to them? There we find, not only the name, but also the thing, Heb. v. 1, &c. This is of greater force than ten names, used by ten authors. Also it is not true, that this name *priest*, is not to be read in other writers. See, Pl. cx. 4. Zech. vi. 13. Mat. xxii. 43, 44.

*Adher.* All that we expect from Christ as a priest, may be said to come from him as a king <sup>h</sup>.

*Ans.* Why then is the priestly-office more improper, than his kingly? It is a palpable falsehood, however, that Christ as a king performs that which we expect from him as a priest. From him, as a priest, we expect reconciliation only through his merit, and intercession. From him, as a king, we expect the application of the benefits, which he hath obtained for us.

*Adher.* How can the words, Psal. ii. 6. 7. speaking of

<sup>g</sup> Volk. lib. 3. cap. 38.

<sup>h</sup> Crell. contra Grot. p. 545.

Christ's royal dignity, be applied to his priesthood, Heb. v. 5. 6. if his priesthood be different from his kingly office?

*Ans.* These words are not applied to Christ's priesthood. They are only quoted, to show, who called him to be a priest, to wit, he who said unto him, Thou art my Son, begotten of me to day.

XIII. The Thirteenth proof from the atoning virtue of Christ's bloody sacrifice<sup>1</sup>. In suffering here upon earth, he offered up himself a sacrifice unto God. *1st*, *Coming into this world*, he here offered his propitiatory sacrifice, Heb. x. 5, 6, 7, &c. It is shown above, that by the *world*, in this text, is understood *the earth*.

*2dly*, The apostle concludes, Heb. ix. 25, &c. that Christ must often have suffered, if he was often offered up. Herein there is no consequence, if he had not in, or by suffering, offered up himself upon earth. For otherways he could have offered himself often, without suffering.

*3dly*, We read, that Christ offered up himself once, Heb. vii. 27. ix. 28. x. 10. How once, if he did not here upon earth offer himself, to be slain once? You will say, It was once done, *because he but once entered into heaven by the shedding of blood, and so presented and offered up himself to God. From that time, he stands continually before God with this his offering, not to depart from the sanctuary henceforth, till the reconciliation.*

<sup>1</sup> Cocc. in Heb. vii. 9, 10.

*be fulfilled*<sup>k</sup>. In opposition to this, we say, that this militates against the apostle's intention. He shews, that this once *sanctifies* sinners and *makes them perfect*, Heb. x. 10. 14. But according to this interpretation, Christ must still stand continually, offering himself, to perfect that propitiation. This is also against the style of scripture, which never says of a work which still continues, that it happened once. It never speaks thus of Christ's *intercession*, and of his sitting at God's right hand. In opposition to which, is placed this *once*, Heb. x. 14. It is also against all reason, that men should say, a work is *once done*, and that *that* work should still continue, and so for that reason, not be *yet done*.

*4thly*, The apostle attributes to the blood of Christ a priestly reconciliation and purification, Heb. x. 13, 14. and xiii. 12. This could by no means take place, if he had not in suffering upon earth, offered himself; because this reconciliation and purification is the proper effect of a sacrifice. Or should these things be improperly attributed to the blood of Christ, to wit, because the shed blood is a cause of those things, from which that reconciliation proceeds, and that thus, that which is the cause of the cause, is also the cause of that which is effected by that cause<sup>l</sup>? This is quite extravagant. For it militates against the style of the Holy Ghost, who never would so frequently, and so strongly attribute to the cause of the cause, that which is ef-

<sup>k</sup> Crell. contra Grot. p. 541.

<sup>l</sup> Crell. contra Grot. p. 528.

fectcd by that last cause. It is also repugnant to a beautiful interpretation (as such an interpretation is instituted by Paul in these texts) that men should, so often, and so strongly, attribute to the first cause, that which is only effected by the last, which comes from that first. This cannot consist with the texts quoted. They ascribe this to the blood of Christ, as the carnal reconciliation is attributed to the blood of the brutal victims, which reconciled immediately. Nay more, Paul ascribes this virtue to the blood of Christ, in opposition to his appearance in the sanctuary; as may be seen, Heb. ix. 13, 14. compared with verse 23. Therefore Christ's blood reconciles in an immediate manner.

5thly, We say with Paul, that Christ once in the end of the ages, was manifested to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself, Heb. ix. 26. Or should the apostle mean to say, that he was manifested for this purpose, not to us *upon earth*, but before God *in heaven*? That be far. For where it is simply read, that Christ was manifested, there, there is always respect to his coming here upon earth. The more, when the time of the manifestation is there added; as here, the end of the ages. When this is meant of heaven, then these words are adjoined, *before God, or in heaven*, as appears, Heb. ix. 24. Here it is also said, that he appeared *once*. This *once* is not applicable to his appearance in heaven, for he is not once manifested there, because that appearance still continues, and that manifestation is always made. This *once* relates to the

following clause, the *second time*, verse 28. Which *second time* has a reference to his coming upon earth, therefore also to that manifestation. As to these things, it is proper likewise to be carefully observed, that the apostle compares these *two manifestations* of Christ, with our death and the future judgment. The *second* answers to the judgment, and the *first* to our death. He was therefore manifested on earth, there to offer himself for sinners, by suffering, and dying.

*6thly*, The propitiatory sacrifices ceased at the death of Christ, Heb. ix. 25. Col. ii. 14, 15, &c. How could they vanish away at his death, if his sacrifice did not consist in his suffering and death?

*7thly*, How is it that the scripture, speaking of Christ's sacrifice and atonement, always useth words of the past tense, as *that he offered, that he made reconciliation*? See Heb. vii. 27. x. 12. The more, because it is the custom of scripture, when treating of those things, which Christ performs in heaven for us, to speak in words of the present time. So it is written, Heb. vii. 25. *that he ever liveth to make intercession for us*. Thus it must speak, in case the priestly reconciliation is still daily effectuated in heaven for us. Perhaps you will say, the Spirit speaks so, because the manner of reconciliation since Christ's entrance into heaven, is perfect of itself<sup>m</sup>. It is against the style of scripture, to say, that a thing is *done* which is not *done*. It is also against all reason, especially when that

<sup>m</sup> Socin. de Serv. p. 2. cap. 21.

thing, even after the course of a hundred years, shall not yet be done. The manner might be perfect, the thing itself is not finished.

8thly, The author to the Hebrews writes, That *Christ had by himself accomplished the purgation of our sins, before he sat down on the right hand of God*, Heb. i. 3. *That he had obtained an eternal redemption, ere he by his blood, entered into the holy place*, Heb. ix. 12. The reconciliation was therefore obtained before his ascension. The reconciliation is the fruit and the effect of his offering. Therefore it was offered on earth for us. For all that was performed before his ascension, took place on earth; yea, also all that was done before his sitting down at the right hand of God; because that sitting, immediately followed on his ascension, and so the purgation of sin could not be accomplished between the two. Wherefore, also our antagonists teach, that Christ still effectuates that purgation every day. *Crellius, Slightingius*, and other *Socinians* would gladly make us believe, that the word *having obtained*, must be translated *obtaining*. In this they are mistaken. For the proper sense of the *aorist* is for us, signifying the *past tense*. It is sometimes used for the *present*, but that happens only when it is joined to words of the present tense, and which signify something that is connected therewith, or when the one is contained in the other. As Matth. x. 5. Gal. iv. 4. 2 Pet. ii. 6. This cannot be applied to these texts. For the entering into the sanctuary, and the sitting down at God's right hand, are by no means one and

the same with the obtaining of redemption or purgation. The thing itself teaches this, and our antagonists agree to it.

9thly, The Holy Ghost testifieth, that Christ in his suffering *made his soul an offering for sin*, Isa. liii. 10. *And gave himself an offering, and a sacrifice to God*, Eph. v. 2. Observe, Paul does not speak concerning the offering of one principal action, but of the offering of Christ, or of his body. For the words offering and sacrifice in the original text, are read in the *accusative case*, and an act, as an act, is never called an offering. Not even in Phil. iv. 18. Heb. xiii. where alms and gifts are so named. He was therefore our sacrifice at that time, when he gave himself up to death. So the word giving, is also used several times concerning a sacrifice, Ezek. xvi. 19. Mic. vi. 7. As also these words, *a sweet smelling savour*, which occur, Eph. v. 2. are used concerning the propitiatory-sacrifices, Lev. iv. 31. and the burnt-offerings, which were also propitiatory-sacrifices: although they are sometimes distinguished, because the burnt-offerings were offered for all sins, but the sin-offerings for some certain sins: they both made reconciliation, Lev. i. 4. 9, 13, 17. Lev. xvi. 24.

10thly, This now suggests to us the nature of the ancient propitiatory-sacrifices. They were figures of Christ's propitiatory-sacrifice, Heb. vii. 27. ix. 13, &c. x. 10, 11. They were offered without the sanctuary; therefore Christ offered himself on the earth for us, to fulfil these types, and that by suffering and

dying for us. Now, this teaches us the certain truth of his satisfaction in our stead. For *that sacrifice* made reconciliation for sin, Heb. ii. 17. Heb. ix. 13, 14, 15. How did it make reconciliation for sin? Immediately (*ipso actu*) upon the act. For so did the sacrifices make reconciliation. Wherefore, it is constantly said, that when the priest made reconciliation, sin was forgiven. No offering can by the very act (*ipso actu*) make reconciliation for sin, if it is not satisfactory. Therefore it is also said, Heb. ix. 15. that sins are expiated through a ransom (this is the sense of the word in the original text) which manner of speaking, evidently points out this satisfaction. Therefore we are not afraid to write with Cocceius<sup>o</sup>. *That in the death of Christ there is a perfect offering for sin, a satisfaction, a redemption, a reconciliation, and an obtaining of righteousness.*

*Evas.* Our priest behaved first to be tempted in all things, before he could make reconciliation for sin, Heb. ii. 17. iv. 15. Therefore he was not a perfect priest upon earth, there to make reconciliation for sin, for he was not yet tempted in all points<sup>p</sup>.

*Ans.* These texts say no such thing. They only teach, that our priest behaved to be such a one, who, in the time of that temptation, made reconciliation for the sins of the people.

*Adher.* In order to be a high-priest, all power in heaven and in earth was necessary. Christ first re-

<sup>o</sup> In Heb. ii. 17.

<sup>p</sup> Volk. lib. 3. cap. 37.

ceived this in his ascension. Therefore it is written, Heb. viii. 1. That our High-priest sitteth at God's right hand in the heavens.

*Anf.* Christ had this power before his ascension. *He is God blessed for ever*, Rom. ix. 6. He was our High-priest, before he sat down at God's right hand, as the ancient high-priest was truly a priest, before he entered into the earthly sanctuary.

*Adher.* It is written, Heb. iv. that to the constitution of Christ's priesthood, it was necessary he should be in heaven, being otherways no priest<sup>a</sup>.

*Anf.* It is not taught there, that he could not be a Priest before he was in heaven. It is only written, *That if he were on earth, he should not be a Priest.* This is not strange, because the priest, after having offered the sacrifice, behoved to enter into the heavenly sanctuary, to execute the other part of his priestly-office.

*Adher.* Christ was made a priest, when the Father said to him, *Thou art my Son, begotten of me to day*, Heb. v. 5, 6. This took place, after he was raised from the dead, Acts xiii. 33, 34. Rom. i. 4. It is manifest therefore, that his propitiatory-sacrifice was not performed upon the cross, but accomplished in heaven.

*Anf.* It is not taught, Heb. v. 5, &c. that he was first made a priest, when these words were said unto him. There I read only, that he was made a priest

<sup>a</sup> Ibid.

by him who said, *Thou art my Son*, &c. Much less is it taught, Acts xiii. and Rom. i. that this was first said to him after his resurrection. Therefore these texts are not against us. As a Son, he learned obedience by his suffering, Heb. v. 8. These words were therefore said to him before his suffering.

*Adber.* Under the condition, requisite to a true and a perfect priest, this is mentioned, That he is *made higher than the heavens*, Heb. vii. 26. Therefore he was not a high-priest, nor had he offered a perfect propitiatory-sacrifice, till he was made higher than they<sup>r</sup>.

*Ans.* We shall for this time allow to Crellius, that these words express a place<sup>r</sup>. He behoved to be higher than the heavens, not to offer, but to intercede for us. He was a Priest before; as well as the ancient priest before he entered into the worldly sanctuary: although of the ancient it must be said, *that a priest entering into the sanctuary became them*.

*Adber.* Christ is made a Priest *after the power of an endless life*, Heb. vii. 16. This had no place upon earth. For it could not consist with the shedding of his blood<sup>t</sup>.

*Ans.* He possessed this life upon earth. And it perfectly consists with the shedding of his blood. It made him fit for that purpose, because he thereby was able to lay down his life, and to take it again. It is

<sup>r</sup> Crell. contra Grot. p. 538.

<sup>r</sup> Else see Cocc. upon Heb. vii. 26.

<sup>t</sup> Crell. ubi Supra.

the life of his Godhead, by which he only was sufficient to be our Priest.

*Evaf.* The atonement of the yearly sacrifice took place in the sanctuary, Lev. xvi. 27. Thus Christ must also expiate our sins in heaven.

*Ans.* The yearly sacrifice behoved to be of the same nature with the other propitiatory-sacrifices. It was therefore offered without the sanctuary. What, should this be offered in the sanctuary, where there was no propitiatory-altar, and holy Moses plainly writes, that the atonement was made by the slaying of the victims, before entering into the sanctuary, Lev. xvi. 6. 24. Therefore that which is said, verse 27, respects the application of the acquired atonement. For no *double* atonement could be effectuated here, one *without*, and another *within* the sanctuary.

*Adber.* Paul in Heb. ix. 25. opposes the sacrifice of Christ, to the yearly entrance of the priest into the sanctuary, with blood not his own. When therefore it is said, that Christ offered himself, the sense is this, that by his own blood he entered into heaven, and there stands before God for us <sup>v</sup>.

*Ans.* It is true, that the apostle opposes the sacrifice of Christ, to the annual entrance of the ancient high-priest <sup>w</sup>. Not that he means, that Christ offered himself in heaven, or even that the ancient priest sacrificed in the ancient sanctuary; but that Christ having

<sup>v</sup> Soc. de Serv. p. 2. cap. 15.

<sup>w</sup> Cocc. in Heb. ix.

once offered perfectly on earth, could not enter into heaven, to offer often there, as indeed the ancient high-priest behoved to offer every year upon the earth; his annual entrance into the sanctuary, being a certain evidence thereof. For otherways, the apostle could make no difference between Christ's sacrifice and his appearance in heaven, verses 24, 25. Much less, place that sacrifice in suffering, as is done, verse 26, if he had offered himself in heaven.

*Evas.* Upon Heb. ix. 15. The Greek words signify sometimes nothing else, but a deliverance by the intervention of some loss. Hence it is said, that one with his great inconveniency redeems or ransoms another from damage, misery and death, because he bore these inconveniencies, that he might deliver the other from them, though meanwhile, he did not pay for him. This manner of speaking is found, Prov. xvi. 6<sup>x</sup>.

*Ans.* This manner of speaking is not found, Prov. xvi. 6. The Greek word (*apolutron*) is not read there, and it should have the self-same sense there, for that manner of speaking always signifies a satisfaction. Crellius his embellished manner of speaking, is against all reason and custom.

*Evas.* How should a satisfaction to Divine Justice be concluded from Christ's sacrifice, when it is manifest, that he also offered for himself? He could not satisfy for himself<sup>y</sup>.

<sup>x</sup> Crell. contra Grot. p. 404.

<sup>y</sup> Soc. de Serv. p. 2. cap. 24.

*Ans.* How can you teach, that Christ did not offer himself upon earth? How, hath he offered in one manner for himself and for us? Has he therefore made reconciliation for himself, as he has for us? This is hard language. We shall point out its detestable nature.

*1<sup>st</sup>,* When a priest is said to offer sacrifice for himself, and for others; then he is placed in the same state with those, for whom he offers, that is, in a state of sin. See Heb. v. 1. 2. Heb. vii. 27. This cannot be thought of Christ, without blasphemy.

*2<sup>dly</sup>,* The priest might only offer for those, for whom it was commanded him, Heb. v. 1, 2, 3, &c. Where was it ever commanded Christ to offer for himself?

*3<sup>dly</sup>,* The end of the propitiatory-sacrifice is forgiveness. Christ had no need of this for himself. Therefore he did not offer for himself, when he offered for us.

*4<sup>thly</sup>,* That which is offered for another, must be free of every defect. He who needs a sacrifice for himself, is not without defect. All this was pointed out in the Levitical sacrifices. Thus he could not offer himself for us, and for himself.

*5<sup>thly</sup>,* No offering was made for simple misery. Our offering is a propitiatory-sacrifice for sin. Had he therefore offered himself at once for us and himself, then he behoved to have been a sinner. O blasphemy!

*Adher.* This is said of every priest, Heb. v. 1, &c. therefore also of Christ.

*Ans.* It is said of every priest, that is, of every other priest but Christ. For it is only said of *that* priest, who is guilty of the same sins with those, for whom he offers. For this reason, it is also omitted in the application of that description, Heb. v. 9.

*Adher.* This appears to be taught, Heb. vii. 27.

*Ans.* These words, *this he did once*, refer not to the first thing which the priests did, to wit, *to the offering for their own sins*. For otherways, Christ also had had real sin, like the ancient priests. These words have a reference to the second member, to wit, *the offering for the people*. This he did by his own sacrifice. Which shows, that he with his own sacrifice, by a true satisfaction, made reconciliation for our sins, For otherways he never could, by that one offering, have accomplished the reconciliation for all the people.

XIV. The Fourteenth proof from observing those persons, whose sins are expiated by Christ's bloody sacrifice<sup>z</sup>. He by his suffering *made reconciliation for the sins of the fathers*, who lived before his appearance in the flesh. For he made reconciliation for the sins of Abraham's seed, Heb. ii. 16, 17, 18. These are also the ancient believing Jews, who are of the circumcision, Rom. iv. 11.—18. He is a propitiation for the whole world, 1 John ii. 2. Which words are with great reason extended to all the heirs of righteousness, who have been, are, and shall be in all ages. This is very plainly taught, Heb. ix. 15. *Therefore he*

<sup>z</sup> Cocc. de fæd. par. 139. 285. Summ. Theol. cap. 61. num. 17.

*is the Mediator of the New Testament, that death intervening, for the expiation of the transgressions which were under the first Testament, they who are called, might receive the promise of the eternal inheritance. It is impossible, that Christ's suffering and bloody sacrifice, could expiate those old sins, if they did not satisfy in the stead of sinners.*

*Evaf.* It is not impossible<sup>a</sup>. It may be conceived in the following manner. It was foretold that Christ should preach the doctrine of salvation, and of the forgiveness of sins, that he should confirm that doctrine by his death, and rise again from the dead. Believing this, they could reap the same fruit from his death, which we after his death, draw by faith from it; though they neither saw nor heard him in person.

*Ans.* Had all the Fathers then a clear knowledge of this matter, and such a belief in all circumstances, as without *that knowledge*, and without *that faith*, no fruit could be drawn from it? How then durst Socinus at another time, deprive them of *that knowledge and that faith*? How Socinus, is not this your doctrine, that Christ's preaching and confirmation in and by his death, respects such a new covenant only, which does not concern the ancient Fathers, they having been under another covenant? How then could they draw any advantage from it? According to this doctrine, the apostles should also have expiated the sins of the ancients, if they had but known, that

<sup>a</sup> Socin. de Serv. p. 2. cap. 26.

the apostles should have preached that doctrine, and confirmed it by their death. O absurdity! This dull evasion proceeds from wrong conceptions *concerning expiating sins by a bloody sacrifice*. That sacrifice expiates (*ipso actu*) immediately by the action. This is shown above. Christ's sacrifice could not effectuate this concerning the sins of the Fathers, if it was not satisfactory. Wherefore, also in Heb. ix. 15. this matter is held forth in the original text, in such words as teach this satisfaction.

*Evas.* Upon Heb. ix. 15. By the transgressions committed under the first Testament, are not understood those particular faults which were perpetrated under that Testament. There, there is a reference to *that sort of transgressions*, which by virtue of the first Testament could not be expiated, and such were those sins, which according to the law, behoved to be punished with death<sup>b</sup>.

*Ans.* This militates against the express words of the text. There it is written, *Transgressions which were committed under the first Testament*. These words signify not a simple sort, but particular sinful actions. It militates likewise against the nature of the thing. For then there should be a limitation, and that *that sort of sins* was expiated by him, which could not be expiated under the first Testament. Paul's intention here, is, to show the full extent of the expiation of all actions, and kinds of sins. Wherefore, he also

<sup>b</sup> Crell. contra Grot. p. 307.

thereupon promifeth the full inheritance, verſe 15. This likeways militates againſt the reaſoning of the apoſtle. He had taught that the ceremonial expiations do not affect the conſcience. Now it was neceſſary to be taught, how the ſins of the *Fathers* were expiated, who otherways were loſt. This is explained, verſe 15. He therefore refers, not to a *ſimple ſort*, but to ſinful actions. This is alſo inconſiſtent with the connexion of the words, and the preceding verſe. For is only a *certain ſort* of ſins meant here, then the ceremonial ſacrifices are able to purge the conſciences as to the *other ſort* of ſins. For he allows to thoſe ſacrifices, *that* which he does not attribute to Chriſt. This is abſurd. For thoſe ſacrifices could not purify the conſcience as to the leaſt ſin, See Heb. ix. 9. x. 2, 3, 4. Nay more, the text will be for us, though it be explained of *that ſort*. For Paul ſtates only two kinds of expiation, either by the ceremonies, or by Chriſt. Therefore *that kind* is not expiated by the ceremonies, but by Chriſt, and ſo he expiated thoſe ſins by a ſatisfaction.

*Adber.* The author to the Hebrews is engaged in ſpeaking of the virtue which Chriſt's death hath under the New Teſtament. How therefore, can he ſtate the neareſt end thereof, ſatisfaction for the ſins, which were committed under the Old Teſtament, and then immediately add this, *That they who are called might receive the promiſe of the eternal inheritance?* This is the further and the remoter end, for which the former is adduced. By *the called there*, are underſtood thoſe,

who are called by the gospel to salvation. The expiation of those sins, which were committed under the law, is of no profit to these persons <sup>c</sup>.

*Ans.* It is of this advantage to them, that their expiation is tacitly contained in it. For there is but one medium of reconciliation. However, it is not yet proved, that by the *called*, those only are meant, who under the New Testament are called by the gospel. The Fathers of the Old Testament were also called, and with great reason might be so denominated.

XV. The Fifteenth proof from the nature of Christ's mediatory-office <sup>d</sup>. He bears not only the name of a Mediator, but is also described to us in the holy scriptures, as *a Mediator who gives himself a ransom for all*, 1 Tim. ii. 5, 6. *A Mediator whose office consists in being a Priest*, Heb. viii. 6. That is, in expiating sins before God, by a sacrifice, Heb. v. 1. &c. *A Mediator*, who by his death expiated the sins of the ancient Fathers, Heb. ix. 15. Such a Mediator cannot be conceived, without this true satisfaction instead of sinners.

*Evaf.* Upon 1 Tim. ii. 5, 6. It is not certain, that by these words, *who gave himself a ransom for all*, Paul meant to explain, in what sense he had called Christ a Mediator <sup>e</sup>.

*Ans.* This is directly against the text. For the con-

<sup>c</sup> Ibid.

<sup>d</sup> Cocc. Summ. Theol. cap. 24. De fæd. par. 79. et in hos textus.

<sup>e</sup> Socin. de Serv. p. 1. cap. 7.

nexion of the words teaches, that Paul places the work of a Mediator in this, *That he gave himself a ransom for all.*

*Adher.* Here there is no mention of God's wrath against the sins of men. Therefore by the name Mediator is meant, not a *peace-maker*, but a *messenger*.

*Ans.* Why cannot one be called a peace-maker, though wrath be not expressly mentioned before? Is it not enough that the thing is taught? Especially when the wrath is acknowledged by every one, and is tacitly, contained in the words. Thus the matter stands here. For a Mediator who gives himself a ransom for the guilty, presupposes this wrath as certain.

*Adher.* There these words are added, *being a testimony in his time.* Which have this sense, that by Christ, God's loving kindness is insured to men <sup>f</sup>.

*Ans.* Be it so. The Mediator's satisfaction confirms that security, as being the foundation thereof.

*Evaf.* Upon Heb. viii. 6. According to this text, there was also a mediator of that first and old covenant. Yea, there we read, *That Christ is the Mediator of a better covenant, which consists of better promises.* This shows, that in the mediatory-office respecting these two covenants, there is no difference of importance, but that it consists only in the promises <sup>g</sup>.

*Ans.* We acknowledge that there was also a mediator of the Old Testament. Yea, indeed, every priest was a mediator. Wherefore also Paul, in this text,

<sup>f</sup> Ibid.

<sup>g</sup> Ibid.

opposes this our great Mediator, to those ancient priests, and teaches, that here the difference is as great, as between his priesthood, and theirs.

*Adber.* The new covenant can admit of no Mediator, who satisfies for sins. In that covenant God promiseth, that he will be merciful to our unrighteousnesses, and will remember our sins no more. This mildness cannot consist with such a satisfaction.

*Ans.* All the promises are yea, and amen in Christ, 2 Cor. i. 20. The promise of this covenant rests upon his satisfaction, Heb. x. 14.—18. The evasions upon Heb. ix. 15. are answered in the fourteenth proof.

XVI. The Sixteenth proof from the abrogation of the ceremonial law, by the death and blood of Christ<sup>b</sup>. *For he is our peace, who hath made both these one, and having broken down the middle wall of partition, he hath abolished in his flesh the enmity, (namely) the law of commandments consisting in ordinances, that he might create these two in himself, into one new man, making peace, and that he might reconcile them both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity on the same, Eph. ii. 14, 15, 16. Having blotted out the hand-writing, which was against us, consisting in ordinances, which, I say, was in some respect against us, and took it out of the way, having nailed it to the cross, Col. ii. 14.* To slay a law of enmity by suffering, which according to that law was accursed, reconciling sinners unto God by a bloody atonement, proves that the law is

<sup>b</sup> Cocc. in Eph. ii. 14, 15, 16. et in Col. ii. 14.

abolished by virtue of a satisfaction for sins. To blot out, and to cancel a hand-writing by suffering, assures us of a true payment. For a hand-writing, which is kept by the judge against the guilty, and daily subscribed by them, to be cancelled because of the suffering of the innocent for the guilty, always proves a true satisfaction.

*Evaf.* On Eph. ii. 14, &c. The law is called the enmity, not between God and the Jews, but between the Jews and the Gentiles, and so their mutual reconciliation is spoken of<sup>1</sup>.

*Ans.* This militates against the text. For there it is plainly said, that they are both reconciled unto God by the cross. Observe, *unto God*. In the original text, the word *God* is *in the dative*. Therefore they are both reconciled unto God. Hence it is also said, that he bringeth peace to them both, and thereupon equal access unto God; verses 14.—17, 18. it not being free to all the Jews, to approach unto God, Num. i. 51. iii. 10. to wit, as long as this law was in force. Yea, it could have been neither yoke nor bondage to the Jews, Acts xv. Gal. iv. 5. if it had not likewise been an enmity between God and them. The apostle had also taught, that the Jews and Gentiles *are by nature the children of wrath*, verse 3. In opposition to which, he comforts them in these verses. Their mutual reconciliation could not comfort them against this, but only their reconciliation unto God.

<sup>1</sup> Soc. de Serv. p. i. cap. 8.

Otherways they remained both in that state.

*Evaf.* On Col. ii. 14. The blotting out of that hand-writing is here ascribed to the Father<sup>k</sup>.

*Ans.* This is not against us. For the judge tears the hand-writing after receiving payment.

*Adber.* It is a comparifon from a creditor, who blots out the hand-writing by a fimple acquittance<sup>l</sup>.

*Ans.* No creditor will keep the hand-writing fo many ages after the death of the debtors, much lefs, will allow it to be fubfcribed every day by the indebted, if he feeks no payment. Also the text teaches, not that God firft blotted out the hand-writing, and afterwards nailed it to the crofs, but that he accomplished them both at once. For this blotting out, confifts in taking away; and this taking away, in nailing it to the crofs. This is taught both by the text, and the fubject-matter. For the law of institutions, which is this hand-writing, was blotted out upon the crofs of Chrift, and no fooner. He was crucified for us. Now when a judge tears an hand-writing, becaufe another fuffers an execrable death for the guilty, that will always be fufained in law as a proof of a true fatisfaction.

*Adber.* Paul fpeaks of the ceremonies of the Jews. How can a fatisfaction be concluded from thence? Were all men guilty<sup>m</sup>?

*Ans.* Very conveniently. For if fatisfaction was

<sup>k</sup> Soc. de Serv. p. 2. cap. 24.

<sup>l</sup> Ibid.

<sup>m</sup> Ibid.

made for the Jews, then also for the Gentiles. For in Christ there is no difference between Jew and Greek, Gal. iii. 28.

*Adher.* Paul speaks of meat, drink and days. These ceremonies did not teach the guilt of sins.

*Ans.* These things were also testimonies of guilt. For they signified, that man was still unclean, because of his guilt, for which satisfaction was not yet made.

XVII. The Seventeenth proof from those texts, in which Christ calls our sins his sins<sup>o</sup>. *Innumerable evils have surrounded me. Mine iniquities have taken hold of me, so that I am not able to look up: multiplied they are, more than the hairs of mine head, therefore my heart faileth me, Psal. xl. 12. That which I took not away, I must restore. O God, thou knowest my folly, and my guiltinesses are not hid before thee, Psal. lxxix. 5, 6.* Here the Messias confesseth, that he had sins and trespasses. He had neither sins of his own, nor trespasses of his own. For *he knew no sin*, and therefore also could say, *He behoved to restore, that which he had not taken away.* He was therefore laden with our sins and our trespasses; and for that reason, satisfied for them by his suffering.

*Evas.* How do you prove that these texts speak concerning Christ?

*Ans.* From the infallible interpretation of the New-Testament writers. Of the first we read, Heb. x. 5,

<sup>o</sup> Cocc. de fæd. par. 88. Summ. Theol. cap. 61. num. 11. p. 649.

6, &c. Of the second John ii. 17. Rom. xv. 3. Also Matth. xxvii. 34. 48. Mark xv. 23. John xix. 28, 29.

XVIII. The Eighteenth proof from the essential difference between the sufferings of Christ, and the sufferings of the apostles<sup>p</sup>. This is taught, 1 Cor. i. 13. *Was Paul crucified for you?* That is, it is peculiar to Christ only to be crucified for you. Therefore it is also said, that he suffered for the apostles themselves, 1 Pet. iii. 18. Whosoever denies this satisfaction, will never be able to point out an essential difference between the sufferings of Christ, and of the apostles. As certain therefore, as this difference is, so true also is his satisfaction in our place.

*Evaf.* This is the first difference, that the apostles suffered not of their own will (*sponte*) for the church, to bring any benefit to it by that means<sup>q</sup>. Although they, intending to be profitable to the church, suffered afflictions, yea, death. Christ did not die, intending only to do us good, but he died of his own accord for that end, that in that manner he might communicate many benefits to us.

*Anf.* The apostles also gave up themselves willingly to such sufferings, Acts xx. 24. xxi. 13. 2 Cor. xii. 15. Phil. ii. 17. 2 Tim. ii. 10. And that even without the hope of such a high reward, as was promised to Christ. This therefore, should rather teach, that the work of the apostles was to be extolled above the suf-

<sup>p</sup> Cocc. in 1 Cor. i. 13.

<sup>q</sup> Socin. de Serv. p. 2. cap. 8. Præl. cap. 20.

ferings of Christ, because *a less reward* was promised to them, for *equal sufferings*.

*Adber.* This is the second difference. One seems truly and properly to die for another, who ministrerth unto him, not a common, but an extraordinary benefit; especially when he preserves him in life. Christ by his death communicated to us the greatest and the most excellent benefits, prepared eternal life for us, and is by his death exalted to the highest power and immortality<sup>r</sup>.

*Ans.* He dies as well for another, who by his death conveys a smaller, as he who brings a greater benefit. Perhaps it is more to be commended. For it is the greatest love for a little one to be willing to die for his neighbour. The apostles also, in their sufferings for the church, intended the same benefit as Christ, to wit, the salvation of men, 2 Cor. i. 5, 6. Phil. i. 7, 12, 13, 14. Col. i. 24, 25. 2 Tim. ii. 10. Therefore, this by no means appears to be the essential difference.

*Adber.* Whatever comes from the afflictions, and the death of the apostles, Christ must be thanked *for that*. He died first. He was the first-born from the dead, and so gave an example to others, to die for the brethren<sup>r</sup>.

*Ans.* This teaches no essential difference. It intimates a difference in time only, such as was between apostle and apostle.

<sup>r</sup> Ibid.

<sup>r</sup> Ibid.

*Evaf.* The difference consists in this, that our salvation and deliverance from eternal death, depends neither *chiefly*, nor so *fully* on the death and sufferings of the apostles, as indeed on the death and sufferings of Christ. He is the leader of faith, of life and of salvation<sup>t</sup>.

*Ans.* The priority of suffering makes no difference in degrees, much less in essence. The prophets also confirmed their doctrine by their sufferings and death. They were before Christ in suffering.

*Adber.* This is the greatest difference, that Christ died for that end, that having obtained power over all, and being made our faithful and merciful High-Priest, he might expiate our sins for ever, assist them that are tempted, turn away God's punishments from us, snatch us from the jaws of death, and transport us to a blessed immortality<sup>v</sup>.

*Ans.* This teaches no difference in suffering and dying for us, but in the consequences, or in the following reward. And if there be no difference in the sufferings, why have they not the same reward? We shall therefore, also be more obliged to the apostles, than to Christ. According to this doctrine, they suffered *as much* for us, as Christ did, and received *a less reward*. After Christ's ascension, they published the doctrine of salvation more clearly, and in greater extent, and sealed their testimony with their blood. According to this doctrine therefore, we are most

<sup>t</sup> Crell. contra Grot. p. 465.

<sup>v</sup> Idem. p. 467.

obliged unto them. According to it, it is so far from being true, that an essential difference should remain between Christ's sufferings and those of the apostles, that it sets the apostles above him.

XIX. The Ninteenth proof from the necessity of Christ's sufferings in order to our redemption. *For it became him for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, that he leading (or having led) many children to glory, should consecrate the captain of their salvation by suffering, Heb. ii. 10.* That which becometh God, is necessary for us, because he neither can, nor will work otherways, than becometh him. *Now then, if perfection were by the Levitical priesthood, what need was there yet, that another priest should arise after the order of Melchizedec? Heb. vii. 11.* It was therefore necessary, that indeed the patterns of the things which are in the heavens, should be purified by these things; but the heavenly things themselves, by better sacrifices than these, Heb. ix. 23<sup>w</sup>. What necessity is there, if Christ's suffering was not requisite, in order to satisfaction for our sins? Not the least. For then without these sufferings, all things could be performed which were necessary to salvation. At the same rate also, the Fathers could be received up into glory, without these sufferings.

*Evaf.* These sufferings were necessary, to assure us of the promise of forgiveness of sins and of eternal

<sup>w</sup> Cocc. in hos textus.

life, which promise was not to be found in the law of Moses.

*Ans.* For what purpose is that assurance necessary, when according to this doctrine, the Fathers were saved without that promise and assurance? Could not God have given that assurance without Christ? and in Christ many other ways without his suffering? By his miracles? By his ascension? Thus, there is no appearance of necessity in this matter. Here, also a structure is reared upon a false foundation, to wit, that the Fathers were not comforted with that blessed promise.

*Evaf.* These sufferings were necessary, that he might obtain that power, whereby he delivers us from deserved punishment.

*Ans.* Was not God powerful enough of himself for that purpose? What necessity to communicate this power to another? Could not this communication of power take place without such painful and accursed sufferings? Yea, certainly. Without this satisfaction there is no appearance of necessity. All necessity must here come from the law, and therefore consist in this, that the right of the law must be fulfilled by a satisfaction.

XX. The Twentieth proof from the perfection of Christ's sufferings and sacrifice, which is such, that it neither can nor may be repeated<sup>x</sup>. Of this we read, Heb. vii. 27. ix. 25. x. 10.—18. If you deny this

<sup>x</sup> Cocc. de fæd. par. 100.

fatisfaction, then there is no appearance of reason, why these sufferings should not be repeated. This satisfaction is the only reason, because it purifies and sanctifies the conscience; which also is the reason, why the sacrifice, as being perfect, may not be repeated.

*Evaf.* Christ's sacrifice may not be repeated, because it is sufficient and perfect, to reconcile all, that is, to turn finners from their sins; because it assures them of everlasting happiness, when they, forsaking sin, are zealous in godliness. This promise was not made to the Fathers, and for that reason, the ancient sacrifices were not able to turn them from sin, and therefore subject to perpetual repetition<sup>7</sup>.

*Ans.* In this there is no appearance of truth. The promise of eternal happiness might indeed be frequently ascertained and confirmed. It was confirmed by Christ's miracles, and yet, according to the doctrine of our opponents, confirmed also again in his death. After this, it was further ascertained by the death of the apostles. This can be no reason, why Christ's sacrifice might not be repeated. We are daily in danger of falling into sin; yea, we daily offend in many things, James iii. 2. It is therefore as necessary, that this sacrifice of Christ, (if it consist in this) be repeated, as it was necessary that the ancient sacrifices should. The repeating of that assurance of the promise of salvation, can be no proof of imper-

<sup>7</sup> Volk. lib. 3. cap. 38.

fection, but only shows the goodness of him who repeats it, and the advantage of the repetition. Here also two false foundations are laid. *1st*, That the Fathers were not comforted with the promise of everlasting life. *2dly*, That the promise of salvation is the *only*, or at least, the *chief* reason which turns us from sin. Two dangerous errors, clashing with one another. For then the Fathers should have had no means to draw them from sin, being destitute of the promise of salvation. It appears therefore, that without the satisfaction of Christ, no reason can be given, why his suffering and sacrifice might not, or behoved not to be repeated.

XXI. The Twentieth and First proof from those texts, which teach that the forgiveness of sins is the peculiar and certain effect of the shedding of Christ's blood. *In whom we have redemption through his blood, namely, the forgiveness of sins, Eph. i. 7. Col. i. 14. By his stripes healing is come to us, and we are healed, Isa. liii. 5. 1 Pet. ii. 24<sup>z</sup>. By this healing is meant the forgiveness of sins. For that healing is understood, which removes those sicknesses, which are mentioned. These are the debts and punishment of sins, verses 4, 5<sup>a</sup>. See the word healing thus explained, Mark iv. 12. compared with Isa. vi. 10. For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth them to the purifying of the flesh; how much more shall the blood of*

<sup>z</sup> Cocc. in hos textus. et de fæd. par. 353.

<sup>a</sup> See concerning this, Isa. xxxiii. 20.

*Christ, who through the eternal Spirit, offered himself without spot unto God, purge your consciences from dead works, to serve the living God, Heb. ix. 13, 14.* This purifying consists chiefly in the forgiveness of sins, Heb. ix. 22. and is here as a certain effect, attributed to the blood of Christ. *The blood of Jesus Christ his Son, cleanseth us from all sin, 1 John i. 7.* This cleansing is explained by the forgiveness of sins, verse 9. It appears therefore, that the blood of Christ procures certain forgiveness. This again teacheth us the truth of Christ's satisfaction. For he shed his blood for sinners, Matth. xxvi. 27, 28. And it is not to be conceived, that any sheds his blood for the guilty, and thereby procures the certain forgiveness of their guilt, and that *that shedding of blood* should not be satisfactory for *that guilt*.

*Evaf.* Forgiveness is attributed to the blood of Christ, not because he obtained it, but because his blood assures us of the forgiveness of sins, which God promiseth in the new covenant<sup>b</sup>.

*Ans.* Then not forgiveness itself, but the assurance of that forgiveness, must be attributed to the blood of Christ. Now in these texts actual forgiveness is ascribed to it. According to their contents, this forgiveness is procured by him as a Priest: Heb. ix. 10. which he is, not as to men, but as to God, Heb. v. But this assurance is not given to God, but to men. It can therefore by no means be explained of such an

<sup>b</sup> Soc. de Serv. p. 2. cap. 16.

assurance. Then also what hath the blood of Christ, in the matter of forgiveness, above the word of God, above the sacraments, above his miracles, above the sufferings of the apostles, which likewise assure us of this? yea, above the ancient sacrifices? For, according to the doctrine of Volkelius, these also insured this<sup>c</sup>.

*Evaf.* Forgiveness is attributed to the blood of Christ, because it works in us the hope of a blessed immortality, and by that hope, worketh in us love to God, and to our neighbour. They who are so qualified, God will never remember their sins.

*Ans.* Where does ever the word of God attribute a thing so frequently, and so emphatically to this or that act, which by so many turnings and windings gives occasion only, to be able to receive that thing? Thus it must happen here. *Christ preached the doctrine of salvation, and sealed it with his blood. The doctrine thus sealed, gives hope of salvation, which hope excites to repentance. To those who are penitent, God gives remission; and for that reason, forgiveness is attributed to the blood of Christ.* He raves who forges such interpretations, the more, because hereby nothing is given to the blood of Christ, which does not belong to the apostles. Yea, in the matter of forgiveness, this ascribes nothing to the blood of Christ. For that which is but an occasion of a benefit, and that remotely, by so many turnings and windings,

<sup>c</sup> Lib. 3. cap. 18.

cannot be said to have any true influence, in accomplishing *that matter*.

*Evaf.* It is attributed to the blood of Christ, because by his sufferings he obtained power to forgive us our sins<sup>d</sup>.

*Ans.* The power, to be able to forgive sins, is no actual forgiveness. According to the doctrine of our opponents, he also received that power by the interposition of his birth, doctrine, miracles, and the cruelties of the Jews. Now, would we attribute the forgiveness of sins to these things? This is too absurd. For that which is but the way only, whereby one receives power to convey a benefit; that benefit cannot be attributed thereto, as the fruit or effect thereof. Christ had also that power before the shedding of his blood. For by a miracle he assured his hearers of it, Matth. ix. 5, 6.

XXII. The Twentieth and Second proof from the quality and nature of the forgiveness of sins<sup>e</sup>. It is not only an act of *grace*, but also of *justice*. Of this we read, Rom. iii. 24, 25. For there it is declared, that in redemption and the forgiveness of sins by the blood of Christ, *the righteousness of God* is manifested, and that therein he intends the *demonstration of his justice*. It is therefore an act of justice. The word of God informs us of this, when it says, *That the receiving of the forgiveness of sins is the same as to be justified*, and calls that *forgiveness righteousness*, Acts

<sup>d</sup> Volk. lib. 3. cap. 18.

<sup>e</sup> Cocc. in Col. ii. 14. num. 111. De fæd. par. 105.

13. 38, 39. Rom. iv. 5, 6, 7. How can forgiveness be also an act of God's justice, if it do not flow from a true satisfaction? Without this satisfaction, it is only an act of *grace*, and not of *justice*.

*Evaf.* Upon Rom. iii. 24, 25. By this righteousness is only understood God's steadfastness in his promises.

*Ans.* Where is ever God's simple steadfastness in his promises, called *His righteousness*? Where does steadfastness signify this, when it is distinguished from grace, as here? *That* righteousness is here meant, by which God is said to be righteous, and by which he justifieth, verse 26. This is the righteousness of God, as a Judge, rewarding according to righteousness. For *to justify one*, is to assign something to him on the footing of righteousness, and to judge, that it justly belongs to him.

*Adher.* The word *justify*, when referring to the forgiveness of sins, never signifies to pronounce one righteous by a sentence (which seems to be the act of a judge) but to deal with those as righteous, whom God may treat as unrighteous<sup>f</sup>.

*Ans.* This is contrary to scripture-style. For when this word is spoken concerning a person, it always signifies to declare one righteous by a sentence, upon the footing of righteousness, Deut. xxv. 1. 1 Kings viii. 32. Prov. xvii. 15. Isa. v. 23. Also it cannot consist with the meaning of the word. For that is not

<sup>f</sup> Crell. contra Grot. p. 2. cap. 2.

to pardon, but to justify. Wherefore, Paul also writes, That by this justification, *the law is established*, Rom. iii. 31. How otherways, but because according to the law, none is justified, or treated as righteous, but on the footing of true righteousness?

XXIII. The Twentieth and Third proof from the difference with respect to the forgiveness of sins, before and since the death of Christ. This difference is most clearly represented by the very learned Cocceius<sup>g</sup>, in the following manner.

1st, *There was a forgiveness of sins accompanied with a confession, that sin was not yet expiated, nor righteousness brought in; nevertheless without bondage and yoke.*

2dly, *There was a forgiveness of sins, joined with a bondage, yoke, and institutions, which demanded a hand-writing against the sinners.*

3dly, *There is a forgiveness attended with a declaration of righteousness brought in, and of the death of Christ to do away sin.*

The forgiveness therefore, which belonged to the Fathers, had with it a confession of debt not paid. For this reason, the law of ceremonies is called *a hand-writing, which was in some degree against them*, Col. ii. 14. The sacrifices were a continual memorial, that their debts or sins were not taken away, Heb. x. 3. A forgiveness of sins, coupled with a confession and a remembrance of a debt not paid,

<sup>g</sup> In Colofs. ii. 14. num. 110.

teaches, That by the promised surety, satisfaction must and shall be made for sin<sup>h</sup>. Therefore Paul writes, Rom. iii. 24, 25. That Christ *in order to that forgiveness, behoved to be set forth for a propitiation in his blood.* That forgiveness requires therefore, that Christ satisfy for sins.

*Evaf.* It is not necessary, that by *the sins committed before*, are understood the sins of the Fathers under the Old Testament<sup>i</sup>.

*Ans.* It is necessary for two reasons. *1st*, Because Paul had taught, that none, whether Jew or Gentile, can be justified by the law. In opposition to this, he places the redemption by Christ. When he therefore speaks of *sins which were committed before*, there must be respect to the sins of the Fathers. For otherwise, Christ was by no means the only medium of redemption, and *they* would be justified by the law, which is opposite to verse 21, &c. *2dly*, Because Paul in Rom. iv. concludes from thence the same justification before and after the death of Christ. This reason was very groundless, if redemption and forgiveness through his blood, had not extended to those ancient Fathers. For justification follows redemption, and so the same justification proves the same redemption.

XXIV. The Twentieth and Fourth proof from those texts which attribute the effect, or the work of reconciliation to Christ, in opposition to the impo-

<sup>h</sup> Cocc. summ. Theol. cap. 61. num. 9.

<sup>i</sup> Crell. contra Grot. cap. 1. p. 80.

tence of other causes, yea, to an impossibility arising from necessary causes<sup>k</sup>. *And every priest stood indeed every day ministering, and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins: but this man, having offered one sacrifice for sins, &c.* Heb. x, 11.—14. *Be it therefore known unto you, men and brethren, that by this man the forgiveness of sins is preached unto you, and that by him every one who believeth, is justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses,* Acts xiii. 38, 39. Here the power to expiate and to satisfy for the guilt of sins, is denied to the sacrifices; and on the contrary, ascribed to the blood and to the sacrifice of Christ.

XXV. The Twentieth and Fifth proof from those texts, which say, that Christ fulfilled the right of the law for sinners<sup>l</sup>. *For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God hath, sending his Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh, (punished it in the flesh) that the right of the law might be fulfilled in us,* Rom. viii, 3, 4. *O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? The sting of death is sin, and the strength of sin is the law. But thanks be to God who giveth us the victory, through our Lord Jesus Christ;* 1 Cor. xv. 55.—57. We have therefore in Christ a fulfilling of the right of the law, a victory over the law, and the strength of the law. These things are

<sup>k</sup> Cocc. de fæd. par. 105.

<sup>l</sup> Cocc. de fæd. par. 105. Summ. Theol. cap. 61. num. 6. 7. 11.

destitute of all truth, if he did not satisfy the curse of the law in our stead.

*Evaf.* Upon Rom. viii. 3, 4. To condemn sin here, is to destroy sin, or to declare that it is destroyed<sup>m</sup>.

*Ans.* It is here as much as *to punish sins, or to condemn them in order to punish them.* Sin cannot be otherways condemned in a person, but in order to punishment. This manner of speaking has this sense frequently in this chapter, verse 1. and 34. otherways Paul could not conclude from thence, that the right of the law is fulfilled thereby. It is only fulfilled by a satisfaction to its demand.

*Adber.* Christ came, to work that which was impossible to the law. It could well punish sin<sup>o</sup>.

*Ans.* It could not condemn sin to punishment, or fo punish it, that the guilt should be expiated. To effectuate this, Christ appeared; and this is here attributed unto him.

XXVI. The Twentieth and Sixth proof from God's own declaration<sup>p</sup>. This is his word, *Cursed is every one who hangeth on a tree*, Deut. xxi. 23. Gal. iii. 13. Here it is plainly taught, that no man, who is not guilty of sin, or burdened with the curse of sin, is hanged on a tree. When, therefore, a righteous person, is according to God's pleasure, hanged on a tree, it is a certain proof, that he bears the curse of

<sup>m</sup> Socin. de Serv. p. 2. cap. 23.

<sup>o</sup> Ibid.

<sup>p</sup> Cocc. summ. Theol. cap. 61. num. 8.

sin instead of the accursed. For he cannot be a curse for his own sin.

XXVII. The Twentieth and Seventh proof from the vile absurdities, which necessarily follow, when this satisfaction is denied. As,

1<sup>st</sup>, That then the sufferings of Christ save no man. Contrary to Isa. liii. 10.—12. and Isa. xlix. 4, &c.<sup>a</sup>

2<sup>dly</sup>, That the sufferings of Christ, neither actually, nor properly redeems us from the least evil. Contrary to Gal. iii. 13. iv. 5, 6.

3<sup>dly</sup>, Much less, that by these sufferings he could purchase a peculiar people to himself. Contrary to Tit. ii. 14. which could not take place without this satisfaction<sup>r</sup>.

4<sup>thly</sup>, That then Christ can ask nothing for us, in virtue of the satisfaction made. Contrary to Job xxxiii. 24, Isa. liii. 12<sup>r</sup>.

5<sup>thly</sup>, That we are not dead to the law by the sufferings of Christ. Contrary to Rom. vii. 1, 2, 3, &c. Gal. ii. 19, 20<sup>c</sup>.

6<sup>thly</sup>, That then he hath not by his sufferings procured the purgation of sins. Contrary to Heb. i. 3. For that purgation teaches, that sins were not purged by the Levitical washings, but remained to his time, and for that reason, behoved to be blotted out by a

<sup>a</sup> Cocc. summ. Theol. cap. 34. num. 3.

<sup>r</sup> Cocc. de fæd. par. 105.

<sup>r</sup> De fæd. par. 88.

<sup>c</sup> De fæd. par. 100.

satisfaction, in regard that they for that purpose, held the guilty under the relation of guilt <sup>t</sup>.

*7thly*, That then a sinner shall draw nigh to God, without a satisfying righteousness, whereby sin is condemned <sup>v</sup>. He who approaches God in such a manner, seeking any thing from him, casteth a reproach upon him, as judging, that he is such a one, who can be loved without the knowledge, admiration, esteem, and approbation of his holiness and justice. Contrary to Heb. vii. 25. where it is taught, that we sinners must not come unto God without an atoning Priest.

#### OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.

*Object.* Before the coming of Christ, sins were forgiven without a satisfaction, Gen. iv. 7. Deut. iv. 30. xxx. 1. Neh. ix. Jer. xviii. Ezek. xviii. and xxxiii. Also in the time of John the Baptist, Luke i. 77 <sup>w</sup>.

*Ans.* Those sins were forgiven in virtue of Christ's suretyship <sup>x</sup>. Wherefore in his death he expiated them also. See, Rom. iii. 25, 26. Heb. ix. 15. The forgiveness arising from the bowels of God's mercy, according to Luke i. 77. flow also from the satisfaction of the horn of salvation, verses 69, 72, 73. These two go together.

<sup>t</sup> In hunc textum, Heb. i. 3.

<sup>v</sup> Summ. Theol. cap. 61. num. 14.

<sup>w</sup> Socin. de Serv. p. 3. cap. 2.

<sup>x</sup> Cocc. de fæd. par. 285.

*Obj.* God promiseth in the new covenant, that he would be merciful to our unrighteousnesses, and remember our sins no more, Jer. xxxi. 34. How shall he be merciful to them, if he provided a satisfaction<sup>y</sup>? How should he remember them no more, when he punished them so severely in Christ? It is not strange, that he remembers them no more, because he is perfectly satisfied for them; and hath so remembered them, that not one is unpunished. Where then remains that mercy and mildness, which is so highly extolled in this covenant?

*Ans.* The apostle satisfies this objection, Heb. x. 14.—17<sup>z</sup>. Where the sacrifice of Christ (that is, his satisfaction) is placed upon the sole foundation of that promise. Also, the Hebrew text solves the difficulty objected. For the word, *to be merciful*, signifies such grace or forgiveness, as rests on a previous ransom. When any one through his goodness, desists so far from his right, that he admits, provides, accepts of a surety, and on account of his payment, discharges and remits the debt, he is with great reason said to be merciful to unrighteousness, and to remember sins no more.

*Obj.* The holy scriptures testify, that now God by grace forgiveth sins, Rom. iii. 24, &c. This satisfaction strikes directly against a gracious forgiveness. For where a creditor is satisfied, either by the debtor,

<sup>y</sup> Socin. ubi supra.

<sup>z</sup> Cocc. de fœd. par. 353.

or by a surety in the debtor's name, he cannot be said to discharge the debt for nothing <sup>a</sup>.

*Ans.* Forgiveness is not only an act of *grace*, but also of *justice*, as was shown above <sup>b</sup>. Hence forgiveness is called *a ransom or redemption through the blood of Christ*, Eph. i. 7. Col. i. 14. Grace therefore must consist in this, that the debtor pays nothing, that the judge admits of a surety, appoints and accepts of his payment for the salvation and redemption of the guilty, and so discharges and remits him, who according to law is in debt. In such cases, where the punishment remains certain, this acquittance is the highest grace.

*Obj.* God is introduced, Matth. xviii. under the representation of a King, who remits the debt, without speaking of payment <sup>c</sup>.

*Ans.* *Silence is no denial.* Every thing is not said in one place. It is sufficient that nothing is said here, which is to the prejudice of the satisfaction. Also it is not said here, that the King forgives the good and the penitent servants only. Which, however, is true concerning God.

*Adher.* The application of this parable teacheth, that we must forgive, as God hath forgiven us. He forgives upon the footing of a satisfaction, and therefore we are not bound to forgive without a satisfaction <sup>d</sup>.

<sup>a</sup> Catech. Racov. cap. 8. q. 15.

<sup>b</sup> Cocc. de fæd. par. 350.

<sup>c</sup> Socin. de Serv. p. 3. cap. 2.

<sup>d</sup> Ibid.

*Anf.* Here we must by all means remember, that there is a wide difference between God's forgiveness, and the forgiveness of men. God forgives the debt, the punishment, the injury done to his law, his office and majesty. Man forgives only the simple injury which is done to himself: which teaches us, that in this reasoning great mistakes are committed. As,

1<sup>st</sup>, That it is very unreasonable, when this act of the supreme Judge, is proposed to his subjects for imitation, then from the act of the subject to be willing to measure the act of that supreme Judge, in all its circumstances, antecedents, and foundations.

2<sup>dly</sup>, That it is very unjust, when an act is proposed for imitation, that then men, from the manner of acting in the *imitator*, conclude, what should be the manner of working in the *supreme Judge*. This would make the creature equal to God. Yea, then we would be forced to conclude, that we must not forgive instantaneously, because, according to the doctrine of the Socinians (here we form an argument from their own principles) God does not immediately give the absolute remission of sins. To which conclusion no Socinian can assent.

3<sup>dly</sup>, That here things respecting a public office and a private state are confounded. In public administration, a Judge may not always forgive without a satisfaction, also not in things where his public honour is concerned. These are the glories of a public state, and they cannot be separated from Deity.

*Adber.* If this King had forgiven the *first servant*

the debt on the footing of a satisfaction, how could he then demand forgiveness from *this servant* without payment? Could not this servant with good reason say, You upbraid me because I seek payment, and will you convince me by your example, when you have received payment? If another had been willing as a surety to satisfy for him, I should not have distressed him<sup>e</sup>.

*Ans.* Many false foundations are laid here. As,

*1<sup>st</sup>*, Here it is supposed for certain, that this servant grants no forgiveness to his fellow-servant, because his lord had forgiven *him* on account of a surety. Whereas this arose only from cruelty against his fellow-servant.

*2<sup>dly</sup>*, Here it is supposed for certain, that this servant would have been content with a surety. His desire of revenge teaches, that he sought the misery of his fellow-servant.

*3<sup>dly</sup>*, Here it is supposed for certain, that this servant has equal right and power with the king, and that he is not obliged to do otherways in the manner of forgiveness, than his king doeth.

*4<sup>thly</sup>*, Here it is supposed for certain, that the king forbids the servant to ask payment, when he only demands that he should be patient; and that at the request of his fellow-servant, who only sought a delay, in order to pay him afterwards.

*5<sup>thly</sup>*, Here it is supposed for certain, that men

<sup>e</sup> Ibid.

may argue from all the circumstances of a *parable*: which is a great mistake. For then from this *parable* I must conclude, *1st*, That God forgives such, as intend to pay their debts. *2dly*, That we are not obliged to forgive, if payment be not proffered. *3dly*, That men may again demand a debt, which was once discharged. The slander therefore, which Socinus teaches the wicked servant, the king will answer in this manner. *Without your desire and knowledge, and only for your salvation. I have provided a surety for you, who could not pay. His satisfaction I have imputed to you, and thereupon forgiven the debt; and thus have let fall as much of my right, as my justice, honour and office permitted. Therefore you are also obliged to forgive your fellow-servant, that which neither your office, nor your honour, nor the law forbids.*

*Adher.* The example of another, obliges to do no more, than he hath done, who is proposed to you for an example. God forgives on account of Christ's satisfaction, therefore we may also demand a satisfaction, before we forgive<sup>f</sup>.

*Ans.* This is enough to us. For as God in that forgiveness, desists from all things, as far as he can, consistent with office and honour; so this parable binds us, to forgive all, that consistent with office and honour we can. When these therefore demand a satisfaction, then it must be demanded. When, without prejudice to them, we set a satisfaction aside,

<sup>f</sup> Crell. contra Grot. cap. vi. p. 28.

then we must desist from our right, as our neighbour cannot otherways remain safe.

*Obj.* Forgiveness is proposed in the original text, Eph. iv. 32. Col. ii. 13. iii. 13. in such words, as teach, that God has desisted from his right, to show grace to another <sup>g</sup>.

*Ans.* In this forgiveness God departs from his right to show grace to us. He goes from us to the surety, and on the surety's account delivers us from punishment and guilt.

*Obj.* Then Christ suffered death for the advantage of his Father <sup>h</sup>.

*Ans.* In punishment the Judge's advantage is not sought. Such suretyships redound always to the advantage of the guilty, and serve to maintain the office of the Judge, his honour, and the law.

*Obj.* Christ because of his innocence was not fit to be subjected to righteous punishment <sup>i</sup>.

*Ans.* Because of his innocence he was *not worthy of punishment for himself*, but fit, as a surety to satisfy for others, 2 Cor. v. 21. 1 Pet. iii. 18.

*Obj.* God, intending to deliver the guilty from punishment, by no means willed to punish the most innocent, and the most beloved <sup>k</sup>.

*Ans.* Yea, he certainly willed this, yet upon his Son's offer and consent, Psal. xl. 7. Isa. liii. 5, 6, &c. Heb. x. 5, 6, &c.

<sup>g</sup> Socin. de Serv. p. 3. cap. 2.

<sup>h</sup> Idem. p. 3. cap. 11.

<sup>i</sup> Crell. de Deo et Attrib. cap. 23.

<sup>k</sup> Ibid.

*Obj.* God prompted Christ to die through the promise of an infinite reward, and by that reward, mitigated and recompensed his pains, Isa. liii. 10, 11. Phil. ii. 9, 10. Heb. xii. 2. These things cannot consist with a proper punishment, in regard that it is vengeance<sup>1</sup>.

*Ans.* He who suffers punishment for his own sins, can thereby merit no reward, because it is a personal punishment, and for that reason, personal vengeance. It is otherways with a surety, who therefore also may be incited by such promises of the Judge, to suffer for the guilty<sup>m</sup>. This hath particular place, when these two things appear. *1<sup>st</sup>*, When the suffering is of that value, that it is worthy of all. *2<sup>dly</sup>*, When this exaltation is not so much for the surety, as for the guilty. These are to be found here. The humiliation of such a person is worth all. His sufferings for us could not have a glorious issue without that reward. Hereby he applies, that which he merited, and his glory does not subsist without the glory of the church, which is his property, and his purchased inheritance. See all this beautifully explained, Isa. liii. 10—12.

*Obj.* Christ did not despair, how then did he suffer the punishment of our sins.

*Ans.* Despair is no punishment. Where is it threatened in the law? How can the holy Judge inflict it, who nevertheless inflicts all true punishment? Punish-

<sup>1</sup> Ibid.

<sup>m</sup> Cocc. de fæd. par. 105, 106, 107.

ment is according to the law, despair is against the law. By punishment satisfaction is made, by despair God is provoked. Despair proceeds from weakness, because there is no prospect of relief. But a sufficient surety is assured of a comfortable issue, and for that reason, cannot despair.

*Obj.* Christ could pay to the uttermost for one only, because every sinner deserves that punishment. He could contribute no more, than what was necessary to satisfy for one sinner only. He who gives but an hundred pence, cannot therewith satisfy for many, the least of whom owes as much °.

*Ans.* It depends only on the judgment of the Judge, to say, wherewith a surety can satisfy the law<sup>p</sup>. Therefore, in this matter we must content ourselves with that declaration which the word of God makes concerning it. It opposes *one* Christ to many individuals, Mat. xx. 28. Rom. v. 19. 2 Cor. v. 15. 1 Tim. ii. 5, 6. The reason of which is taught us, Jer. xxiii. 6. where he is called, *The Lord our righteousness*. He can therefore by his suffering and righteousness counterbalance all, yea, exceed them. The highest goodness and the highest majesty outweighs all, and can satisfy to the full, for all the wounds given to the majesty of God. Therefore Socinus his similitude of the debt of an hundred pence, is not to the purpose here. For money is valued, only according to its *matter and form*. *Whoever* possesses it, or pays with it, it conti-

° Socin. de Serv. p. 3. cap. 4.

<sup>p</sup> Cocc. summ. Theol. cap. 61. num. 16. 18.

nues of the *same value*. In sufferings, men value the person and his dignity. We may also turn this similitude against Socinus. When one owes ten pound weight of silver, and together with him, others likewise owe as much; and now when a surety weighs down ten pound weight of gold, without doubt, that shall pay for more than for one only. Here the most High was given.

*Adber.* Christ, as the eternal God, could not suffer, therefore his Godhead could not give infinite value to his sufferings<sup>9</sup>.

*Ans.* Is it all one then, whether you strike a man or a beast, a private person or a king, a stranger or a father, because the strokes reach the flesh and the body, and neither the soul nor the royal dignity, nor the paternity<sup>r</sup>? The dignity of the person always gives worth to the sufferings, though *that* do not suffer in itself, which communicates the work. The unity of the person is sufficient for this purpose, the two natures being united in his one person. This is the aggravation of sin, that it is committed against God and his majesty, though properly it affects him with no sorrow. Therefore it must also heighten the value of the sufferings, when the person suffering is God, though his Godhead does not suffer in itself. This therefore, is also observed in God's word, and that to the magnifying of the worth of Christ's sufferings, Acts xx. 28. Rom. v. 11. 1 Cor. ii. 8. 1 John i. 7.

<sup>9</sup> Socinus *ibid.*

<sup>r</sup> Cocc. de *fæd.*

The more, because here the punishment affects the dignity, as far as it can take place in the Godhead. For a time it did not manifest itself, but kept itself concealed beneath and behind the suffering humanity. Where punishment affects dignity, there (according to the doctrine of Crellius himself<sup>f</sup>) that redounds to the value of the sufferings. See concerning this, Phil. ii. 6, 7.

*Adher.* All God's works are not of infinite value; nor also whatever is done to him, though the Godhead be<sup>†</sup>.

*Ans.* Then the works of God and of the creatures will not differ essentially in value, and we owe neither eternal obedience, nor infinite thanksgiving on account of them. There is likewise a difference between *working and suffering*. Suffering as a punishment follows sin, and the penal evil follows the nature of the moral. The moral evil is reckoned according to the dignity of the person, against whom sin is committed; so then the penal evil must also be estimated according to the dignity of that person, who suffers for sin.

*Adher.* If this be so, why then was not the least suffering sufficient? to what purpose those bitter sorrows<sup>‡</sup>?

*Ans.* Because the curse of the law behoved to be suffered, and God to be sanctified, as the hater of sin,

<sup>f</sup> Contra Grot. p. 446.

<sup>†</sup> Socinus ibid.

<sup>‡</sup> Ibid.

before the Godhead could give worth to these sufferings<sup>w</sup>.

*Adher.* As the satisfaction must come from that nature which sinned, so also the worth; therefore not Christ's Godhead, but his manhood must communicate worth to his suffering. He who is condemned to carry any thing on his shoulders, will not fulfil that sentence, if another help him<sup>x</sup>.

*Ans.* Why should he not, when the Judge allows him a surety? It is enough, that the surety, who is of one nature with us, suffering in that nature, satisfy the curse of the law; his Godhead communicating the highest worth to these sufferings.

*Obj.* To be a Mediator of satisfaction, speaks an inferiority, which does not agree to the eternal God<sup>y</sup>.

*Ans.* Here two false foundations are laid<sup>z</sup>. 1<sup>st</sup>, That this speaks an inferiority. Why may not an equal be a Mediator with an equal, yea, a superior with an inferior? The Mediator must be according to the work? What is to be done here, can only be performed by the eternal God. See, Isa. xlv. 18, &c. 2<sup>dly</sup>, That all inferiority is an essential inferiority of whatever is in the Mediator. Here there is an inferiority, John xiv. 28. But it consists in the singular œconomy of fulfilling the work of redemption.

*Obj.* Is he God, then the Godhead gave worth to

<sup>w</sup> Cocc. summ. Theol. cap. 61. num. 15.

<sup>x</sup> Socin. ubi supra.

<sup>y</sup> Crell. de uno Deo patre, lib. 1. sect. 2. cap. 27.

<sup>z</sup> Cocc de fœd. par. 94, 95.

these sufferings, by which he is satisfied, and so Christ satisfied himself.

*Ans.* The satisfaction is made to the Judge, or to him who represents his person, who here is the Father. Although the fruit also redounds to the Son<sup>a</sup>. Or rather, satisfaction is made to the law, and thus it is not his lot to receive, or to satisfy himself.

*Obj.* He who justifieth the wicked, and he who condemneth the just, even they both are an abomination to the Lord, Prov. xvii. 15.

*Ans.* We confess, that Christ is righteous, and we unrighteous<sup>b</sup>. Nevertheless, it is true, that God *justifieth the ungodly*, Rom. iv. 5; &c. And made him who knew no sin, to be sin, 2 Cor. v. 21. and both these justly. How then comes this to pass? He laid our sins upon the surety, and he imputes his righteousness to us; and so here the righteous is condemned, and the ungodly justified, upon the footing of righteousness. Neither does this contradict Solomon's doctrine. For he condemneth these things, when done in opposition to justice. But when they proceed on that foundation, then the law is fulfilled, and the act must be approved. Thus the text is for us. For according to the doctrine of Socinus, that happens, which this text forbids as an abomination. For he teaches, that the righteous Christ, was without suretyship, condemned by the Father to such accursed sufferings; and that we are justified without a satisfac-

<sup>a</sup> Cocc. de fæd. par. 92.

<sup>b</sup> Cocc. summ. Theol. cap. 61. num. 12.

tion to the law. According to his doctrine therefore it is done without the foundation of justice, and this is the abomination, which Solomon here condemns.

*Obj.* God had no reason to let his Son satisfy in our stead. For either he ought not to will otherways, or he could not. The first militates against his mercy and munificence, the second sets limits to his infinite authority. By both, his name and honour would be violated <sup>c</sup>.

*Ans.* He could, yet he would not, because of his perfection, office, honour, and law. This was proved before. This exalts his mercy and authority. For they go hand in hand with his righteousness, Psal. lxxxv. 10. lxxxix. 14. and therefore he appoints our redemption by means wherein his infinite mercy and authority are most conspicuous.

*Adber.* Why is it not sufficient, that God renew and sanctify the sinner, and so restore him to blessed communion with himself? Why could not God effectuate this without a satisfaction, or without the satisfaction of Christ?

*Ans.* This *Why* is evident, and it follows from all those grounds, whereby we proved, that punishment is certain, when the rational creature hath sinned against God: yea, it follows from all those points of difference, which were handled in the first part of this Tractate. We have also answered this, upon the eleventh reason of the second point of difference. But since there are some, to whom this matter does not appear so absurd, although with us, they confess the

<sup>c</sup> Socin. de Serv. p. 3. cap. 11.

truth of Christ's satisfaction in our stead; we shall therefore be constrained to say something further concerning it. There are many reasons which teach, that such a renewing, without a satisfaction for deserved punishment, cannot be attributed to God, without prejudice to his honour. We shall mention some of them.

1<sup>st</sup>, God will not renew, or sanctify the sinner, without first sanctifying himself by *all means*<sup>d</sup>. Therefore we must first pray for *the hallowing of his name*. Without punishment he will not be sanctified by *all means*. For he is said to be sanctified by punishment upon the transgressors, Lev. x. 3. Isa. v. 16. Ezek. xxxviii. 23.

2<sup>dly</sup>, This renewing must needs take place, in order to restore and illustrate the law of nature, and not to darken it, or to tread it under foot: which would most certainly be the case, if God renewed without a satisfaction for punishment. For *that* law informs us of certain punishment, when sin is committed, as we have already seen.

3<sup>dly</sup>, This renewing must needs be according to God's image, and so accompanied with the knowledge of him, and with an acknowledgment and declaration of his virtues, 1 Pet. ii. 9. These are his holiness, justice, truth, zeal for his name, &c. These attributes cannot be displayed, without demanding punishment, when sin is committed.

4<sup>thly</sup>, God can renew and sanctify no sinner, with-

<sup>d</sup> Cocc. summ. Theol. cap. 10. num. 54. 58. 60. &c et. in 1 Pet. i. 18. 19.

out justifying him, 1 Cor. vi. 11. He cannot justify, where the righteousness of the law is not full. For otherways there is no righteousness, but an authorizing of sin. Therefore this renewing cannot be conceived here without a satisfaction.

5thly, No sinner can be renewed, if he do not approve, or justify the law of God. See, Pf. cxix. 128. How comes this to pass? By saying, *So then the law is holy, and the commandment is holy, and just, and good,* Rom. vii. 12. We must therefore declare it holy and righteous in its commands, promises and threatenings; and also hold that for unholy and unjust, which militates to the contrary. Thus then it is unholy and unjust, that *he* should not be accursed, who continueth not in all things. Therefore, there is no renewing, if there be not a satisfaction to the demand of the law.

6thly, God will not do *that* which makes the sinner think, that *he is like himself*, Pfal. l. 21. This renewing would have that effect. For thereby God would be silent, and not punish sin. Now, *not to be silent*, but on the contrary, *to punish*, is that which makes it visible, that God is not like the sinner. See this explained, Pfal. l. 21, 22.

7thly, The sinner is for his sin condemned to bondage under sin, and the law is the strength of sin. Thus the law denies all renovation to the sinner, because by it he is condemned, and shut up under the bondage of sin. Therefore, according to the sentence of the law, he cannot be honoured with renovation, if sin be not condemned by a satisfaction to the demand of the law.

Hence it is also taught, that Christ by his blood hath redeemed us from our vain conversation, 1 Pet. i. 18, 19. See also, Gal. i. 4. But enough of this.

*Obj.* The doctrine of Christ's satisfaction in our stead, is prejudicial to godliness.

*Ans.* Paul teaches the contrary, 1 Cor. vi. 15, 19, 20. 2 Cor. v. 15. Tit. ii. 14. 1 Pet. i. 18, 19. It is shown above, that these texts speak of this satisfaction. In this our doctrine, God's highest love is conspicuous, and he only is able to still the troubled conscience, and to comfort it against the curse of the law. The sight of this love, and the sense of this consolation, are the strongest arguments to godliness. For according to the love and comfort, the motives to godliness are powerful. See concerning this, Luke vii. 47. Psa. cxix. 32. If this doctrine be prejudicial to godliness, pray, why then has the Holy Ghost held forth our salvation by Christ, in words of *buying*, by ransoming, and redeeming from the curse? The Holy Ghost, who certainly aims at godliness, borrows no phrases from things, which are prejudicial to it, Who, truly, has the greatest reason to serve his deliverer? He who is delivered by a *mere pardon*, or he who is, by the most valuable ransom? Without doubt, the last. We will not deny, that worldlings may abuse this salutary truth. This, however, is often the unhappiness of that doctrine, which reforms most strongly, and comforts most sensibly. See, Rom. vi. 1. Jude 4. This arises not from the nature of the doctrine, but from the wickedness of mens inclinations, who abuse the highest good

unto their own destruction. We will therefore, turn this reason against our antagonists, and conclude thus; The Spirit of God, intending to encourage men to godliness, and to comfort them with redemption by Christ, setteth it forth in phrases, borrowed from a real buying and paying, as may be seen, 1 Cor. vi. 19, 20. Gal. iii. 13. 1 Pet. i. 18, 19. And even our antagonists do not deny it, although they take these phrases in an improper sense. Thus a true payment and satisfaction must reform in the most effectual manner, and comfort in the most sensible; and consequently our doctrine also, which pleads for this true atonement. Yea, thus Christ's satisfaction in our stead must be true. For otherways, in opposition to the intention of the Spirit in these texts, you weaken the powerful motive unto godliness, and the strong consolation you diminish: nay, you make the former idle, and the latter a thing of nought: which is to violate the word of God, and to cut its sinews.

We have now abundantly proved, *1<sup>st</sup>*, That the punishment of sin is certain when the rational creature hath sinned against God. *2<sup>dly</sup>*, That Christ satisfied the curse of the law in our stead. Under the grace of God then, our intention is accomplished, and the honour and glory of our Saviour vindicated. We conclude, therefore, with these words, *Worthy is the Lamb that was slain, to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and thanksgiving.*

THE  
ARTICLES OF AYR,  
CONTRASTED WITH THE  
ORACLES OF TRUTH;  
IN WHICH,  
A NUMBER OF PASSAGES  
IN

Dr. WILLIAM M'GILL's Essay on the Death of Christ, are  
compared with express Texts of Scripture :

The DOCTOR speaking on the Left-hand Page,  
And the SCRIPTURE on the Right.

BY THOMAS BELL,  
Minister of the Gospel in GLASGOW.

*The fire shall try every man's work, of what sort it is.* 1 Cor. iii. 13.

*Is not my word as a fire ? saith the Lord.* Jer. xxiii. 29.

*To the law and to the testimony : if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.* Isa. viii. 20.

---

GLASGOW:

PRINTED BY ALEX. ADAM.

M. DCC. XC.

1. **I** Humbly conceive it may be shewn, ESSAY, page  
 that the death of the Son of God  
 is not such a stumbling-block, as is ve-  
 ry hard for human reason to get over. 2

2. Christ seems not to have consider-  
 ed his excruciating death, as previously  
 fixed by an *absolute* divine decree. His  
 own predictions, and those of the an-  
 cient prophets, concerning this event,  
 might be *conditional*. 22

3. Might not that great anxiety which  
 Jesus felt in the garden, arise in part  
 from an apprehensiveness about the dif-  
 ficulty of maintaining a becoming tem-  
 per and deportment, under such unex-  
 periened and awful trials as did now  
 present themselves to him? 24

1. **W**E preach Christ crucified, 1 Cor. 1. 23.  
 unto the Jews a stumbling-  
 block, and unto the Greek foolishness.  
 The natural man receiveth not the — 2. 14.  
 things of the Spirit of God: for they  
 are foolishness unto him. Blessed is he Mat. 11. 6.  
 whosoever shall not be offended in me.
2. The man Gabriel talked with me, Dan. 9. 21.--  
 and said, Seventy weeks are *determined* 26.  
 upon thy people, and Messiah shall be  
 cut off. Truly the Son of man goeth Luke 22. 22.  
 as it was *determined*. Him being de- Acts 2. 23.  
 livered by the *determinate* counsel and  
 foreknowledge of God, ye have cru-  
 cified and slain. Thinkest thou that I Mat. 26. 53.  
 cannot now pray to my Father? But 54.  
 how then shall the scriptures be *fulfill-*  
*ed*, that thus it *must be*?
3. The Lord God will help me, Isa. 50. 7.  
 therefore shall I not be CONFOUNDED:  
 therefore have I set my face like a flint,  
 and I know that I shall not be ASHAM-  
 ED. Behold, the hour cometh, yea, John 16. 32.  
 is now come, that ye shall leave me a-  
 lone: and yet I am not alone, because  
 the Father is with me. Father, the and 17th;  
 hour is come; glorify thy Son, that throughout  
 thy Son also may glorify thee.

4. The blessed Jesus was made like unto us, though *more* pure and perfect. ESSAY, page  
25

5. He always behaved, it is true, with the utmost propriety, and performed the most difficult acts of virtue with admirable ease and dignity. That ease, however, we may well believe, was not the effect of carelessness and sloth, nor even of heavenly endowments alone; but of strict attention, and perfect moral discipline, joined with supernatural gifts. Although the *mutual struggles of reason and passion are a consequence of imperfection*, yet the victory of reason derives more value from that very circumstance <sup>a</sup>,

25, 26

<sup>a</sup> How soon our author begins to speak of the blessed Jesus as a mere man, yea, subject to imperfections, evidenced by the struggles between reason and passion! In page 25th, he tells us, that “the divine nature in him, did not absorb the human, or exempt him from the finelss infirmities thereof.” But in a few lines he speaks of him, as if he had not been exempted *even from these*. He grants that he performed the most difficult acts of virtue with admirable ease. So far well. But what makes acts of virtue difficult to any? Why, nothing but the depravity of nature. And therefore to him they could not be difficult. To us, there are some things *easy*, some *difficult*, and some *impossible in this life*. But no such observation can be applied to *the second man, the Lord*

4. We are all as an unclean thing, and all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags. Such an high priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, *separate from sinners*. They are altogether become filthy. Even their mind and conscience is defiled.

Isa. 64. 6.

Heb. 7. 26.

Psal. 14. 3.

Tit. i. 15.

5. God made man upright, but they have sought out many inventions. The second man is the Lord from heaven. The holy One and the just. I delight to do thy will, O my God: yea, thy law is within my heart. My meat is to do the will of him who sent me, and to finish his work. The prince of this world cometh, and hath *nothing* in me. Every man is tempted, when he is *drawn away of his own lust and enticed*.

Eccl. 7. 29.

1 Cor. 15. 47.

Acts 3. 14.

Pf. 40. 8.

John 4. 34.

— 14. 30.

James i. 14.

*from heaven.* All things enjoined in the precepts of the divine law were equally easy to him, that law being perfectly engraven on his heart, Psal. xl. 8. If that law be easy to us, in proportion as it is written in our hearts, Mat. xi. 30. 1 John v. 3. Heb. viii. 10. it must have been perfectly easy to him. Our author tells us, that *that ease with which the Saviour performed the most difficult acts of virtue, was not the effect of carelessness and sloth.* The amount of which is, that it was not the effect of sinful dispositions, for such are carelessness and sloth, Isa. xxxii. 9, 10. Matth. xxv. 26. But when he adds, *nor even of heavenly endowments alone,* we must beg leave to differ. Whence could his holy life proceed, but from a holy nature? Whence the limpid streams, but from the crystal fountain? No, says the Doctor, it was the effect of strict attention, and perfect moral discipline, &c. Why, this strict attention was itself the effect of a perfectly holy human nature, united to the

6. What would be the consequence of any unfuitable deportment under these new and singular trials? Any *failure* in the duties of charity, fortitude, and resignation, thus put to the sharpest proof? The very idea of it was dreadful. These considerations filled the Lord Jesus with painful apprehension, in this preparatory view which he took of his last sufferings.

ESSAY, page

27

divine in his person. He could not sin, and therefore he could not but be strictly attentive to duty in all its extent, Luke ii. 49. But adds the Doctor, "Although the mutual struggles of reason and passion are a consequence of imperfection, yet the victory of reason derives more value from that very circumstance." And did such struggles take place in the holy One of God? Did the bias of animal nature draw contrary to duty? Did the senses and passions discover a reluctance sufficient to call forth painful exertions of moral and religious principle, in order to perform what was right, as the Doctor speaks, page 25th? According to him it seems they did, else why talk of the mutual struggles of reason and passion? These struggles are acknowledged to be a consequence of imperfection, and at the same time they are mentioned as having existed in the Son of God. Certain it is, however, that they are not the consequences of our natural imperfection, as *human creatures*; but of our moral imperfection, as *fallen creatures*. For in the morning of primæval innocence, they were not known. Man was made after God's own image, Gen. i. 27. was very good, verse 31. was upright, Eccl. vii. 27. all within him was orderly and serene. His passions did not draw him *one way*, and his reason point out *another*. No, *they* were subordinate to *it*, and *it* to the law of God. Now, to suppose reason and passion struggling in our Lord, is to suppose him imperfect. Which is blasphemous.

6. He shall not FAIL, nor be discouraged. I have set my face like a flint, and I know that I shall not be ASHAMED. Behold, the Lord God will help me. I have set the Lord always before me: because he is at my right hand I shall not be MOVED. Jesus knew that his hour was come, that he should depart out of this world, unto the Father. Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in me, &c.	Isa. 42. 4. — 50. 7. 9. Pfal. 16. 8. John xiii. 1. — 14. 1. 15, 16, and 17.
--	--

my in effect. But argues the Doctör, the victory of reason derives *more value* from that very circumstance. Such a victory, however, supposes the soul to be the seat of war. And glorious as the victory may be, an holy and an honourable peace is preferable even to this successful war. *As much* as passion struggles with reason, *so much* sin is in the soul. It must ever bear proportion to the degree and duration of that passion. Suppose the man looking to the object desired, as Eve to the forbidden tree, or Achan to the golden wedge, the *higher* his passion rises, and the *longer* it continues, the *greater* is his guilt; whatever may be the victory of reason in the end. He who dashes the first motions of sins, as the brats of Babel against the stones, is less guilty than he in whom the contest long prevails, though victory at last declares on the side of reason. And now let me ask the Doctör, which is the better man? He in whom passion struggles with reason? or he in whom no such struggle ever exists? It is worthy of our observation, that our blessed Surety had to obey the precept, and to endure the penalty of the law. All his difficulties belonged to the latter, not to the former. In obedience to the preceptive part of the law, he had the most *intense delight*, Psal. xl. 8. In suffering the penalty, he exercised the *deepest submission*, Mat. xxvi. 39.—42.

7. The faith of his firmest friends and followers was to be shaken to its foundation, and all their fondest hopes *extinguished.* ESSAY, page 31

8. Another disciple would, by betraying him, become a son of perdition, and a monument of divine vengeance, notwithstanding every fuitable admonition and warning to prevent it. 31

9. Jesus foresaw what multitudes of the human race would finally perish, after he should have endured the death of the cross to save them. 32

10. O Father! Lord of heaven and earth! must thy Son suffer such things, and with so little benefit to the unhappy race of men? *But thy will be done!* 33

11. Thus we have mentioned divers probable causes of our Saviour's agony in the garden; but have said nothing of God's withdrawing his countenance

7. I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not. Did not our heart burn within us, while he talked with us by the way, and while he opened to us the scriptures? Luke 22. 32. — 24. 32.

8. Jesus answered, Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil? I know whom I have chosen. If they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us: but they went out, that they might be made manifest. John 6. 70. John 13. 18. 1 John 2. 19.

9. I lay down my life for the sheep. And I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish. Thou hast given thy Son power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him. John 10. 15. — — 28. John 17. 2.

10. He giveth not account of any of his matters. Who hath been his counsellor? Behold, the man whose name is the BRANCH. Even he shall build the temple, and he shall bear the glory. He shall see his seed: He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be SATISFIED. Job 33. 13. Rom. 11. 34. Zech. 6. 12. — 13. Isa. 53. 10. — 11.

11. Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him, he hath put him to grief. Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, and against the man that is my fellow, faith Isa. 53. 10. Zech. 13. 7.

from him, or inflicting secret torments on his soul; because that seems injurious to the character of God, and not agreeable to the truth of the gospel history<sup>b</sup>. ESSAY, page

12. He feels a momentary dejection, *irresolution*, and horror. 33

13. If he seemed to *betray* any marks of human weakness in the near prospect of his sufferings, it is certain he discovered nothing of that kind when actually engaged with them. 37

14. He had now the *mortification* to see this vessel of wrath prepared in his

<sup>b</sup> While our author would shun one error, he falls, alas, into another. He thinks it injurious to the character of God, to teach that he withdrew his countenance from our Saviour, and inflicted secret torments on his soul; not adverting, that without supposing this, our Saviour's *character*, must in point of magnanimity, sink below that of many martyrs. The difficulties mentioned by our author disappear, when we reflect, that here the Father supported the rights of Deity, and the Son stood in the place of sinners. One for whom the Doctor professes a high regard, expressly says, "That it was not the fear of dying on the cross, which made

the Lord of hosts. And about the ninth hour, Jesus cried with a loud voice, saying, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? God spared not his own Son. Mat. 27. 46. Rom. 8. 32.

12. Be not afraid of them that kill, the body, and after that have no more that they can do. What can *man* do unto me? I have set my face as a flint, and I know that I shall not be *ashamed*. I have set the Lord always before me: because he is at my right hand, I shall not be *moved*. Luke 12. 24. Pfal. 118. 6. Isa. 1. 7. Pfal. 16. 8.

13. I do *always* those things that please him. He became obedient even unto death: was a Lamb without *blemish* and without spot. He offered himself without spot to God. John 8. 29. Phil. ii. 8. Heb. 9. 14.

14. Jesus did not commit himself to them, because he knew all men. He John 2. 24. — 6. 64.

“ *him speak and pray in the manner here related, is evident from this, that to suppose it, would be to degrade our Lord’s CHARACTER infinitely. Make his sufferings as terrible as possible; clothe them with all the aggravating circumstances imaginable; yet if no more is included in them but the pains of death, for Jesus whose human nature was strengthened far beyond the natural pitch, by its union with the divine, to have shrunk at the prospect of them, would shew a weakness which many of his followers were strangers to, encountering more terrible deaths, without the least emotion.*”

MACKNIGHT’S HARMONY, Sect. 132.

own family, and all the pains taken to amend him, *absolutely lost and thrown away*. And what a stumbling-block would it be to weak minds, against the faith of the gospel, that its author was betrayed by a companion, a confidant, and an apostle, who, if he could not be reformed, should, as it might be thought, have been long ago expelled from the Sacred College<sup>c</sup>?

ESSAY, page

49

15. Excepting hope in God, the repentance of Judas had every requisite qualification.

96

16. Jesus's *pretending* to be the Son

<sup>c</sup> Such the depths of divine wisdom, that human reason cannot find them. Meanwhile, we may be absolutely certain, that the only wife God our Saviour, had important purposes to serve, in choosing Judas to be an apostle. One is abundantly obvious, viz. that from him an enemy, and his acquaintance, he might have a most honourable testimony, as to his innocence. When he chose Judas, he knew well that he was a devil; and that he would be a spy upon him in all his actions, which at last should issue in his glory. Accordingly when that traitor had betrayed his Lord, and saw that he was condemned, such the force of truth upon his conscience, that he brought back the thirty pieces of silver to the chief priests and elders, declaring, that he had betrayed innocent blood. What an honourable testimony this to the character of our

*knew from the beginning*, who should betray him. Jesus answered them, Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil? I will be honoured upon Pharaoh. For this same purpose have I raised thee up, that my name might be declared throughout all the earth. Then Judas repented himself, saying, I have sinned, in that I have betrayed the *innocent blood*. Surely the wrath of man shall praise thee.

John 6. 70.

Exod. 14. 4.

Rom. 9. 17.

Mat. 27. 4.

Pfal. 76. 10.

15. That which is born of the flesh, is flesh. Neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. The carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be.

John 3. 6.

Mat. 7. 18.

Rom. 8. 7-

16. The Lord hath said unto me, Psal. 2. 7.

Lord! Who does not see that it was calculated to make deep impressions on the minds of all into whose knowledge it might come? yea, deeper than all the testimonies of the faithful eleven? It is the part of friendship to throw a veil over improprieties of conduct, while an enemy is eagle-eyed to discern, and generally industrious to discover whatever is culpable. Here an enemy, who for several years had been in our Lord's own family, and had access to know his private character, loudly declares his innocence. Had he been expelled long before, his testimony must have lost much of its weight. To have expelled him without evidence of guilt, would have been a bad precedent to church-governors, and might have tempted him to slander; but now, child of the devil as he was, he bears testimony to the truth.

of God, was really no more than what he had already confessed to Pilate, without giving him any offence, when he avowed himself to be *the King of the Jews*. ESSAY, page  
136

17. Pilate was already satisfied, from a former conversation with Jesus, of the harmlessness of his *pretensions*. 138

18. There is none of them (*priests, elders and scribes, Pilate, people and executioners*) for whom Jesus does not perform the office of an Advocate and Intercessor. 172

19. Had an *ordinary man*<sup>d</sup> been exposed to so long a combat with the powers of darkness, and to such various assaults of malice and cruelty, we should not have been surpris'd to hear him utter some complaints and murmurings, &c. 181

## 20. The perfect obedience of Christ

<sup>d</sup> The Doctor frequently opposes our Lord to an ordinary man, as in pages 257, 285, 287, never to a mere man. Hence there is but too great reason to conclude, that he believes he was a mere man only, though an *extraordinary*. True it is, he speaks of his divine nature and his human, page 25. But what he means by

Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee. What is his name, and what is his son's name, if thou canst tell? Thou art the Son of God; thou art the King of Israel. God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son.

Prov. 30. 4.

John 1. 49.

— 3. 16.

17. Christ Jesus witnessed before Pilate a good confession.

1 Tim. 6. 13.

18. Ask of me, and I shall give thee. I knew that thou hearest me always. I pray for them: I pray not for the world, but for them whom thou hast given me, for they are thine.

Pfal. 2. 8.

John 11. 42.

— 17. 9.

19. His name shall be called the mighty God. They shall call his name Immanuel, which being interpreted, is, God with us. Feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood. The second man is the Lord from heaven. Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us.

Isa. 9. 6-

Mat. 1. 23.

Acts 20. 28.

1 Cor. 15. 47.

1 John 3. 16.

20. Him hath God exalted to give

Acts 5. 31.

these phrases, is not easy to tell. Charity itself, which thinketh no evil, will scarce allow us to think, that he understands them in the sense in which they are commonly taken. To what his apparent contradictions must be ascribed, whether to a defect in mind, or in memory, does not belong to me to determine.

in his death, was made one reason for granting sinners the *means* of repentance.

ESSAY, page

234

21. God is willing to *overlook* involuntary frailties, and smaller blemishes, and even to allow the benefit of repentance, in case of wilful sins; but determined to punish with everlasting destruction, the obstinately wicked and impenitent<sup>e</sup>.

238

22. In this way, we are taught to hope for salvation, by the gospel; and

<sup>e</sup> It is not more comfortable than true, that there is no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus, though there are many things condemnable in them, Rom. viii. 1. This, however, is a privilege peculiar to them. None else have either part or lot in it. For Christ is become of no effect unto such as seek to be justified by the law: they are fallen from grace, Gal. v. 4. Our author, when speaking of God's overlooking involuntary frailties, and smaller blemishes, is professedly enquiring into his original plan, respecting the human race. Now, it is certain, that man in his original state was subject to no involuntary frailties, or blemishes. He bore his Maker's image, and therefore was every way qualified to yield perfect obedience to his law, Gen. i. 27. Eccl. vii. 29. He could not sin in an involuntary manner. He could not say, *that which I do, I allow not*, Rom. vii. 15. His first sin was not involuntary, but wilful, Rom. v. 18, 19. To talk of frailties and blemishes as existing in man from the beginning, smells rank of Socinianism. Our author makes little or no difference betwixt the pri-

*repentance* unto Israel. Then hath God — 11. 18.  
 also to the Gentiles *granted repentance*  
 unto life. Unto you it is *given* in the Phil. 1. 29.  
 behalf of Christ to *believe* on him.

21. The wrath of God is revealed Rom. 1. 18.  
 from heaven against *all ungodlinefs*.  
 Whatsoever the law saith, it saith to — 3. 19.  
 them who are under the law. Cursed Gal. 3. 10.  
 is every one who continueth not in *all*  
*things* which are written in the book  
 of the law to do them. For whosoever James 2. 10.  
 shall keep the whole law, and yet offend  
 in *one point*, he is guilty of all.

22. Unto Adam he said, Behold, Job. 28. 28.  
 the fear of the Lord, that is wisdom;

mitive and the present state of man. Accordingly he speaks of man's trying his own strength to gain eternal life merely by his own obedience, without the assistance of a Mediator; implying, that finding himself unable, then he was to ask and use that assistance. What a medley this! Going on in the same train of confusion, he tells us, it was never God's intention to save men by what is called the covenant of works without grace. And for this plain reason, because the thing is impracticable for such creatures as we are. Still he makes no difference betwixt a *fallible* and a *fallen* state. Upright Adam was in the former, we in the latter. What we were in him our federal Head, and what we are in our own persons, are very different things. The Doctor further tells us, that by the covenant of works our first parents themselves were not saved. But why? For this plain reason, because they brake it, Hof. vi. 7. Rom. v. 12.—19. Having once broken it, they could no more be saved by it, than we their posterity can.

none of our kind, strictly speaking, could ever be saved on any other terms. That a frail and fallible creature, such as man is in his *best estate*, endowed with animal passions, as well as reason, and allied, by the constitution of his nature, both to angels, and to brutes, should be able to secure his happiness forever, by his own perfect obedience; He who made him, knew it to be impossible <sup>f</sup>.

ESSAY, page

238

<sup>f</sup> Our author still goes upon the supposition that man suffered little by the fall, and that our nature is much the same in point of purity, as at the first. That man in innocence was a fallible creature, we cannot deny: but that it was *then* impossible for him to secure eternal happiness by his own perfect obedience, we utterly refuse. That he *did not* secure his happiness, is no proof that he *could not*. What, though he was endowed with animal passions, fitting him for the enjoyments of that state in which he was placed? These laid him under no impossibility of securing eternal bliss. They were entirely subordinate to his reason and will, which lay straight with the will of God. As all things were made very good, so was man. Animal appetites were not contrary to the will, nor it to the law of God. Otherways there should have been a conflict in man from the beginning, arising from the very constitution of his nature; his animal passions drawing him one way, while his reason pointed out another. Though alas, it be thus with us now, yet *from the beginning it was not so*. Our first parents were endowed with strength sufficient to keep the covenant. That they did not, was not owing to *want of power*, but to their not *exercising that power*. So he who has the power of sight, may shut his eyes. And to say the truth, if man was not endowed at first with ability to keep the law, it was but just in God to overlook involun-

and to depart from evil, is understanding. In the day that thou eatest of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt surely die. Moses describeth the righteousness which is of the law, That the man who doeth those things shall live by them. The law is not of *faith*: but, The man that *doeth them* shall live in them. If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments. The commandment which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death. The law became weak through the flesh.

Gen. 2. 17.  
Rom. 10. 5.  
Gal. 3. 12.  
Mat. 19. 17.  
Rom. 7. 10.  
—— 8. 3.

tary frailties and imperfections, he not being the austere, reaping where he did not sow. Agreeable to this principle, it is observable, that our author puts God's allowances for involuntary frailties and imperfections to the score of justice, and not to that of mercy. He does not speak of *merciful* allowances, such as are celebrated by the scripture-saints, Psal. ciii. 13, 14. cxxx. 3. 6. but of equitable allowances, page 529, implying, that it would be unjust in God not to make them. He speaks of the gospel indeed; but it is the Galatian gospel, Gal. i. 6. not the glorious, 1 Tim. i. 11. He all along proceeds on the supposition that our nature suffered little by the fall: a radical error, giving rise to many others. According to the scriptures, the fall was followed with two fatal effects, the condemnation of our persons, and the corruption of our nature, *for by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation*, Rom. v. 18. *And hence they are by nature the children of wrath*, Eph. ii. 3. *By one man sin entered into the world*, Rom. v. 10. And hence it is, that we are *shapen in iniquity, conceived in sin, and all as an unclean thing*, Psal. li. 5. Job xiv. 4.

23. Nor could man sustain any hurt by trying his own strength in this way to the utmost, and endeavouring to gain eternal life, he could, merely by his own obedience, without the assistance of a Mediator.

ESSAY, page

236

24. It was the good pleasure of Al-

xv. 14. Isa. lxiv. 6. Therefore, though now we cannot give perfect obedience to the law, it does not follow from thence that we *never could*. The apostle tells us, that the law became *weak thro' the flesh*, Rom. viii. 3. By the flesh we must not understand the animal passions, or sensitive appetites, but the total depravity of our nature. For to be in the flesh, stands opposed to being in Christ, Rom. viii. 8. 1. Such as are in Christ have animal passions, but they are not in the flesh, Rom. vii. 5. viz. not in an irregenerate state. The weakness which the apostle ascribes to the law, is not real, but relative. The law is the same that ever it was, holy, just, and good, verse 12. It is not become weak in itself, but weak in relation to us; we not being able to answer its demands. It is still saying, *The man who doeth these things shall live by them*, Rom. x. 5. Gal. iii. 12. But as we are without strength to do them, Rom. v. 9. it cannot now give us life, Gal. iii. 21. When the apostle teaches that the law became weak through the flesh, this evidently implies, that before man was in the state called flesh, i. e. before he fell, it was abundantly able to give him life. In the flesh, in the depravity of nature, dwelleth no good thing, Rom. vii. 18. And therefore, of man in that state it is expressly said, That every imagination of his heart was *only evil continually*, Gen. vi. 5. In his first state man bore his Maker's image, Gen. i. 27. and was very good, verse 31. in him there

23. God made man upright. By Eccl. 7. 29.  
 one man sin entered into the world, Rom. 5. 12.  
 and death by sin. They like Adam Hof. 6. 7.  
 have transgressed the covenant. The Rom. 6. 23.  
 wages of sin is death. They who are Mat. 9. 12.  
*whole* need not a physician, but they  
 who are *sick*. There is one Mediator 1 Tim. 2. 5.  
 between God and men, the man Christ  
 Jesus.

24. All that are in the graves shall John 5. 29.

was no evil thing, no animal bias to carry him off the straight line of duty. Then, then *he* could keep the law, and *it* could give him life. *He* being strong, *it* was not weak. Allow me to add, that all this seems to be implied in our Lord's answer to the young man, Matth. xix. 16, 17. Says the legalist, *Good Master, what good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life?* Our Lord replies. *If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments.* As the young man desired to live by doing, our Lord directs him at first unto the law. It is not till afterwards, that he bids him take up the cross and follow him, verse 21. compare Mark x. 21. The youth appealing as to Cesar, to Cesar he is sent. To him who was in a state of nature, the Saviour said, *If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments*; whence we may certainly infer, that God said the same in effect to the first man, who was well able to keep them. If this be not admitted, it necessarily follows, that the great Teacher come from God, here pointed out a way which was not known to man in his best estate, and which then only he could have trode with a steady foot: pointed out to fallen man, a way which never existed. "The end of giving the law, says Char-  
 "nock, was, that man might have eternal life by it: there would  
 "else be no strength or truth in that answer of Christ to that  
 "ruler."

mighty God, that this death should not be eternal, as the rigour of the law required it to be, but only temporary : that mankind should be delivered from it by a resurrection, &c.

ESSAY, page

240

25. Had the Jews received Jesus with the respect and submission due to the Messiah, as they ought to have done, it is certain he would not have suffered at their hands in the manner he did ; and who will say that he would have been thereby prevented from being a Saviour to them, and to the rest of mankind ?

243

N. B. We must have perished if he had not died.

420

§ This seems to me one of the most subtile passages in the whole of the Essay. The first part of the sentence is so evidently true, that it cannot be denied. And to it the author subjoins a question, which he takes to be very pungent. “ Who will say, &c.” This question I would answer by proposing another. Had Joseph’s brethren treated him as they ought to have done, would he have been thereby prevented from being a saviour to them, and to the Egyptians? How our author would answer this, I shall not say. Meanwhile, I make no difficulty in averring, that if Joseph’s brethren had treated him as they ought, he would have been thereby prevented from being a saviour to them, and to Egypt. Had

come forth, they that have done good, unto the resurrection of *life*; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of *damnation*. Then shall the King say unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels. Mat. 25. 41.

25. But how then shall the scriptures be fulfilled, that thus it must be? Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory? Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer. Verily, verily I say unto you, Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth *alone*: but if it die, it bringeth forth *much fruit*. Mat. 26. 54. Luke 24. 26. — — 46. John 12. 26.

they so treated him, they would not have hated him; Gen. xxxvii. 4. had they not hated him, they would not have sold him; verse 28. had they not sold him to the Midianites, he would not have been sold by them to Potiphar; verse 39. had he not been in Potiphar's house, he would not have been accused by Potiphar's wife; chap. xxxix. 2.—19. had he not been accused by her, Potiphar would not have cast him into prison; verse 20. had he not been there, he would not have interpreted the butler's dream, chap. xl. 13. and had he not, the butler would not have recommended him to Pharaoh, as an interpreter of dreams; chap. xli. 12, 13. had he not thus obtained that monarch's favour, he would not have

26. To suffer many indignities, and to die on a cross, were not the chief and ultimate ends of our Saviour's mission, nor any direct ends of it at all, but only incidental calamities, which could not fail to come upon him in discharging the duties of his mission faithfully, amidst an evil and adulterous generation.

ESSAY, page

244

been set over all the land of Egypt ; verse 39.—45. and had he not been governor there, he could not have saved his brethren, and the Egyptians. Thus it was, that God did send him to save many people alive, Gen. xlv. 5. l. 20. Psal. cv. 17. In his case, and in that of our Saviour, a holy God used the malice of men to accomplish his deep designs, Acts ii. 23. According to our author, the blessed Jesus could have had a seed, though he had not made his soul an offering for sin, Isa. liii. 10. And there was *no necessity* that the heavenly things should be purified with better sacrifices than the Mosaical, Heb. ix. 23. According to him, sins could have been remitted without the shedding of blood, verse 22. They could have been taken away without any blood at all, Heb. x. 4. He proposes it as an unanswerable question, “ Who will say, &c.” Amongst many others, there are two who will say so. The one is his worthy friend Dr. Macknight, to whom he acknowledges himself much indebted, page 351. For in his harmony, sect. 27. note, the Doctor expresses himself thus, “ *Had the Jews universally become Christ's followers, they would have endeavoured to make him a King, by which means, one main end of his coming must have been defeated, his dying as an atonement for sin ; and the Christian*

26. God sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins. In all things it behoved him to be like unto his brethren, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. He is the Mediator of the New Testament, that by the *means of death*, for the expiation of the transgressions, &c. For where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator. Every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices: wherefore it is of necessity that this priest have somewhat to offer. I lay down my life for the sheep: this commandment have I received of my Father. The Son of man came to give his life a ransom for many. My blood is shed for many for the remission of sins.

1 John 4. 10.

Heb. 2. 17.

— 9. 15.

— 16.

— 8. 3.

John 10. 15.

18.

Mat. 20. 28.

— 26. 28.

*“ religion have been deprived of the evidence which it derives from the greatest of all his miracles, his resurrection from the dead.”*

The other who says so, is our author himself. For in his Essay, page 420, he expressly asserts, that “ We must have perished if Christ had not died.” Is not this to say, that if Christ had not died, he would thereby have been prevented from being a Saviour to the Jews, and to the rest of mankind? This is but one of the many inconsistencies with which the Essay abounds; whether through ignorance or design, would be too much positively to assert.

27. The direct and immediate end of his mission, was to preach the gospel of the kingdom; to confirm his doctrine by proper evidences; to set an *example* of what he taught, &c. ESSAY, page  
245

28. Jesus himself supposes, that his being saved from death, was not absolutely inconsistent with the salvation of men. 246

29. It never was the intention of Almighty God, to save men by what is called a covenant of works, without grace; and for this plain reason, because the thing is impracticable for such creatures as we are. By it our first parents *themselves* were not saved. 251

30. The supreme Law-giver determined from the beginning, to mitigate in our favour the rigour of law, to make allowance for human error and *imperfection*, and to accept of repent-

27. Christ loved the church, and gave himself for it. He once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God. Take the prophets for an *example* of suffering affliction, and of patience.

Eph. 5. 25.  
1 Pet. 3. 18.  
James 5. 10.

28. If it be *possible*, let this cup pass from me. It became him to make the captain of their salvation perfect thro' sufferings. For it is *not possible* that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins.

Mat. 26. 39.  
Heb. 2. 10.  
—— 10. 4.

29. The law became weak through the flesh. By grace are ye saved. And if *by grace*, then it is no more *of works*: otherways grace is no more grace, &c. By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin. The Lord God said unto the serpent, I will put enmity between thee and *the woman*, and her seed shall bruise thy head. Where' is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? of works? Nay: but by the law of faith. For these are the two covenants.

Rom. 8. 3.  
Eph. 2. 8.  
Rom. 11. 6.  
—— 5. 12.  
Gen. 3. 15.

30. Cursed is every one that *continueth not in all things* which are written in the book of the law to do them. What things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law.

Rom. 3. 27.  
Gal. 4. 24.  
Gal. 3. 10.  
Rom. 3. 19.

ance and sincere obedience, instead of  
sinless perfection.

ESSAY, page

251

31. God abates of his own right, that the condition of man may not be forlorn. Where there is a right, there is a power to moderate and abate of that right, yea to part with it, if we please. Any man may take less than his right, may pardon upon *any satisfaction*, upon no *satisfaction*. We all say we have this right, and will we deny it to God?—Whichcot's Aphorisms quoted.

251

32. The perfect obedience of Christ in his death, was made a reason for extending mercy to persons not otherwise *entitled to it*<sup>h</sup>. Our blessed Saviour died on a cross, to render us the objects of divine mercy.

255, 449

<sup>h</sup> To talk of a title to mercy is absurd. If we have a title to a thing, it is not mercy, but justice to give it us.

Moses describeth the righteoufness Ro. 10. 5.—  
 which is of the law, That the man who 10.  
 doeth those things, shall live by them.  
 But the righteoufness which is of faith,  
 speaketh on this wise, Say not, &c.

31. The Lord of hosts shall be ex- Ifa. 5. 16.  
 alted in judgment, and God, that is  
 holy, shall be sanctified in righteouf-  
 ness. JEHOVAH, JEHOVAH, *will by no* Exod. 34. 7.  
*means* clear the guilty. The Lord *will* Nah. 1. 3.  
*not at all* acquit the wicked. Thou Pfal. 50. 21.  
 thoughtest that I was altogether such a  
 one as thyself. Avenge not *yourselfes*, Rom. 12. 19.  
 for it is written, Vengeance is mine; I  
 will repay, saith the Lord. Is God Rom. 3. 5, 6.  
*unrighteous* who taketh vengeance? (I  
 speak as a man) God forbid: for then  
 how shall God judge the world? It *be-* Heb. 2. 10.  
*came him*, for whom are all things, and  
 by whom are all things, in bringing  
 many sons into glory, to make the cap-  
 tain of their salvation perfect through  
 sufferings. It was therefore *necessary*, — 9. 23.  
 &c.

32. *I will* have mercy on whom *I* Rom. 9. 15.  
*will* have mercy. God *so* loved the John 3. 16.  
 world, that he gave his only begotten  
 Son. Whom he hath set forth to be a Rom. 3. 25.  
 propitiation through faith in his blood, 26.  
 that he might be just, and the justifier  
 of him who believeth in Jesus.

33. Let us consider the influence of true piety and virtue in ordinary men, for procuring divine blessings to others, as well as themselves, and to persons less worthy than they. Sinful men have often received very valuable benefits, not only through the instrumentality, but on account of the virtue of others. Sinners, in the time of their calamity, look up to the righteous as their favourites, and seek an interest in their prayers, when they cannot pray for themselves.

ESSAY, page  
257, 260, 272

34. Repentance is the only radical cure of the sinner's misery.

268

35. God suffers the piety of the virtuous to overflow to the good of all with whom they are connected, or for whom they interest themselves. He is pleased to accept of it at their hands, both on their own behalf, and in some sort too as *the price of benefits* bestowed on the undeserving. To them the wicked are indebted, under God, for their conversion and salvation, if ever they be happy enough to attain it.

269, 270

33. Unto *thee* lift I up mine eyes, Psal. 123. 1.  
 O thou that dwellest in the heavens.  
 Look unto *me*, and be ye saved, all the Ifa. 45. 21,  
 ends of the earth : for I am God, and 22.  
 there is none else. A just God and  
 a Saviour, there is *none* besides me.  
 Neither is there salvation in *any* other : Acts 4. 12.  
 for there is none other name under hea-  
 ven given among men, whereby we  
 must be saved. Thus saith the Lord, Jer. 17. 5.  
 Cursed be the man that *trusteth* in man,  
 and maketh flesh his arm.

34. With his stripes we are healed. Ifa. 53. 6.  
 A new heart also will I give you, and Ezek. 36. 26.  
 a new spirit will I put within you : and  
 I will take away the stony heart out of  
 your flesh, and I will give you an heart  
 of flesh.

35. If thou, Lord, shouldst mark ini- Psal. 130. 3.  
 quities : O Lord, who shall stand ? For Rom. 3. 23.  
 all have sinned, and *come short* of the  
 glory of God. Was Paul crucified for 1 Cor. 1. 13.  
 you ? Ye are not your own, for ye are — 6. 19, 20.  
 bought with a price. With the preci- 1 Pet. 1. 19.  
 ous blood of Christ, as of a Lamb with-  
 out blemish and without spot. God for- Gal. 6. 14.  
 bid that I should glory, save in the cross  
 of our Lord Jesus Christ. In the Lord If. 45. 24, 25.  
 have I righteousness and strength : In

36. The eminent patience, piety, submission, and benevolence, which Christ displayed at the close of life, avail with God in favour of sinners, in the *same manner* as do the piety and virtue of good men in general; only the effects of such singular excellencies are *proportionally greater* and more extensive.

ESSAY, page

275, 276

37. Christ is the propitiation (or expiatory victim) for our sins, and for the sins of the whole world, provided they be forsaken.

278

38. The worthiness of Christ was most eminently displayed in his *endeavouring to save* men at the price of his blood.

279

39. He prayed not for the world,

the Lord shall all the seed of Israel be justified, and shall glory. The foolish virgins said unto the wise, Give us of your oil. But the wise answered, saying, Not so; lest there be not *enough* for us and you. Mat. 25. 8. 9.

36. There is *one Mediator* between God and men, the man Christ Jesus. Jesus saith, I am the way, and the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father but *by me*. Neither is there salvation in any other. Who then is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers by whom ye believed, even as the Lord gave to every man? Was Paul crucified for you? He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord. Who his ownself bare our sins. 1 Tim. 2. 6. John 14. 6. Acts 4. 12. 1 Cor. 3. 5. — 1. 13. — 1. 31. 1 Pet. 2. 24.

37. I lay down my life for the sheep, and I give unto them eternal life. Jesus Christ gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from *all iniquity*, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of *good works*. John 10. 15. 28. Tit. 2. 14.

38. He *shall save* his people. It is the Fathers will who sent me, that of all which he hath given me, I should *lose nothing*, but should raise it up again at the last day. Mat. 1. 21. John 6. 39.

39. I pray for them whom thou hast John 17. 9.

the reprobate generation of impenitent finners; because while they continue such, *nothing can be done* for them<sup>i</sup>. ESSAY, page  
280

N. B. What more have I to ask of thee, O my God! *but a heart* to value and improve these benefits? 550

40. The holiness and righteousness of Christ, can procure substantial good to none but such as are disposed to improve the grace conferred on them through him. It can obtain pardon for finners, only by bringing them to repentance. 282

41. We are not said any where in the New Testament, to be saved by the merits of Christ. 284

42. Nor are we ever directed in scripture expressly, to ask any thing of God *for Christ's sake*, or for his merits. 284

<sup>i</sup> That is, nothing can be done for them, till they do something for themselves. But if nothing can be done for finners while they continue impenitent, how is it that they are brought to repentance? As life is previous to action, so must the new heart to repentance. If nothing can be done for us till we become penitent, heaven we shall never see. For sooner shall the Ethiopian change

given me, for they are thine. Is my hand shortened at all, that *it cannot* redeem? or have I *no power* to deliver? I was found of them that sought me not; I was made manifest unto them that asked not for me. Thou shalt be called Sought out. The grace of our Lord was exceeding abundant; &c. I am apprehended of Christ Jesus.

40. Unto you it is given in behalf of Christ, to believe on him. Ye have obtained like precious faith with us, through the righteousness of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ. I will give them one heart and one way, that they may fear me for ever. I will put my fear in their hearts, that they shall not depart from me.

41. Ye are *bought with a price*: With the blood of Christ: Who gave himself a ransom for all.

42. Paul, as his manner was, *reasoned* out of the scriptures. Let thy hand be upon the man of thy right

his skin, than we of ourselves can do good, Jer. xiii. 23. The truth is, Christ's intercession is the cause of our repentance, and not repentance the cause of it. There is a word spoken *for us*, and a work wrought *in us*, ere we commence true penitents, John xvii. 24. Ezek. xi. 19, 20. Zech. xii. 10. Cannot God give the impenitent that heart, which our author asks for himself? page. 520.

N. B. We have considered the benefits which sinners receive from God *for the sake of Christ.* ESSAY, page  
294

43. Righteousness including every branch of duty, differs in our blessed Lord, and in *ordinary* men, only in the degree of it. No *ordinary* man's virtue can come up to the purity and rectitude of the divine law: the obedience of Jesus Christ himself, did not exceed it, and how then can ours? 285, 287

44. The merit of our Lord Jesus Christ, compared with the *best of men*, was unspeakably great and transcendant: yet it did not equal, even in his case, the munificence of God in rewarding it\*. 288

\* What awful doctrine this from a master in Israel? Is it indeed so, that Christ was rewarded above his merit? received greater glory than he deserved? In person he is equal to God, and yet it seems the work on the one side, did not equal the reward on the other. Who that believes the divinity of our Lord, can hear this without horror?

hand : upon the son of man whom thou hast made strong for thyself. Cause thy face to shine on thy sanctuary that is desolate, *for the Lord's sake*. Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you.

43. This is the name whereby he shall be called, JEHOVAH is our righteousness. He hath made him to be sin for us, that we might be made the *righteousness of God* in him. If by one man's offence, death reigned by one; much more they who receive *abundance* of grace, and of the *gift of righteousness*, shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ.

44. Awake, O sword, against the man who is my fellow, saith the Lord of hosts. Christ Jesus, subsisting in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God. Nevertheless, he made himself of no reputation, &c. Wherefore God hath also highly exalted him. Unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever. Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; *therefore* God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness. *Worthy is* the Lamb that was slain, to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing.

Dan. 9. 17.

John 16. 23.

Jer. 23. 6.

2 Cor. 5. 21.

Rom. 5. 17.

Zech. 13. 7.

Phil. 2. 6—9

Heb. 1. 8. 9.

Rev. 5. 12.

45. Christ was selected and separated on account of his unblemished holiness, to be the medium of all God's intercourse with men. ESSAY, page

289

46. The least worthy are invited, (*to come to him through the Mediator*) provided they repent and believe the gospel<sup>1</sup>.

290

47. All are instructed in the most affecting manner, what it is that will recommend them to God, and what they must aspire after, in order to have communion with him.

290

48. He hath put it in our power, by the practice of righteousness, to be happy ourselves, and blessings to others.

291

<sup>1</sup> And are they not invited, except or till they repent? Is the invitation limited and conditional? Are not the most unworthy invited to repent and believe? Isa. lv. 6, 7. Believing is not a qualification required in them that come, or as giving a right to come, but the coming itself, Matth. xi. 28. John vi. 35. 1 Pet. ii. 4. Our author's doctrine therefore amounts just to this, The least worthy are invited to come, provided they come.

45. I was set up from *everlasting*. Prov. 8. 23.  
 The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, be- Luke 4. 18.  
 cause he hath anointed me to preach  
 the gospel to the poor. It pleased the  
 Father, that in him should all fulness  
 dwell. Col. 1. 19.

46. Turn ye, turn ye, from your e- Ezek. 33. 11.  
 vil ways; for why will ye die, O house  
 of Israel? We pray you in Christ's 2 Cor. 5. 20.  
 stead, be ye reconciled unto God.  
 Whosoever will, let him take the wa- Rev. 22. 17.  
 ter of life freely.

47. He hath made us accepted *in the* Eph. 1. 6.  
*beloved*. By grace are ye saved: not  
 of works, lest any man should boast. — 2. 8, 9.  
 I count them but dung that I may win  
 Christ, and be found in him; not hav-  
 ing mine own righteousness, but that  
 which is through the faith of Christ,  
 &c. Phil. 3. 8, 9.

48. We were without strength. No Rom. 5. 6.  
 man can come unto me, except the Fa- John 6. 44.  
 ther who hath sent me, draw him. The Deut. 29. 4.  
 Lord hath not given you an heart to  
 perceive, and eyes to see, and ears to  
 hear, unto this day. Thou knowest  
 not that thou art wretched, and miser- Rev. 3. 17.  
 able, and poor, and blind, and naked.

49. Even in his state of humiliation, *Jesus had power to forgive sins on earth,* *ESSAY, page*  
 or to remit the temporal penalties of sin. But after his exaltation, he had power to forgive sins in heaven, by remitting to penitent sinners the punishments due to their sins in another world, or delivering them from the wrath to come. 302

N. B. He assures this sincere, though late penitent, of a place with him that very day in paradise. As he had *always with full authority,* granted to sinners the benefit of pardon, when they shewed signs of true repentance, so he continues to do the same with his latest breath. 173, 174

50. The glorified Jesus straightway appears in the divine character of a Creator, or the author of a new creation, which extends to all things in heaven and earth. Being begun in himself, the first-born of it, Rom. viii. 29. by his resurrection from the dead, Col. i. 15. 18. It was afterwards all left to be accomplished by his own mediatorial power, the Father having given all things into his hand <sup>m</sup>. 303

<sup>m</sup> Our author seems here to set foot on Socinian ground. For having observed that some of the texts quoted by him, are universally allowed to refer to the new creation, he adds, "*It ap-*

49. Her sins, which are many, are forgiven; for she loved much. And he said unto her, Thy sins are forgiven: Thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace. And the malefactor said unto Jesus, Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom. And Jesus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, To day shalt thou be with me in paradise.

Luke 7. 74.  
48.  
50.  
—— 23. 42,  
43.

50. We have redemption through his blood, Who is the image of the invisible God, the *Former* of every creature at first: For by him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, &c. And he is before all things, and by him all things consist.

Col. 1. 14.  
15.  
16.  
17.

*“ pears to me, that when they are all understood to relate to the same subject, they throw light on one another.”* Now, it is certain, that the Socinians understand Col. i. 16. of the new creation. And if so understood, so far from throwing light on any other text, it itself is vastly obscured. For then, by creating all things that are in heaven and in earth, we must not understand the creation wherof Moses speaks, Gen. i. and which is a proof of eternal power and Godhead, Rom. i. 20. And by Christ's being before all things,

51. He hath given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as *shall enjoy the same*; to all the virtuous and holy in every age and nation from the beginning to the end of time.

ESSAY, page

310

cannot be meant that he existed from eternity, but only was before the new creation in point of time, as says the Doctor, page 306, i. e. existed before his resurrection from the dead, wherein that new creation began. The Doctor tells us, that he would not wish any texts to be interpreted otherways than according to the rules of sound criticism. If to these we adhere, his sense of Col. i. 14. must be rejected. The celebrated critic Bengelius, observes, that the rhetorical figure *Anaphora*, used verse 18. shews that there a new subject begins. The apostle having given thanks unto the Father, who had translated him and the saints at Colosse into the kingdom of his dear Son. verse 12.—14, is immediately carried away as in sacred rapture, in the contemplation of the blessed Redeemer, verse 15.—20. He first contemplates him, in his person, and his works of creation and providence, verses 15, 16, 17. and then in his offices and relations to his church, verses 18, 19, 20. And pleasant it is to see how he uses the same manner of speaking in both. Compare,

1st, Verse 15th. *Who is the image of the invisible God.*

Verse 18th. *And he is the head of the body the church.*

2dly, Verse 15th. *The Former of every creature at first.*

Verse 18th. *The beginning, the first-born from the dead.*

3dly, Verse 16th. *For by him were all things created, &c.*

Verse 19th. *For it pleased the Father, that in him should allfulness dwell.*

4thly, Verse 17th. *And he is before all things, and by him all things consist.*

Verse 20th. *And having made peace through the blood of his cross, &c.*

51. Thou hast given him power over John 17. 2.  
 all flesh, that he should give eternal life  
 to as many as *thou hast given him*. I  
 pray not for the world, but for them — 9.  
 whom thou hast given me. Father, — 24.  
 I will that they also whom thou hast  
 given me, be with me where I am;  
 that they may behold my glory which  
 thou hast given me.

It must be obvious to the unprejudiced, that two distinct subjects are handled here, and therefore to confound them, as our author does, by connecting the 19th verse immediately with the 17th, (*By him all things consist. For it pleased the Father, that in him should all fulness dwell, &c.*) is a gross violation of the rules of sound criticism, as overleaping the true antecedent in verse 18th, to which the 19th so obviously refers. As to our reading, *The Former of every creature at first*, and not the *first-born of every creature*, it cannot be denied that this reading has the sanction of antiquity, is most agreeable to the scope of the passage, and is what the word *πρωτόγονος* will bear. It was adopted by Isidore of Pelusium, who flourished about the year 430, was a man of uncommon learning and sanctity: and whose epistles, still extant, discover more piety, genius, erudition and wisdom, than are to be found in the voluminous productions of many other writers. It is quite agreeable to the scope of the passage, as is obvious from the slightest inspection. *Who is the image of the invisible God, the Former of every creature at first; for by him were all things created that are in heaven, &c.* and it is what the word *πρωτόγονος* will bear. It is well known, that it has not only a passive signification, referring to what is brought forth, viz. the first-born; but also an active, referring to the dam that produces her first birth. Witness Homer's Iliad, book 17th, line 4th, *ὡς τις μητήρ, Πρωτόγονος*. As some mother, when she has first brought forth. Compare Gen. ii. 4. Job 38. 29.

52. The acquisition of this power, ESSAY, page  
 was the joy set before him, for the sake  
 of which, and not by way of *punish-*  
*ment*, he endured the cross, and despis-  
 ed the shame of it. 312

53. There is no doubt but God Al-  
 mighty could have found *other methods*

Pfal. xc. 2. The only plausible objection against our reading, is, that we assign one sense to the word *πρωτότοκος* in the 15th verse, and another in the 18th, reading there the first Begetter, and here the first-born. But does not the subject itself require this? For in verses 16, 17. our blessed Lord is considered as active, *By him were all things created, &c.* Whereas in verses 18, 19. he is considered as passive, *He is the head of the body the church.* Compare Eph. i. 22. *It pleased the Father, that in him should all fulness dwell.* Now, this being undeniably the case, why may we not read *πρωτότοκος*, the first Begetter, in the one passage, and *πρωτότοκος*, the first-born, in the other? since the learned allow, that the different position of the accent gives a different signification to the word; not to urge, that these different significations of one and the same word, agree well with the rhetorical figure which is here observed by critics. It is generally said in opposition to the Socinian gloss, that *πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως*, signifies, begotten or born before every creature, referring the words to the eternal generation of the Son. But it may justly be doubted whether this be the sense of the phrase. Two things are certain. The one is, that it conveys no such sense to the English reader. For as the first-born of the dead, implies that our Lord was really dead; so the first-born of every creature, naturally suggests to the English reader, that he truly is a creature, though the first of creatures, as the Socinians

52. He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the *punishment* of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed. Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a *curse* for us. Who his ownself bare our sins in his own body on the tree.

Isa. 53. 5.

Gal. 3. 13.

1 Pet. 2. 24.

53. In the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die. God cannot lie. He cannot deny himself. JEHOVAH, JEHOVAH; God merciful and gracious: forgiving iniquity, and transgression, and sin: and who will by *no means clear the guilty*. God *so* loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son. He spared not his own

Gen. 2. 17.

Tit. 1. 2.

2 Tim. 2. 13.

Ex. 34. 6, 7.

John 3. 16.

Rom. 8. 32.

speak. The other is, that this interpretation does not at all agree with the sense of the phrase, as used by the Septuagint. Witness, Exod. xii. 29. *ἕως πρωτότοκου τῆς αιχμαλωσίας, και ἕως πρωτότοκου παντός κτηνός.* *To the first-born of the captive, and to the first-born of all cattle.* Chap. xxxiv. 20. *παν πρωτότοκων των υἱῶν σου λυτρώση,* *all the first-born of thy sons thou shalt redeem.* Num. iii. 50. *Παρά τῶν πρωτότοκων των υἱῶν Ισραήλ ἔλαβε το αργυριον.* *Of the first-born of the children of Israel took he the money.* Neh. x. 36. *Και τα πρωτότοκα υἱῶν ἡμῶν, και κτηνῶν ἡμῶν.* *Also the first-born of our sons and of our cattle.* The first-born of the Egyptians, were Egyptians; the first-born of beasts, were beasts. Hence it naturally follows, one would think, that the first-born of every creature, is a mere creature. And because this cannot be said of our Lord, therefore Col. i. 15. is to be read, the first Begetter of every creature, or the Former of every creature at first.

of saving us, *without the bloody passion* ESSAY, page  
of his dear and only Son°. 316

N. B. The purchase of redemption  
could be made *only by the blood of Christ*. 487

° According to our author, the Almighty could have done in the true redemption, as in the typical. He led the Israelites not through the way of the land of the Philistines, although that was *near*: but he led them *about*, through the way of the wilderness of the Red Sea, Exod. xiii. 17, 18. In like manner, the Doctor doubts not but God could have brought sinners to a state of glory, in another way than by the blood of Jesus. Had we needed only a teacher and an example, perhaps his assertion would be admissible. But if satisfaction for sin was necessary, it cannot. For as God can do nothing which argues a contradiction, neither can he act contrary to the perfections of his nature. And therefore though our author makes *no doubt* but other methods of salvation could have been found out, yet it is very much *to be doubted*. God cannot but hate sin, Hab. i. 13. Psal. v. 5. and xi. 5. and if he cannot but hate it, he cannot but hate it as much as it deserves. If he cannot but hate it, he cannot but testify his hatred. And if he cannot but hate it as much as it deserves, he cannot but testify that hatred as much as it deserves. If he cannot but testify his hatred of sin as much as it deserves, he cannot but sooner or latter, punish it as much as it deserves. And if he cannot but punish it as much as it deserves, he cannot but punish it with a punishment infinite, either in duration, or in value: that is, either in the sinner himself, or in a surety for him. The amount of our author's doctrine, is, That the death of Christ was not absolutely necessary to the salvation of sinners; and if so, then God gave an unnecessary instance of his love, in giving his only-begotten Son. And what is this, but to say, that Christ was *put to grief* in vain, suffering inconceivable things, when consistent with our salvation, they might have been avoided? Scripture plainly teaches, that God *so loved* the world, that he gave his only begotten Son. But with

Son, but delivered him up for us all. It *became him*, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect thro' sufferings. Jesus was made a surety. Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likeways took part of the same. For verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham. Wherefore in all things *it behoved* him to be made like unto his brethren. Without shedding of blood is no remission. It was therefore *necessary* that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these. For it is *not possible* that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins. And Jesus fell on his face, and prayed, saying, O my Father, if it be *possible*, let this cup pass from me.

Heb. 2. 10.  
 ——— 7. 22.  
 ——— 2. 14.  
 ——— — 16.  
 ——— — 17.  
 ——— 9. 22.  
 ——— 9. 23.  
 ——— 10. 4.  
 Mat. 26. 39.

reverence be it spoken, why all this amazing expence, if less could have sufficed? Why should the sword of justice be bathed in the blood of heaven, if remission could have been obtained without the shedding of blood? The apostle when speaking of our redemption by Christ, saith, *Verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham*: an intimation, one would think,

54. God permitted his dear Son to undergo a painful and ignominious death, in order to conquer the enmity of his rebellious creatures, and reduce them to obedience.

320

55. We are often said in the New Testament to be now justified, saved, redeemed, delivered, and the like, because we are put in the sure way of ob-

that in order to save sinners, whether angels or men, it was necessary that he should assume their nature. For if the assumption of that nature which sinned, be not necessary, then the Son might have saved fallen angels, without taking their nature upon him. And thus there would be no force in the apostle's reasoning. For according to him, the reason why sinners of mankind are saved, and not fallen angels, is, because the Son of God assumed the human nature, not the angelic. "Had any other way been possible, why doth the perishing of angels so inevitably follow the non-assumption of their nature." Owen on the place. The apostle also tells us, it was *necessary* that the heavenly things themselves should be purified with better sacrifices than the Mosaical, Heb. ix. 23. But what was the necessity of the better sacrifice, if sinners could be saved without it? Why, no absolute necessity at all. The same apostle asserts, *it is not possible that the blood of bulls, and of goats should take away sins*, chap. x. 4. And from the insufficiency of such sacrifices, he argues the necessity of Christ's. But his argumentation would be quite inconclusive, if any other method of salvation were possible. For then though the Mosaic sacrifices could not take away sin, yet something different from Christ's might: all these other methods, of which our author speaks, lying as in the intermediate space between the two. The apostle says, *It is not possible that the blood of bulls, and of goats*

54. The Son of man came to give his life a ransom for many. To make reconciliation for the sins of the people. Christ once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God. Mat. 20. 28. Heb. 2. 17. 1 Pet. 3. 18.

55. He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: And shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life. Being justified Rom. 5. 1, 2.

*should take away sins.* By why not possible, if sin can be taken away without any sacrifice at all? "For what could be so easily taken away by the mere mercy of God without any satisfaction, why could it not likewise be taken away by the death of the legal sacrifices?" Turret de satisfactione, page 23. What can be done without any means, may be done by any means. Compare Luke xviii. 42, 43. with John ix. 6, 7. When our Saviour prayed, *O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me,* does not this imply, that it could not pass from him, consistently with the honour of the divine perfections? Guyse on the place. If it be said, God can do whatsoever he pleaseth, we cheerfully grant it. But then he can will nothing, but what is agreeable to his all-pure and perfect nature. *He cannot lie,* Tit. i. 2. *Cannot deny himself,* 2 Tim. ii. 12. *Cannot look on iniquity,* Hab. i. 13. And hence we may infer, that he cannot pardon sin without a satisfaction to his justice. And this our author himself confesses, for in page 487, he expressly says, "Silver and gold are by no means equal to the worth of the soul, of which the redemption is too precious to be procured by such means. This purchase could be made only by the blood of Christ." If it could be made only by his blood, then there was no other method of saving us, but by his bloody passion.

taining these benefits, and cannot fail of them but by our own fault, yet, strictly speaking, we are at present saved from the guilt of sin, in *hope and expectation*, rather than in actual *possession*. ESSAY, page  
322

56. We are justified by his blood, because by the shedding of his blood, he obtained power to justify us. 330

57. It is certain our redemption was not procured by his death alone; if it had, there would have been no need of his resurrection. 331

58. We now come to a figurative and metaphorical description of the efficacy of Christ's blood in taking away the guilt of sin. It is that by which the death or blood of Christ is represented as a sacrifice, solemnly ratifying

by faith, we have peace with God, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God. Ye are not under the law, but under grace. There is *no condemnation* to them who are in Christ Jesus. I will put my fear in their hearts, that they shall not depart from me. He who hath begun a good work in you, will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ.

56. Being justified freely through the *redemption* that is in Jesus Christ: whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood. He is the Mediator of the New Testament, that by means of death, for the expiation of the transgressions, &c.

57. If when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the *death* of his Son: much more being reconciled, we shall be saved by *his life*. Jesus was delivered for our offences, and was *raised again* for our justification. *Declared* to be the Son of God with power, by the resurrection from the dead.

58. The law having a shadow of good things to come, &c. Which was a *figure* for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices. Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are *fi-*

Rom. 6. 14.

— 8. 1.

Jer. 32. 40.

Phil. 1. 6.

Rom. 3. 24,

25.

Heb. 9. 15.

Rom. 5. 10.

— 4. 25.

— 1. 4.

Heb. 10. 1.

— 9. 9.

— — 24.

the doctrine he taught, and assuring the penitent of pardon in its utmost extent, to all them that repent according to his prescriptions.

ESSAY, page

334

59. Wherever life was forfeited; no atonement could be received instead of it <sup>P</sup>.

339

<sup>P</sup> From the famous foot note, concerning the British Governor and the Indian Chief, it is obvious that our author intends a fatal thrust to the doctrine of the substitution. If his assertion be true, one would be thereby led to believe, that Christ did not die instead of his people, who had forfeited life, their being no such typical sacrifice under the law. It cannot be denied that there were some crimes for which no atonement was to be made, as murder, Num. xxxv. 30, 31. Adultery, Lev. xx. 10. Deut. xxii. 22. Pfall. li. 16. Incest, Lev. xviii. 29. Idolatry, Deut. xvii. 2.—7. Blasphemy, Lev. xxiv. 15, 16. Sabbath-breaking, Exod. xxxi. 14, 15. Num. xv. 35, 36. and presumptuous sin, Num. xv. 30, 31. In these cases the transgressor himself was to die, and not a beast sacrificed for him. For other sins an atonement was accepted, and hence the transgressor being forgiven, continued in life. From this, however, it will not follow, that in these cases there was *no* forfeiture of life. In the cases of murder, adultery, &c. the forfeiture was *absolute*, no atonement being accepted, and therefore no remission given, unless in virtue of JEHOVAH'S sovereignty, as to David, 2 Sam. 12, 13. In other instances the forfeiture was *conditional*, that is, the transgressor behoved to die, unless he offered the appointed sacrifices. Let us suppose that the thief, Lev. vi. 1.—7. the unclean, chap. xix. 20.—22. or he who had come to the knowledge of his sin committed ignorantly, Lev. iv. 13.—20. had refused to make the atonement enjoined in the law, what would have

gures of the true, but into heaven itself.

This is the testament, saith the Lord; Heb. 10. 16.  
 I will put my laws into their hearts, and 17.  
 in their minds will I write them: and  
 their sins and iniquities will I remem-  
 ber no more.

59. They shall give every man a ran- Ex. 30. 12.  
 som for his life unto the Lord, when  
 thou numberest them: that there be no  
 plague among them, when thou num-  
 berest them. The rich shall not give ——— — 15.  
 more, and the poor shall not give less  
 than half a shekel, when they give an  
 offering unto the Lord, to make an a-  
 tonement for their lives. And thou ——— — 16.  
 shalt take the atonement-money of the  
 children of Israel, &c. The life of the Lev. 17. 11.  
 flesh is in the blood, and I have given  
 it to you upon the altar, to make an a-  
 tonement for *your lives*: for it is the  
 blood that maketh an atonement *for*  
*the life.*

been the issue? Why, as despisers of the law, they would have di-  
 ed without mercy, under two or three witnesses. That this would  
 undoubtedly have been the case, appears both from analogy, and  
 from the promises of forgiveness made to such as offered the ap-  
 pointed sacrifices. The uncircumcised was to be cut off from the  
 people of the Lord, Gen. xvii. 14. Whosoever ate any manner of  
 blood, Lev. xvii. 10. Whosoever did not afflict his soul on the day  
 of atonement, Lev. xxiii. 29. He who in certain cases forebore to  
 keep the passover, Num. ix. 13. The unclean, who did not purify

60. No atonement could be admitted where life was forfeited; because atonement was not made in any case merely by the killing of the victim; and because it was made in divers cases where there was no moral guilt, and sometimes without the death of any animal, or any shedding of blood<sup>9</sup>. ESSAY, page  
339

himself, Num. xix. 20. And hence we may infer, those also who did not offer the sacrifices appointed of God. This is likewise evident from the promise of forgiveness. It was always made on condition that they sacrificed. For instance, atonement being made for the sin of ignorance, the promise runs, It shall be forgiven, Lev. iv. 13.—20. So also in the case of theft, chap. vi. 1.—7. and of uncleanness, chap. xix. 20.—22. The promise of forgiveness being made to such only as offered sacrifice, is a certain proof that those who omitted to sacrifice, should not be forgiven; but that their sin should be upon them, and accordingly they should die. It remains therefore, that in theft, uncleanness, &c. as well as in murder, adultery, &c. there was a forfeiture of life. Only in the one case, life was *redeemable*, in the other not. And indeed unless life had been forfeited, how could it be said to be ransomed, as it expressly is? Exod. xxx. 12.—16. compare chap. xxi. 30. Job xxxiii. 24. Matth. xx. 28. 2 Tim. ii. 6. 2 Cor. v. 14. Rom. v. 15.

<sup>9</sup> Our author is peremptory that no atonement could be admitted where life was forfeited, and that because it was made in divers cases where there was no moral guilt. But did not the breach of any divine law deserve death? Was not the authority of God interposed in the *political law*, as well as the *moral*? And if so, surely the transgressor of that law deserved to die; and certainly would, if sacrifice had not been offered for him. The ceremonial sacrifices were not appointed to remove *moral guilt*, (nor could they, Heb. x. 4.) but *ceremonial, or political*; and as temporal

60. Then shall he kill the goat of Lev. 16. 15,  
 the sin-offering that is for the people, 16.  
 and bring his blood within the veil,—  
 and sprinkle it on the mercy-seat. And  
 he shall make an atonement for the ho-  
 ly place, because of the uncleanness of  
 the children of Israel, and because of  
 their transgressions in all their sins. It  
 is the blood that maketh atonement for Lev. 17. 11.  
 the life. And without shedding of Heb. 9. 22.  
 blood is no remission.

life was forfeited by sin, so was it ransomed by sacrifice, the vic-  
 tim being put to death instead of the man.

Our author, in support of his opinion, tells us further, that a-  
 tonement was sometimes made without the death of any animal,  
 or any shedding of blood, alluding, as appears from page 344, to  
 Lev. v. 11.—13. where we read, that he who was not able to  
 bring two turtle-doves, or two young pigeons, should bring the  
 tenth part of an ephah of fine flour for a sin-offering, &c. But why  
 may we not say with the learned Dr. Owen, that there was a special  
 dispensation in the case of the *poor man*? Owen on the Hebrews,  
 Vol. I. Exercit. 24. page 312. It was ever a rule with God mer-  
 ciful and gracious, that *if there be first a willing mind, it is accep-*  
*ted according to what a man hath, and not according to what he hath*  
*not*, 2 Cor. viii. 12. He who so frequently enjoined compassion to  
 the poor, Exod. xxi. 25. Lev. xxiii. 22. Deut. xxiv. 14, 15. would  
 not himself oppress them. It is also to be observed, that in this  
 his sin-offering, the poor man offered unto the Lord, that by which  
 his life was supported, viz. bread. As the widows two mites,  
 being all her living, were more to her than the abundance which  
 the rich cast into the treasury, Mark xii. 41.—44. So the small  
 quantity of flour offered by the poor man, was vastly more to him  
 than the lamb, or the kid to the rich. The handful of flour, which

61. The temple where he officiates is heaven, and his flesh is the veil, *which being taken away*, a free entrance was opened, by a new and living way, into the true Holy of Holies.

ESSAY, page 344

made atonement for him, and upon which his sins were forgiven him, was burnt upon the altar, according to the offerings made by fire unto the Lord. His offering was destroyed by fire, strongly typifying what he himself deserved. When a living creature was sacrificed as a sin-offering, its blood was sprinkled on the altar, and its body burnt with fire without the camp, Exod. xxix. 11.—14. Lev. iv. 12. 21. and xvi. 27. Heb. xiii. 11. 12. In like manner, the handful of fine flour was burnt, as a sin-offering before the Lord. I may also add, that the poor man's sin was expiated by blood in the daily sacrifice, and in the anniversary atonement for *all* the iniquities of the children of Israel, and *all* their transgressions in *all* their sins, Lev. xvi. 16. 21. The very learned and judicious Outram, when speaking of vicarious sacrifices, says, *Neque ququam moveat, quod in maxima fontium paupertate, &c.* That is, “Neither let it move any, that in the extreme poverty of the guilty, atonement could be made, and the pardon of sins obtained, by a certain piacular cake; Lev. v. 12. in which there could not be the appearance, much less the reality, of vicarious punishment. For if a piacular cake could not undergo a vicarious punishment, we ought not therefore immediately to conclude that the piacular victims themselves did not suffer that kind of punishment. For this is as if one should say, that the death of none of the piacular victims represented the death of Christ, because no piacular cakes did. And how trifling this is, every one may see.—Neither is it true, that no victims could suffer death instead of the sacrificers, unless some law had in express words denounced death unto them for those kinds of sins, which were to be expiated by those victims. Yea, this, if so it had been, would have left no place for piacular sacrifices at all. For every punishment denounced by an express law against those guilty persons, would

61. Behold my hands and my feet, Luke 24. 39.  
 that it is I myself: handle me and see,  
 for a spirit hath not *flesh and blood*, as  
 ye see *me* have. The Lord Jesus Christ Phil. 3. 21.  
 shall change our vile body, that it may  
 be fashioned like unto his *glorious body*.  
 A new and living way he hath conse- Heb. 10. 20.  
 crated for us, *through the veil*, that is  
 to say, *his flesh*.

“ by virtue of the same law have been inflicted on them, and there-  
 fore could have been averted by no sacrifice, no satisfaction.  
 Hence it is understood, that *that* punishment, whatever it was,  
 which was averted by sacrifices, could by no express law  
 (which would not have been contrary to the other enjoining sacri-  
 fice) be denounced against the sacrificers, that is, the guilty  
 themselves: and indeed *that punishment* was by no means de-  
 nounced for this very reason, because provision was made by the  
 law, that it might be averted by sacrifices.

“ Since therefore these things are so, in vain do you seek, in ex-  
 press threatenings pointed at the guilty themselves, *that punish-*  
*ment* which was to be turned away from them by propitiatory-  
 sacrifices. But that you may understand *what* it was, you must  
 see *what punishment* could have been inflicted on the guilty, pro-  
 vided God had pleased to exercise his right respecting them.  
 And that, if you will hear the holy scriptures, was death itself,  
 or destruction: as the words of Moses testify, Lev. xvii. 10, 11.  
 where that blood which is said to make atonement for the soul,  
 signifies the blood of the victims. And further, to make an a-  
 tonement for the soul signifies the same, as to be the כפר or  
 λύτρον of the soul, for as much as the same sense uses to be ex-  
 pressed by both phrases, Exod. xxx. verse 12. compared with  
 verses 15. 16. Now to be the כפר or λύτρον of the soul, is the  
 same as to avert death. And this is understood from these words,

62. What Jesus does for us as a Priest, was not *completed* by his sufferings on the cross, when he was not yet properly consecrated to his priestly office.— As his sufferings were the necessary *means of preparing him* for the great office of expiating or making atonement for the sins of men, it is evident he could not effectually and *completely* execute that office, until he ascended into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God.

345

63. There was nothing but sin unrepented of, that stood between men and the richest tokens of his favour.

346

64. Even in their impenitent state he pitied and sought them, and he waited only for their amendment, to receive them into the bosom of his love. This was the effect of mere goodness, and often of *uncovenanted mercy*, of which

“ Every man shall give *נפשו ליהוה כפר* the ransom of his soul unto the Lord, and there shall be no plague among them. For that plague signifies the pestilence, which would bring on a sudden death.

“ Add, that to *make atonement for the soul*, is the same as to make atonement for the life, for without all doubt, the soul in this phrase signifies the life. Now, to make atonement for the life, what else is that, but to preserve it safe, death being turned

62. For their sakes I sanctify myself. John 17. 19.  
 When Jesus therefore had received the ——— 19. 30.  
 vinegar, he said, It is *finished*, and gave  
 up the Ghost. By his own blood he Heb. 9. 12.  
 entered in once into the holy place,  
*having obtained* eternal redemption for  
 us. Christ is entered into heaven itself, ——— — 24.  
 now to *appear* in the presence of God  
 for us. This Priest, *after* he had of- ——— 10. 12.  
 fered one sacrifice for sins, for ever sat  
 down on the right hand of God. He ——— 7. 25.  
 ever liveth to make intercession.

63. Without shedding of blood is *no* Heb. 9. 22.  
*remission*. It is not possible that the ——— 10. 4.  
 blood of bulls and of goats, should take  
 away sins. We were reconciled to God Rom. 5. 10.  
 by the death of his Son.

64. The deliverer shall turn away Rom. 11. 26,  
 ungodliness from Jacob. For this is 27.  
 my covenant unto them, when I shall  
 take away their sins. This is the *testa-* Heb. 8. 10.  
*ment*, I will put my laws into their  
 mind, and write them in their hearts.

“away? And who does not see that *that* phrase is of such a na-  
 “ture, that of itself it claims this sense, and plainly rejects every  
 “other?”

“Therefore there is no doubt, but this phrase, to make atone-  
 “ment for the soul of man, signifies the same as to turn away  
 “death from the man. Neither is there any of the Jews who af-  
 “signs another sense to it.”

OUTRAMUS de SACRIFICIIS, page 256, 257, 258.

there are many examples in the Old Testament. See among others, the following passages. Gen. iv. 7. chap. xviii. 23. chap. xx. 17. Neh. ix. Ezek. xviii. xxxiii. Jer. iii. 12.—15. chap. iv. 1. Jon. iii. 10. Pfal. xxxii. 5. Pfal. ciii. 3.—19. ESSAY, page  
347

65. God, in his goodness, hath used every precaution to invite and encourage the repentance of sinners, and to make them fly to it, as the haven of rest, 348

66. The blood of Christ shed to ratify this covenant, demonstrates the fixed purpose of Almighty God to make good every title of it.—*Any other method* of confirming the covenant, if appointed by God, might have been *sufficient*; but there was no other so well fitted to establish our faith and hope, and to inspire us with strong consolation, 348

67. The Spirit means the divine tes-

I will make an *everlasting covenant* with you, even the *sure mercies* of David. Mercy shall be built up for ever. He hath made with me an *everlasting covenant*, ordered in all things, and *sure*.  
 Isa. 55. 3.  
 Psa. 89. 2.  
 2 Sam. 23. 5.

65. The name of the Lord is a strong tower: the righteous runneth unto *it*, and is safe. And this is the name whereby he shall be called, The Lord is our righteoufness. Come unto *me*, all ye that labour, and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. We who have believed do enter into rest. We who have fled for refuge, &c.  
 Prov. 18. 10.  
 Jer. 23. 6.  
 Mat. 11. 28.  
 Heb. 4. 3.  
 — 6. 18,

66. There *is* none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved. Other foundation can no man lay, than what is laid, which is Jesus Christ. Let no man beguile you, intruding into those things which he hath not seen. Without shedding of blood is *no remission*. It was therefore *necessary* that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these.  
 Acts 4. 12.  
 1 Cor. 3. 11.  
 Col. 2. 18.  
 Heb. 9. 22.  
 — — 23.

See note on No. 54.

67. There are three that bear record 1 John 5. 7.

timonies that were given to Christ, and the miracles that were wrought by him, and his apostles and ministers after him, all proceeding from the *Spirit or Power* of God<sup>r</sup>. ESSAY, page  
350

68. In the new covenant, Jesus Christ promiseth the remission of sins, and eternal life to all sinners who repent, and live virtuously. 350.

69. And for this reason he is the Mediator (or Surety) of the new covenant, that by means of death (or death intervening) for the expiation of the transgressions (which remained unex-

<sup>r</sup> The harmony which prevails in point of doctrine, betwixt our author and his Reverend colleague, cannot but excite some suspicion with respect to the phrase here used, *The Spirit or Power of God*, as if these were synonymous terms. For in his first catechism for the use of Lord's-day Schools, his colleague observes, quest. 3d, that Christ was anointed with the Holy Ghost, which is the *power of God*, Acts x. 38. And on the 12th question, he bids the catechist tell the children, "That the Spirit of God, and "Holy Ghost, or power of the Highest, are the same." He does not say, nor does he bid the catechist tell the children, that the Holy Ghost is the third person in the Godhead, equal in power

in heaven: and these three are one.

The Father shall give you *another Comforter*; even the Spirit of truth. The Holy Ghost said, Separate ME Barnabas and Saul, for the work whereunto I have called them.

John 14. 16,  
17.  
Acts 13. 2.

68. I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the Spirit of grace and of supplications, and they shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn. Him hath God exalted, to give repentance to Israel, and remission of sins. We are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works.

Zech. 12. 10.  
Acts 5. 31.  
Eph. 2. 10.

69. And for this cause he is the Mediator of the New Testament, that by means of death, for the expiation of the transgressions which were under the first Testament, they who are called

Heb. 9. 15.

and in glory to the Father and to the Son. By calling the Holy Ghost the power of God, an idea is ready to be conveyed, that he is not a person, but a property or attribute of the divine nature: which is well known to be the Socinian doctrine. Allow me to add, that it does not appear from Luke i. 35. that the Holy Ghost, and the power of the Highest, are equivalent terms, pointing out one and the same person. The power of the highest, signifies the power of the Father, compare verse 32. He shall be called the Son of the Highest. A body hast thou prepared me, Heb. x. 5. This therefore is one of the many passages in which we see a Trinity of persons: the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

piated) under the first covenant, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance. For where a covenant is, there must also of necessity be the death of the (victim) appointed (to confirm it). For a covenant is valid upon things being dead, (that is, after the sacrifices ratifying it are duly slain and offered); otherways it is of no strength at all while the appointed (victim of ratification) liveth<sup>f</sup>. ESSAY, page 351.

<sup>f</sup> Here our author, adopts the hints given him by a respectable Divine, Dr. Macknight, who observes that our translators ought not to have departed from the usual meaning of the word *διαθήκη* *covenant*, to make it signify a *testament* in this place, and that a testament does not need the death of a mediator to render it valid. It cannot be denied, that the *διαθήκη* signifies either covenant, or testament, and accordingly must be translated as the nature of the subject requires. After all the criticisms, however, which the learned have made upon this passage, I cannot but acquiesce in our version: and am so far from blaming our translators for reading *testament*, and not *covenant*, that I apprehend they should always have done so, wherever the word *διαθήκη* occurs in this epistle. It is observable, that this epistle was not written to the Gentiles, as those to the Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, &c. but to the Hebrews: Not to men, who had been under the covenant of works only, and surrounded with Pagan darkness; but to such as had long been under a dispensation of grace. Accordingly the opposition is not here, as in Rom. v. 14.—19 and 1 Cor. xv. 45.—49. betwixt Adam and Christ, but betwixt Moses and Christ, chap. iii. 5, 6. It is not betwixt *covenant and covenant*, viz. the covenants of works and of grace, as in Gal. iii. 17, 18. iv. 24. but betwixt *testament and testament*, the two different dispensations of one

might receive the promise of the eternal inheritance. For where a *testament* is, there must also of necessity be the death of the *testator*. For a *testament* is of force after men are dead: otherwise it is of no strength at all whilst the testator liveth. This is my blood of the *New Testament*, which is shed for the remission of sins. Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you: not as the world giveth, give I unto you. I dispoſe to you a kingdom.

Heb. 9. 15.  
 — 16.  
 — 17.  
 Mat. 26. 28.  
 John 14. 27.  
 Luke 22. 29.

and the same covenant, chap. viii. 13. ix. 1. Hence we see it stated between the time past and the last days, between servants and son, chap. i. 1. 2. Rest and rest, chap. iv. 5.—11. Priesthood and priesthood, chap, v. 1.—6. vii. 20. 28. Sanctuary and sanctuary, chap. viii. 2. ix. 1. 24. Ministry and ministry, chap. viii. 6. x. 11. Sacrifice and sacrifice, chap. ix. 23. x. 11, 12. 14. Blood and blood, chap. ix. 12. Punishment and punishment, chap. x. 28, 29. Mountain and mountain, chap. xii. 18.—18. Altar and altar, chap. ix. 4. xiii. 10. As to the phrase, the Mediator of the New Testament, which is reckoned improper, because a testament does not need the death of a mediator to render it valid, I confess, I see no more impropriety in it, than in saying, the priest of the New Testament, or the blood of the New Testament, though a human testament needs neither priest nor blood to give it validity. There is a huge difference between a human testament and a divine. Concerning which, the reader may consult Gillespie's ark of the Testament opened, page 334. It is observable that the apostle never once calls our Lord the Mediator of the Testament, but the Mediator of the *better*, or the *New Testament*, chap. viii. 6. and ix. 15. and xii. 24. Evidently opposing him to the mediators of the comparatively *faulty*, and the *Old Testament*, chap. viii. 7. 13. And it is no less re-

70. Christians are sanctified by the Spirit, and *made* the elect of God, that they may be obedient to his commands and *so have their guilt washed away.* ESSAY, page 353

71. The blood of Christ considered simply as *shed*, has respect to the whole

markable, that in the very making of his Testament he mediates between God and us. Witness his ever-memorable words, I appoint unto *you* a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto *me*, Luke xxii. 29. If Aaron and others were the priests of the Old Testament, then Christ is the priest of the New. If Moses was by way of eminence the mediator of the Old Testament, Deut. v. 5. Gal. iii. 19. it follows that Christ is the Mediator of the New. As by the mediation of the priests under the Old Testament, the people offered sacrifices, so by Jesus, the Mediator of the New, we come unto God and offer the sacrifice of praise, Heb. vii. 25. xiii. 15. When therefore Jesus is called the Surety, and the Mediator of the New Testament, I understand it that he is the Surety and the Mediator *under* the New Testament, in opposition to the priests who were the sureties and the mediators *under* the Old. The promise of the eternal inheritance mentioned in this passage, seems also to justify our translators in reading *testament*, and not *covenant*. For certain it is, that the promise of that inheritance is merely *testamentary* with respect to the heirs, Gal. iii. 17, 18, 29. Heb. vi. 13,—17. though *federal* to him who made the purchase. He purchased it with his own blood, and to them he freely bequeathes it. Testament, death, inheritance, and heirs, are all terms which beautifully coincide in pointing out the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ. It is also to be observed, that a far richer sense is conveyed by our version, than by the proposed alteration. For according to Dr. M'Gill, our blessed Lord died as a victim only, to confirm the covenant of God, or the conditional promises of pardon, viz. to all who shall repent and live virtuously :

70. He hath saved us, and called us, 2 Tim. 1. 9.  
 not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus, *before the world began.* The blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin. 1 John 1. 7.

71. I lay down my life for the *sheep*, John 10. 15.  
 and I *give* unto them eternal life. I — 28.

but he purchased nothing *for us*, bequeathes nothing *to us*, only in reward of his martyrdom for the truth, he is honoured to confer those blessings, which are promised on *condition* of our repentance. But in our version, we see our Lord in the endearing characters of a Surety and a Testator: A Surety, in expiating transgressions by his death, and a Testator in dying to confirm the promise of the eternal inheritance: A Surety in paying our enormous debts, a Testator in bequeathing to us an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away. Under the Old Testament the priest did not die for the people, nor could the victim make them any promises. But such the fulness of Christ, that he does both: being at once the Priest and the sacrifice. Allow me to add, the alteration proposed cannot but be attended with very disagreeable consequences. If it take place, down goes the doctrine of the testatorship of Christ, so replete with consolation to the church. For if in this passage, the word *διαθήκη* must not be translated *testament*, but covenant, why not so rendered wherever it occurs, particularly in the institution of the holy Supper? If the word testator must here be erased for victim, it is to be found no where else in holy scripture. And with it evanishes the idea of a testament, and of consequence an article of our Confession of Faith, viz. chap. 7. 4. Permit me to close this note with observing, that according to the above criticism, we must no longer say, The scriptures of the *Old and New Testament*, but of the *Old and New Covenant*. So true is it, that the critics tool has often polluted the altar of the Lord, Exod. xx. 25.

world, and gives assurance to all men of God's placability, or his willingness to pardon finners who repent and believe the gospel.—Though *shed* for us all, it cannot benefit any but those who are sprinkled with it, which is only the fruit of faith and gospel-obedience. ESSAY, page  
354

72. He justifies us according to the *terms* of a merciful covenant, confirmed by the blood of his dear Son. 362

73. The blood of Christ ratifies the *threatenings*, as well as the promises of the gospel. 363

74. Though other martyrs might be, in some instances, mistaken in what they professed, it is *scarce conceivable* that he could be so <sup>c</sup>. 378

<sup>c</sup> How depreciating, this man's language concerning the great God our Saviour. He does not say, it was *impossible* that he could be mistaken; nay, nor *inconceivable*: but only that it is *scarce conceivable*. And yet he mentions this as the remark of a Reverend Doctor. So far from reflecting honour upon that Doctor, it is *scarce conceivable* that any who believe the Godhead of our Saviour, could have expressed himself in such a manner.

pray not for the world, but for them whom thou hast given me. As many as were ordained to eternal life, believed. God hath chosen you to salvation, through sanctification of the Spirit, and belief of the truth. A man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the law.

John 17. 9.  
Acts 13. 48.  
2 Th. 2. 13.  
Rom. 3. 28.

72. Being justified *freely* by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus. To him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the *ungodly*, his faith is counted for righteousness.

Rom. 3. 24.  
Rom. 4. 5.

73. This is the testament, I will be to them a God, and they *shall be* to me a people. Where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator. The blood of sprinkling speaketh *better things* than that of Abel.

Heb. 8. 10.  
— 9. 16.  
— 12. 24.

74. His name shall be called Counsellor. The Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, and shall make him of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord. Behold, I have given him for a witness to the people. Him shall ye hear in *all things* whatsoever he shall say unto you. The Word was God. God is light, and in him is no darkness at all. The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, full of *grace and truth*. There are three in heaven who

Isa. 9. 6.  
— 11. 2.  
— 55. 5.  
Acts 3. 22.  
John 1. 1.  
1 John 1. 5.  
John 1. 14.  
1 John 5. 7.



bear record, the Father, the Word, (John iii. 13.) and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. If we receive the witness of *men*, the witness of *God* is greater. Yea, let God be true, but every man a liar. Jacob was *scarce* gone out from the presence of Isaac his Father. With these sayings *scarce* restrained they the people.

75. Being born again, not of *corruptible* seed, but of *incorruptible*. Whosoever is born of God, his seed *remaineth* in him.

76. He that believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death to life. Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him. As I have sworn that the waters of Noah should no more go over the earth; so have I sworn that I would not be wroth with thee, nor rebuke thee, &c. I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins; and their iniquities will I REMEMBER NO MORE. The Lord grant Onesiphorus that he may FIND MERCY of the Lord in that day.

and perfect at first; but given out at different times, according as repentance is sincerely renewed: all *past* sins being remitted to the

1 John 5. 7.

— 9.

Rom. 3. 4.

Gen. 27. 30.

Acts 14. 18.

1 Pet. 1. 23.

1 John 3. 9.

John 5. 24.

Pf. 103. 13.

Isa. 54. 9.

10.

Heb. 8. 12.

2 Tim. 1. 18.

77. The objections we lie under to our Lord Jesus Christ, are indeed great and unspeakable; but to God, even his and our Father, we are first and *chiefly indebted* for every gospel blessing; and to him, therefore, should the gratitude of our hearts be *primarily and ultimately* offered up, through Christ.

ESSAY, page

401

penitent believer, with assurance of *the like remission* of all future sins, upon repentance. It cannot be denied, that the believer falls into sin after he has obtained the remission of sins, and therefore in some respects needs forgiveness. But there is a vast difference between the first, and the subsequent pardons granted him. They are far from being *alike*, as our author teaches. In remitting all past sins to the believer, God receives him into his family; no such thing in the remission of future sins, as out of that family he is never cast. Under a father's rod he may fall, but under the curse of the law he cannot. The first pardon therefore is judicial, delivering the man from the curse of the broken covenant; all the subsequent pardons are only paternal, bringing him from under a father's rod. This doctrine is taught so plainly in Pf. lxxxix. 30.—33. that he who runs may read. The sins of believers, though much more aggravated than those of others, do not expose them to eternal punishment. And the reason is obvious, they are not under the law, but under grace, Rom. vi. 14. What time they were united to Christ, remission was granted them, as to all past and present sins; and a non-imputation, as to future. To speak after the manner of men, the former were *blotted out*, and the latter are *never written*. Hence it is, that the blessed are characterized, not only as they whose iniquities are *forgiven*, but also as those to whom the Lord *will not impute sin*, Rom. iv. 7, 8. Being still in Christ, even when they fall into the most atrocious sins, there is no condemnation to them, Rom. viii. 1. A father's rod will be upon them, it may break their bones, Psa. li. 8. and cast

77. I and my Father are one. God John 10. 30.  
 so loved the world, that he gave his on- — 3. 16,  
 ly begotten Son. The Son of God Gal. 2. 20.  
 loved me, and gave himself for me.  
 All men should honour the Son, even John 5. 23.  
 as they honour the Father. Worthy Rev. 5. 12.  
 is the *Lamb that was slain*, to receive  
 power, and riches, &c.

their bodies into the grave, 1 Cor. xi. 30.—32. but not their souls into hell. Their *evidences* they may lose, but from their *title* to the inheritance, they can never fall, no more than they who are already in the full possession of it. Being indissolubly united unto Christ, his *righteousness* is still imputed to them, and therefore their sins cannot. For under these two imputations no man can possibly be at one and the same instant. They can no more be under two opposite imputations, than under two opposite obligations before God, viz. obliged *to do a thing*, and obliged *not to do it*. This will still be more evident, when it is considered, that the imputation, whether of sin, or of righteousness, is not a *making* them ours, but a placing them to our account, upon finding that they *are ours*. For instance, the righteousness of Christ is not imputed, and therefore ours; but ours by faith, and therefore imputed. We must not imagine that a man can be in a state of justification, and of condemnation by turns. By no means. For at that rate, who could tell whether he should die a wise man or a fool? die in his sins, or in Christ? Indeed if we credit the Doctor, there is no such a state as justification in this life. For he tells us, page 322, that we are at present saved from the guilt of sin, in hope and expectation, rather than in actual possession. He teaches, that allowances are made for every infirmity and imperfection, consistent with a prevailing habit of innocence and virtue. It is usual with Divines to speak of the habits of grace, viz. the grace given us in regeneration. But to talk of a prevailing habit of innocence *in us*, who by nature are all as an unclean thing, is more like the

78. The punishment of sin is not represented in scripture as the necessary effect of the justice of God, but rather of his severity, wrath, vengeance, &c. Rom. xi. 22. And though these are never exercised by him without justice, Rom. iii. 5. yet justice does not require them to be exercised when the sinner repents. In that case, his justice is *pacified*, and he delights to grant pardon and forgiveness, Isa. lv. 7. Dan. ix. 7,—9. 1 John i. 9.

ESSAY, page

401

79. Sinner, God hath already saved you, so to speak, as far as it depends on him; I mean, as far, as it can be done in a moral way, that is, consistently with your freedom of will, and

language of Ashdod, than that of Canaan. We are certain, according to scripture, that whosoever is born of God, his seed remaineth in him, 1 John iii. 9. and that therefore, even David, when all over stained with adultery and murder, had not lost the habits of grace. Though his conduct was inconsistent with the *power* of godliness, yet not with the *being* of grace. Meanwhile, there was no intercession of his right to eternal glory, his union with Christ being indissoluble. The Doctor further speaks of all *equitable allowances* being made in the final judgment for our involuntary frailties and imperfections. If *only equitable*, it is but just that God should make them. All his paths are *mercy and truth, unto such as keep his covenant, and his testimonies*, Psa. xxv. 10. All the benefits he bestows upon them, though just in respect of Christ, are

78. God is of purer eyes than Hab. 1. 13.  
 to behold evil, and cannot look  
 on iniquity. His wrath is revealed Rom. 1. 18.  
 from heaven, against *all* ungodliness,  
 and unrighteousness of men. The ——— 6. 23.  
 wages of sin is death. Cursed is Gal. 3. 10.  
 every one that continueth not in *all*  
*things*, &c. Christ hath redeemed us ——— — 13.  
 from the curse of the law, being made  
 a curse for us. We were reconciled Rom. 5. 10.  
 to God by the death of his Son. He Pſal. 68. 18.  
 received gifts for men. Was exalted Acts 5. 31.  
*to give repentance*. Then shalt thou re- Ezek. 16. 61.  
 member thy ways and be ashamed,—  
 when I am PACIFIED toward thee. — 63.

79. The Lord thy God *will circum-* Deut. 30. 6.  
*cise* thine heart, to love the Lord thy  
 God with all thine heart, and with all  
 thy soul, that thou mayest live. Thy  
 people *shall be willing* in the day of thy Pſal. 110. 3.

mercy to believers themselves, and thence called, *the sure mercies of David*, Isa. lv. 3. In particular, it is in mercy, that he does not enter into judgment with them, Pſal. cxliii. 2. *Blessed are the merciful*, says our Lord, *for they shall obtain mercy*, Matth. v. 7. The apostle deeply impressed with a sense of what Onesiphorus had done for him, prays, not for all equitable allowances, respecting his involuntary frailties and imperfections, but that he may obtain mercy of the Lord in the day of judgment. It is also to be observed, that neither the remission, the assistance, nor the allowances of which the Doctor speaks, were, according to him, purchased by Christ; since he died, not in our stead, but only as an example, and to confirm his doctrine.

with the nature of that holiness and happiness to which he desires to bring you. Whatever we do, it must now be owned that God hath not been wanting in the use of proper means to cure the disaffection of our hearts.

ESSAY, page

404

408

80. The apostle says, that Christ Jesus being in the form of God (as he certainly was here below, being Immanuel, God manifest in the flesh) *did not hold it for a prey to be as God.* So the words may be literally rendered, and more justly than they are in our translation. The meaning is, He did not arrogantly seize, and retain to himself, those God-like powers and honours which he possessed, or was entitled to: He regarded them not as his prey or booty, as acquisitions of his own, and for his own use, but as the gifts of God, to be employed only for his glory<sup>x</sup>,

413, 414

<sup>x</sup> Here our author drops the vizard, and stands forth the bare-faced Socinian, both in translating this passage, and in the sense he assigns unto it. Witness Pool's continuation, "Paul doth not say (as the Arians of old) he robbed not, or snatched not, held not fast equality with God, or (as the Socinians since) Christ thought not to do this robbery to God, or commit this rape upon God, so as that he should be equal to him, but acknowledged he had it of the free gift of God." Ridgely in his *Body of Divinity*, vol. I. page 153. observes, That "the Anti-trinitarians ren-

power. I will take away the stony heart out of their flesh, and will give them an heart of flesh. That they may walk in my statutes, &c. God, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us.

Ezk. 11. 19.

— 20.

Eph. 2. 4, 5.

80. I and my Father are one. Christ is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen. Who subsisting in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: Nevertheless, he made himself of no reputation, taking upon him the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men: And being found in fashion as a man, &c. Tho' he was rich, yet for our sakes he became poor. In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. Unto the Son God saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever, &c.

John 10. 30.

Rom. 9. 5.

Phil. 2. 6,

7,

8.

2 Cor. 8. 9.

Col. 2. 9.

Heb. 1. 8, &c.

“ der the word, *He did not covet to be honoured*, or was not greedy, “ or in haste of being honoured, *as God*, that is, he did not affect “ to appear like a divine person, or catch at those divine honours, “ that did not belong to him.” Taylor of Norwich Paraphrases, “ He did not regard the dignity and glory, which he had with the “ Father, as soldiers do the spoil and plunder, which they take by “ force, and resolutely hold against all the world.” The Scripture Doctrine of Atonement examined, page 120. In support of the Socinian translation, adopted by our author, a passage or two is frequently quoted from a Greek writer. But whether in the interpretation of scripture, we should repair to the puddles of Pa-

81. When the time came in which it behoved him, according to the appointment of his Father, to suffer and die, he hesitated not to descend from a state of grandeur and elevation, never

ESSAY, page

ganimism, or to the streams of the sanctuary, will not be disputed by the lovers of truth. The word *ἠγίστατο*, rendered *thought*, in our version, is found in eighteen places of the New Testament, five of which are in the same epistle, and in all of them it signifies, to *think, esteem, account, reckon, or judge*, as will appear in considering them apart.

Acts xxvi. 2. *I think myself happy, &c.*

Phil. ii. 3. *Let each esteem, &c.*

Phil. ii. 25. *I supposed it necessary, &c.*

Phil. iii. 7. *Those I counted loss, &c.*

Phil. iii. 8. *I count all things but loss, &c.*

Phil. iii. 8. *And do count them, &c.*

1 Thess. v. 13. *Esteem them very highly, &c.*

2 Thess. iii. 15. *Count him not, &c.*

1 Tim. i. 12. *He counted me, &c.*

1 Tim. vi. 1. *Let servants count, &c.*

Heb. x. 29. *Hath counted the blood, &c.*

Heb. xi. 11. *She judged him faithful, &c.*

Heb. xi. 26. *Esteeming the reproach, &c.*

James i. 12. *Count it all joy, &c.*

2 Pet. i. 13. *I think it meet, &c.*

2 Pet. ii. 13. *They count it pleasure, &c.*

2 Pet. iii. 9. *Some men count slackness, &c.*

2 Pet. iii. 15. *Account that the long-suffering, &c.*

Now to use the word *ἠγίστατο* in one and the same sense in eighteen passages, and to abandon that sense in the nineteenth, would be something very extraordinary, especially when there is not the shadow of necessity for so doing. Such a conduct would betray a design, not to seek the truth, but to shun it, as the owls do the

81. Now that he ascended, what Eph. 4. 9.  
 is it but that he also descended *first*  
 into the lower parts of the earth?  
 And Mary brought forth her first- Luke 2. 7.  
 born son, and wrapped him in swad-  
 dling clothes, and laid him in a man-  
 ger, because there was no room for  
 them in the inn. And when the days ——— — 22.  
 of her purification were accomplished,  
 they brought him to Jerusalem, to pre- ——— — 24.  
 sent him to the Lord, and to offer sa-  
 crifice according to that which is said  
 in the law of the Lord, A pair of Lev. 12. 8.  
 turtle-doves, or two young pigeons.  
 The foxes have holes, and the birds of Mat. 8. 20.

light. It cannot be denied, that in the original phrase, ουχ ἀρ-  
 παγμὸν ἠγήσατο το ειναι ισα Θεῶ, there is either an ellipsis, or an  
 enallage. Taking it to be elliptical, some construe it in the fol-  
 lowing manner, He thought it not robbery *ἑαυτον*, or *τα ἑαυτου*  
*το ειναι ισα Θεῶ*, that *his things* should be equal to God, that is,  
 that he himself should in all things be equal to God. And the  
 supplement, *his things*, they take from verse 4th, Look not every  
 man on his own things. Zanchy de Incarnatione, page 19. Mas-  
 tricht Theor. vol. I. page 489. Others take the plural adjective  
*ισα* substantively, as it is certain the singular *ισος* is often used,  
 Scapulæ Lex. page 690, and hence they read, He thought it not  
 robbery to be *altogether* equal with God. Turret. de Satisfactione,  
 page 287. The renowned Sir Richard Ellys observes, in his For-  
 tuita Sacra, page 213. That with the Greeks, *το ειναι* joined to  
*ισα* is most significant: and that PERFECT EQUALITY cannot be  
 more fully expressed, than it is by that phrase.

possessed by any *man* before or after him, ESSAY, page  
to the deepest abyfs of humiliation <sup>y</sup>. 415, 416

<sup>y</sup> It is pitiable to see how our author understands the apostle's words, Phil. ii. 6,—8. If ever scripture was wrested by the unlearned, this is by the Doctor, pages 414, 415. He tells us, that Jesus emptied himself of the form of God, by laying aside every mark of that majestic dignity and splendour whereby he represented God on earth, and took upon him the form of a servant, or slave, even with respect to men; that he was made in the likeness of men, not merely by assuming their nature, but by descending to their common lot, becoming like those men who have no extraordinary endowments, &c. What an awful perversion of the passage this! Did the Son of God never empty himself, or make himself of no reputation, till it behoved him to die? Did he never take upon him the form of a servant, but towards the close of life? Was he always in a state of grandeur and elevation till apprehended in the garden? According to the true sense of the passage, he made himself of no reputation, by taking upon him the form of a servant; and he took upon him the form of a servant, by being made in the likeness of men. When did he assume that form? When was he made in that likeness? Why, when God sent him in the likeness of *sinful flesh*, made of a woman, made *under the law*, Rom. viii. 3. Gal. iv. 4. The Doctor tells us, that Christ was certainly in the form of God here below, that he appeared like him among men. But as the *form of a servant* which he assumed, is directly opposed to the *form of God* in which he ever was, Who does not know that the one was as a veil to the other? His flesh to his Godhead, Heb. x. 20. So impenetrable this veil, that natural men could not discern the Deity behind it. So far from beholding the God, they saw nothing but the carpenter's son, and therefore were offended at him, Matth. xiii. 55,—57. Nor will it follow from this, that God was rather hid, than manifested in the flesh. He was so manifested there as no where else. None of his works, no not the highest, were ever so precious to him, as that portion of our nature which he assumed into personal union with himself.

the air have nests ; but the Son of man Mat. 8. 20.  
hath not where to lay his head.

Hence his ever memorable words, This is MY BODY, this is MY BLOOD, Matth. xxvi. 26. 28. In this temple of our humanity he deigned to dwell : Was so manifested, that all whose minds God had enlightened, beheld him and adored. And those who did not, behoved to die in their sins, John viii. 24. They who believed not on him as incarnate, could see him no where else in a saving manner.

That he was always in a state of grandeur and elevation, till the time came in which it behoved him to die, is notoriously false. From that state he descended, when he took upon him the likeness of sinful flesh, the form of a servant. It is said indeed, that *being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself*, &c. Phil. ii. 8. But the question is, to what period does this refer ? Why, not to his being apprehended in the garden, but to his incarnate state, which was the immediate consequence of his emptying himself, mentioned verse 7th. For it is undeniable, that in these two verses, there is but one conjunction, joining together two acts of our Saviour. The first is his exinanition, *ἐαυτον ἐκένωσε*, he emptied himself ; the second, his farther humiliation, *ἐταπείνωσεν ἐαυτον*, he humbled himself. The first was his act as God : subsisting in the form of God, he emptied himself, taking upon him the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men. The second was his act as man : *and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself*, becoming obedient unto death, the death of the cross.

Now, when did his state of humiliation properly commence ? When did he become poor ? At his incarnation, surely. Then it was that he emptied himself. Soon as he assumed a servant's form, his humble state and his obedience accordingly began : which obedience continued unto death, the death of the cross, as its last act, John x. 18. It is further to be observed, that when it is said he humbled himself, this, if referred to the closing scene of life, can only be understood of a deeper degree of humiliation than he had hitherto experienced as man. Compare Psal. xxii. 15. Being ap-

82. The prospect of *becoming mighty* to save, by doing the will of God, must delight the heart of generosity itself; and this was the reward to which our Saviour aspired. This was, if ye will, the *selfishness* of the Lord Jesus.

ESSAY, page

419

83. When Christ is said to have suffered and died for us, it has been made a question, What is the precise import of the word *for*? Does it mean *on account of*? or, *instead of*?—Unless we will say that he rose again from the tomb in our stead, the apostle Paul seems to forbid us to say that he died for us, in that sense of the word, when he says that Christ *died for us, and rose again*, 2 Cor. v. 15. He rose, as well as died for us; and the word *for* must bear the same sense when applied to his resurrection, as when applied to his death. Not but that he died in our stead, as we must have perished, if he had not died.—It is remarkable, that our translators have never rendered it *instead of*, throughout

prehended in the garden, he submitted to be bound and led away as an evil doer. But even then, he gave his enemies a striking proof that he was the Lion of the tribe of Juda, before he submit-

82. I have laid help upon one that *is mighty*. Even Christ pleased not *himself*, &c. Ye know the *grace* of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich. Though he was a Son, yet learned he obedience, by the things which he suffered.

Pfal. 89. 19.  
Rom. 15. 3.  
2 Cor. 8, 9.  
Heb. 5. 8.

83. And in as much as not without an oath he was made a priest, By so much was Jesus made a surety of a better testament. All we like sheep have gone astray: and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all. It was exacted, and he was afflicted. God hath made him to be *sin for us*, that we might be made the *righteousness of God in him*. Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us. Made *under the law*, to redeem them that were *under the law*, that we might receive the adoption of sons.

Heb. 7. 20.  
—— — 22.  
Isa. 53. 6.  
—— 7.  
2 Cor. 5. 21.  
Gal. 3. 13.  
Gal. 4. 4.  
—— 5.

ted to be led as a lamb to the slaughter. After all, I may venture to affirm, that it was more for the God to become a man, than for the man to die: More for God to dwell in the likeness of *sinful flesh*, than for that flesh to be rent asunder. It was in the former case, and not in the latter, that our blessed Lord descended from a state of grandeur and elevation, John iii. 13. Eph. iv. 9. compared with Psal. cxxxix. 15.

the whole New Testament, but have very properly confined themselves to the general term *for-us*<sup>z</sup>.

ESSAY, page

419, 420

84. There is a great power and efficacy in Christ's love seriously considered, to promote the conversion of sinners, who have yet any *remains of faith* in them, or even of a candid and ingenuous temper.

425

85. It was *thought better* that the holy One of God should suffer as the worst of criminals use to do on the earth, than that so great an evil as sin should remain and reign in men, or that it should be pardoned without repentance.

447

<sup>z</sup> Here again our author shows himself the Socinian, in teaching that Christ died *for our benefit*, but *not in our law-room or stead*. And if so, then he died in no other sense for us, than did the prophets, apostles, and other martyrs, 2 Tim. ii. 10. and of consequence, we are under no greater obligations to him, than to them. He argues that Christ rose, as well as died for us, and that the word *for*, must have the same sense when applied to both these events. But by what rules of criticism does this follow? He was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification, Rom. iv. 25. delivered, viz. unto death, chap. viii. 32. that he might purchase pardon *for us*; and raised again, to apply that pardon *to us*. If the word *for*, cannot always signify *instead of*, neither can it, *for the good of*; as when it is said that Christ died *for our sins*, 1 Cor. xv. 3. But as the wages of sin is death, Gen. ii. 17. Ezek. xviii. 4. Rom. vi. 23. it is easy to see in what sense Christ is said to die both for sin, and for the sinner, viz. in *his* stead, to expiate *it*. As to what our author says, That if Christ had not died, we must have perished, he here contradicts what he had

Christ once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust. 1 Pet. 3. 18.

84. That which is born of the flesh is flesh. In my flesh dwelleth no good thing. Simon Peter, to them that have obtained like precious faith with us. For all men have not faith. John 3. 6. Rom. 7. 18. 2 Pet. 1. 1. 2 Theff. 3. 2.

85. It was *necessary* that the heavenly things themselves should be purified with better sacrifices than these. He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities, &c. When we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son. Heb. 9. 23. Isa. 53. 5. Rom. 5. 10.

taught, page 243. See No. 25. He observes, that our translators never read *instead of*, throughout the whole of the New Testament, but very properly confine themselves to the general term *for us*. But he must know, that in two passages they have rendered the preposition *ὑπὲρ* *instead of*. 2 Cor. v. 20. We pray you (*ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ*) in Christ's stead. Phil. verse 13. That (*ὑπὲρ σοῦ*) in thy stead he might have ministered unto me. He observes, "That one uniform signification of a word is always best, unless the sense in other places, necessarily requires it be varied." And therefore, according to himself, our translators should have read, We thus judge, that if one died *instead of* all, then were all dead: and that he died *instead of* all, that they who live, should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him who died in their *stead*. Now then we are ambassadors in Christ's *stead*, we pray you in Christ's *stead*, be ye reconciled to God. For he hath made him to be sin in our *stead*, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him, 2 Cor. v. 14, 15. 20, 21.

86. The condemnation of impenitent finners is established in the *same covenant*, and ratified with the *same blood*, which assures the remission of sins to them that repent.

ESSAY, page

456

87. *We* may not find any hope on the merits or atonement of a Saviour, exclusive of our own personal obedience.

457

88. God, by the sufferings of his Son on account of sin, hath given a mortal blow to its reigning power in all who are *willing* to be free from it.—His power is able to raise me up, If I be *willing*.

459

462

89. Am I *chosen* and selected of God to the attainment of salvation? How zealous should I be, by my behaviour, to justify, if possible, a choice so honourable, and beneficial to me; to shew that it hath not been *improperly* placed, and to render it effectual?

474

90. Since I have received so many great proofs of the *love* of God, and of the Lord Jesus Christ, toward me, I am

86. Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion: By the blood of *thy covenant*, I have sent forth thy prisoners out of the pit, wherein is no water. The blood of sprinkling speaketh *better things* than that of Abel. Ye are not under the law but under grace. For these are the  
TWO COVENANTS.

Zech. 9. 9.  
11.  
Heb. 12. 24.  
Rom. 6. 14.  
Gal. 4. 24.

87. *We* conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law. By grace are ye saved: not of works, lest any man should boast. I will shew thee my faith by my works.

Rom. 3. 28.  
Eph. 2. 8, 9.  
James 2. 18.

88. Thy people *shall be willing* in the day of thy power. It is God that worketh in you, both to *will* and to do. I will put my fear in their hearts, that they shall not depart from me.

Psal. 110. 3.  
Phil. 2. 13.  
Jer. 32. 40.

89. The purpose of God, according to election, standeth not of works, but of him that calleth. There is a remnant according to the election of grace. And if by grace, then it is no more of works, otherways grace is no more grace. He hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, *that we should be holy, &c.*

Rom. 9. 11.  
— 11. 5, 6.  
Eph. 1. 4.

90. I know that in me (that is, in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing. The carnal mind is enmity against God.

Rom. 7. 18.  
— 8. 7.

prompted *by nature* itself, to love them in return, with sincerity and fervour, and to love my brethren for their sakes. ESSAY, page  
475

91. What sort of temper ought to be formed in us, by that quickening from spiritual death, and that *new creation*, which the grace of God hath brought us? Some idea of this benefit may be conceived from the condition of a bankrupt.—He is again set upon his feet, as we say, and provided with an ample stock to begin the world anew.—These things exhibit a faint image of an unbeliever, to whom the gospel is preached without effect; or of a Christian, who forgets that he is God's workmanship through Christ, and who does not stir himself up to act as a new creature. 475  
476

92. If we give ourselves to sin, the conclusion and reward of that service is death, death everlasting; if to righteousness, our reward is justification and eternal life <sup>a</sup>. 480, 481

<sup>a</sup> Here we are taught, that we are as certainly justified on account of our righteousness, as condemned for our sins. Now, according to our author himself, all have sinned, there is sin in the best; therefore God, weighing our virtue and our guilt, and finding that the former preponderates, justifies us. What is this, but a bastard covenant of works?

The Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, to love the Lord thy God. Apollos helped them much who had believed through grace. By the grace of God, I am what I am.

Deut. 30. 6.

Acts 18. 27.

1 Cor. 15. 10.

91. Ye are of your father the devil and his lusts ye will do. Thou art in the gall of bitterness, and in the bond of iniquity. All men have not faith. We know that we are of God, and the whole world lieth in wickedness. Thou hast given thy Son power over all flesh, to give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him. The election hath obtained, and the rest were blinded. To the one we are the favour of death unto death, and to the other the favour of life unto life. For many are called, but few are chosen.

John 8. 44.

Acts 8. 23.

2 Theff. 3. 2.

1 John 5. 19.

John 17. 2.

Rom. 11. 7.

2 Cor. 2. 16.

Mat. 22. 14.

92. By the obedience of one shall many be made righteous. The wages of sin is death: but the gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Who of God is made unto us righteousness. For he made him to be sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him. A man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ. By grace are ye saved, through faith, *not of works*, lest any man should boast.

Rom. 5. 19.

— 6. 23.

1 Cor. 1. 30.

2 Cor. 5. 21.

Gal. 2. 16.

Eph. 2. 8, 9.

93. Almighty God deigned to tabernacle with men in a *Person of their own order*, and to manifest his power, wisdom, goodness and holiness, in a man like themselves. This was doing great honour to the whole human race: and the honour was much increased by what this *Divine Person* suffered on our account <sup>b</sup>.

ESSAY, page

487, 488

94. During his last sufferings, all the virtues were collected, as in a narrow space.—Toward God, humility, submission, and self-denial:—Toward man, a benevolence truly generous and disinterested:—A patriotic tenderness for his country:—Private friendship and filial affection,—divine compassion to penitent sinners; even CONJUGAL DUTY, in its sublimest exertions <sup>c</sup>.

496, 497

<sup>b</sup> How inconsistently our author speaks! He is a fountain sending forth at the same place sweet water and bitter. In one sentence he tells us that Almighty God tabernacled with men in a person of their own order; and in the next, he calls that person divine. If of their order, then he was certainly a human person, and if so, he could not be a divine. The Doctor seems to have forgot the difference between a nature and a person. The Son of God assumed *another nature* than what he originally had, but he did not become *another person*. He, a divine person, took part of flesh and blood. Though humanity subsists in his person, yet it is not a person, but a nature. In his one person are two natures, Rev. xxii. 16. *I am the root and the off-spring of David*.

<sup>c</sup> When to the patriotic tenderness, private friendship, and filial

93. Forasmuch then as the children Heb. 2. 14.  
 are partakers of flesh and blood, *he al-*  
*so himself* likewise took part of the  
 same. Last of all he sent unto them Mat. 21. 37.  
*his son*, saying, They will reverence my  
 son. His Son, the brightness of his Heb. 1. 3.  
 glory, and the express image of his per-  
 son. Moses verily was faithful as a — 3. 5, 6.  
 servant, but Christ as a Son.

94. The preacher sought to find out Eccl. 12. 10.  
 acceptable words. In doctrine shewing Tit. 2. 8.  
 found speech that cannot be condem-  
 ned. Whosoever shall do the will of Mat. 12. 50.  
 my Father who is in heaven, the same  
 is my *brother, and sister, and mother*.  
 I will declare thy name unto my bre- Heb. 2. 12.  
 thren. Behold, I and the children — 13.  
 whom God hath given me.

affection of our Lord, the Doctor adds *conjugal duty*, a stranger to  
 Christianity would be ready to draw a conclusion so obvious that I  
 need not mention it. If ever there was an indecent phrase, that  
 of *conjugal duty* applied to the Lord of glory, is. The text quoted  
 by our author, viz. Eph. v. 25. does not in the least apologize  
 for it. Christ is as certainly the Father, as the Husband of his  
 people, Isa. viii. 18. ix. 6. But who would therefore say, that  
 during his last sufferings he shewed *paternal duty*, in its sublimest  
 exertions? He was Mary's Son in a proper sense, being born of  
 her. He is the husband of his church in a figurative. And there-  
 fore to connect these two, as the Doctor does here, was a gross im-  
 propriety.

95. By imitating his obedience, we become partakers of his salvation.—The fat of rams is not to be compared with obedience. Obedience is more acceptable to God, than if *you should offer him the cattle upon a thousand hills; nay, more precious than the blood of Christ himself*<sup>d</sup>.

ESSAY, page

499

96. By dying the death of the cross, in confirmation of the new covenant, Christ hath secured to us the remission of all past sins repented of and forsaken, and hath furnished us also with the most powerful argument to abstain from sin for the future. So that if the matter do not *stick at us*, our sins are effectually carried off by his crucified body; and we are delivered for ever, both from the punishment and the practice of them.

504

97. Our blessed Saviour, the first and chief of all the sons of God, hath before us, and for our sakes, undergone various severe afflictions in the cause of

<sup>d</sup> In proof of this unhallowed assertion, that *our* obedience is more precious than the blood of Christ himself, our author adds, “ Since it was not his blood simply considered, that redeemed us, but “ his blood as expressive of unspotted innocence, or perfect obedience.” But how fallacious this reasoning! The truth is, it was not our Lord’s active obedience which gave value to his blood,

95. He appeared, to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. He purchased his church with his *own blood*. They sung a new song, saying, Thou art *worthy* to take the book, for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by *thy blood*. These are they who have washed their robes, and made them white in *the blood* of the Lamb.

Heb. 9. 26.  
Acts 20. 28.  
Rev. 5. 9.  
—— 7. 14.

96. O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself, but in *me* is thine help. Who maketh *thee to differ* from another? No man can come to me, except the Father who hath sent me, draw him. Without me ye can do nothing. A new heart will I give you, &c. And I will put my Spirit within you, and *cause* you to walk in my statutes. The grace of our Lord was exceeding abundant, &c. I am *apprehended* of Christ Jesus.

Hof. 13. 9.  
1 Cor. 4. 7.  
John 6. 44.  
—— 15. 5.  
Ezk. 36. 26,  
— 27  
1 Tim. 1. 14.  
Phil. 3. 12.

97. Messiah shall be cut off, but not *for himself*. Who needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the

Dan. 9. 26.  
Heb. 7. 27.

nor his blood to it, but the dignity of his person gave value to both. His blood was the blood of God; his righteousness, the righteousness of God, Rom. x. 3. According to scripture, the blood of Christ is the *cause*, and our obedience the *effect*: for it purges our conscience from dead works to serve the living God, Heb. ix. 14.

truth and virtue, submitted to the death of the cross, and attained by *that means* immortal bliss *himself*, with the power of conferring the same on his followers. ESSAY, page

522

—You see in the death of Christ the ground of celestial honour and advancement, first to our Redeemer *himself*, and after him, and by his means, for all the children of God.

541

98. Had our Redeemer been endowed with the same power to save us which Jesus Christ now possesses, but without being allied to us by the same common nature, and without having had previous trial of our infirmities and afflictions, the case *might have been the same* that it is as to the final accomplishment of our hopes, but it would *have been very different* with respect to our present consolation.

527

99. To bring sinners into a state of favour with God, without repentance and a holy life,—was never *attempted* by the Redeemer of mankind; and with the profoundest respect for his charac-

peoples. This is my beloved Son. Appointed heir of all things. Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich.

Mat. 3. 17.

Heb. 1. 2.

2 Cor. 8, 9.

98. It became him for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through *sufferings*. Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same: that *through death* he might destroy him who had the power of death, that is, the devil. He is the mediator of the New Testament, that by means of *death*, &c. Without shedding of blood is no remission. It was therefore *necessary* that the heavenly things themselves should be purified with better sacrifices than these.

Heb. 2. 10.

— — 14.

— 9. 15.

— 22.

— 23.

99. The WORD was God. Far be it from God that he should do wickedness; and from the Almighty, that he should commit iniquity: Yea, surely God will not do wickedly, &c. All

John 1. 1.

Job 34. 10.

— 12.

Deut. 25. 16.

ter, let me add, that it would have been *a vain attempt even for him.* ESSAY, page 542

100. God left every one *free* to reject or embrace the gospel *as he pleased*, only reserving to himself the right of calling all men to account for their conduct, and giving them the suitable rewards of it in another world.

547

101. Thou hast shewn us fully what is good, and what Thou requirest of us. The practice thereof Thou hast enforced by every proper sanction of *reward* and punishment; and hast likewise drawn us to it by demonstrations of love, and by the most perfect example<sup>e</sup>.

549

<sup>e</sup> These words are part of that address to the Deity, with which our author concludes his Essay. These addresses occur frequently throughout the book, and have a great appearance of devotion. But it is very remarkable, that the proto-martyr, when amidst a shower of stones, Acts vii. 59. prayed more to our adorable Saviour, than Dr. McGill has done in the compass of 550 pages. And indeed how could he, in a consistency with his creed? How pray to one of whom he could speak in the following disrespectful terms? He seemed to betray marks of *human weakness*, page 44. *Pretended* to be the Son of God, page 136, 138. Was not an *ordinary* man, page 181, 285, 287. Was a martyr of whom it is *scarce conceivable* that he could be mistaken in what he professed, page 378. Was a person of *our own order*, page 487, who by submitting to the death of the cross, attained immortal bliss *himself*, &c. page 523.

that do unrighteously, are an abomination to the Lord thy God. God is angry with the wicked every day. Is Christ the minister of sin? God forbid.

100. Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, &c. Turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways; for why will ye die? This is his commandment, that we should believe in the name of his Son Jesus Christ. *Compel* them to come in, that my house may be filled.

101. He went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil. Though he had done so many miracles *before them*, yet they believed not on him. To whom is the arm of the Lord revealed? Pulling down strong holds, casting down imaginations, and every high thing, &c. The exceeding greatness of his power according to the working of his mighty power, which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead.

Deut. 25. 16.

Pfal. 7. 11.

Gal. 2. 17.

Isa. 55. 1.

Ezk. 33. 11.

1 John 3. 23.

Luke 14. 23.

Acts 10. 38.

John. 12. 37.

Isa. 53. 1.

2 Cor. 10. 4,

5.

Eph. 1. 19,

20.

F I N I S.



# C O N T E N T S.

## PART FIRST

*Of the Tractate on the Satisfaction, contains the following Points of Difference betwixt the Orthodox and the Socinians.*

	page
I. <i>WHETHER God punishes sin as he is the injured Sovereign? or as he is the Governor and Judge of the world?</i>	9
II. <i>Whether the will of God be indifferent, and indeterminate to punish, or not to punish, when the rational creature hath sinned against him? or if according to the divine honour and perfection, it certainly inflicts punishment, when sin is committed?</i>	22
III. <i>Whether the divine threatening, annexed to the Covenant of the Law, denounces sure and certain punishment, when man transgresses that Covenant in any respect? or if it signifies to the sinner mere guilt only, without the certainty of punishment?</i>	41
IV. <i>Whether by the promise and tender of Gospel-grace thro' Christ, the Law, or the Covenant of the Law, be wholly abrogated and disannulled? or if we be saved by Christ, in a consistency with the right and the demand of the Law?</i>	50
V. <i>Whether a Surety for the sinner, can have place before the Divine Tribunal?</i>	62
VI. <i>Whether the ancient Propitiatory-Sacrifices, made atonement for sin, as a simple pre-requisite condition? or by way of satisfaction?</i>	73

## PART SECOND.

*Whether the Lord Jesus Christ suffered the deserved punishment of Sins, instead of Sinners, and in that manner satisfied the Law of God for them? This proved,*

I. <i>From those texts, which say, That he was made sin for us.</i>	102
II. <i>From those which say, That he suffered for sins.</i>	107
III. <i>From those which say, That he died for sinners.</i>	111
IV. <i>From those which say, That he gave himself a ransom.</i>	115
V. <i>From those which say, That he bore our sorrows and our sins.</i>	117
VI. <i>From those which say, That he redeemed us with a ransom.</i>	123
VII. <i>From those which say, That he bought us with a price</i>	126
VIII. <i>From those which say, That by his sufferings, he reconciled us unto God.</i>	128

# C O N T E N T S.

	Page
IX. <i>From those which say, That he suffered the punishment of our sins.</i>	132
X. <i>From the Covenant between the Father and him.</i>	134
XI. <i>From his suretyship for sinners.</i>	138
XII. <i>From his priesthood.</i>	141
XIII. <i>From the atoning virtue of his bloody sacrifice.</i>	145
XIV. <i>From reflecting on those persons whose sins are expiated by his bloody sacrifice.</i>	157
XV. <i>From his mediatory office.</i>	161
XVI. <i>From the abrogation of the Ceremonial Law by his death.</i>	163
XVII. <i>From those texts, in which he calls our sins, his sins.</i>	166
XVIII. <i>From the essential difference between his sufferings, and those of the apostles.</i>	167
XIX. <i>From the necessity of his sufferings in order to our redemption.</i>	170
XX. <i>From the perfection of his sacrifice.</i>	171
XXI. <i>From those texts which teach that forgiveness of sins is the proper effect of the shedding of his blood.</i>	173
XXII. <i>From the nature of the forgiveness of sins.</i>	176
XXIII. <i>From the difference of the forgiveness of sins before, and since his death.</i>	178
XXIV. <i>From those texts, which attribute the work of atonement unto him, in opposition to other causes.</i>	179
XXV. <i>From those texts which say, That he fulfilled the righteousness of the law for sinners.</i>	180
XXVI. <i>From God's express declaration, Gal. iii. 13.</i>	181
XXVII. <i>From the vile absurdities, which necessarily follow the denial of his satisfaction.</i>	182

## E R R A T A.

- PAGE 23. line 11. for permits, *read* admits.  
 47. l. 7. for that, *read* That.  
 73. l. 11. *omit* are.  
 77. l. 19. *read* of ceremonies.  
 89. l. 6. from the foot, for &c. *read* and.  
 96. l. 1. for XX. *read* XXII.  
 100. l. 9. for that, *read* That.  
 118. l. 8. from the foot, *read* borne.  
 134. l. 12. *read* disobedience.  
 155. l. 9. from the foot, *read* antilutron.  
 175. l. 9. for works, *read* excites.  
 188. l. 10. after salvation put a comma, not a period.  
 264. l. 17. *after* the, *read* word.  
 265. l. 20. *read* 18,—24.  
 272. l. 1. *read* obligations.  
 283. l. 5. from the foot, *read* more.



